were deprived of benefit of advance in price; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting allocation of funds for construction and maintenance of farm-to-market roads by States and political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the enactment of legislation allowing for and directing the annual payment of grants by the United States Government to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of the several counties of Montana in lieu of taxes on lands owned by the United States Government in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the enactment of legislation authorizing the State of Montana to lease State lands for the production of oil, gas, and other hydrocarbons for such periods of time and on such terms and conditions as may be provided by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting legislation to grant certain servicemen and veterans who have been prisoners of war the benefits of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COFFIN:

H. R. 2760. A bill for the relief of Thomas Camarda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2761. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Karsten Harstad; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2762. A bill for the relief of Sotirios Ioannis Perivolaris (also known as Sotirios J. Perivolaris or Sam Aspiotes); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

242. By Mr. KEARNEY: Memorial of the Senate and Assembly of New York State, as exemplified in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 11, calling on the Congress to establish a veterans' hospital in the Borough of Queens; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

243. Also, memorial of the Senate and Assembly of New York State, as exemplified in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 68, calling on the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to authorize the United States Veterans' Administration to take over the St. Albans Naval Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

244. By Mr. KEATING: Petition of citizens of the State of New York protesting the abolition of the Division of Labor Standards of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

245. By Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Petition transmitted by Mr. Walter Burk in behalf of Local Union No. 72, Progressive Mine Workers of America, at New Athens, Ill., petitioning Congress to make revision upward in the benefits of social-security annuitants and for the reduction in the age requirement from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

246. Also, petition submitted by Mr. Robert Grieve, secretary, in behalf of Progressive Mine Workers of America, Local 41, Collinsville, Ill., regarding necessity for increasing social-security benefits and reducing age for entitlement for persons eligible for benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

247. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the Kenosha County Board of Supervisors on March 10, 1947, asking that the Congress of the United States and the Legislature of Wisconsin take whatever steps that are necessary to change the laws affecting the housing and hospitalization of the aged so that the housing of aged pensioners in county and municipal institutions would not result in any loss of State or Federal aid to such pensioners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

248. Also, joint resolution adopted by the Wisconsin State Legislature, pledging the full cooperation of the State of Wisconsin, its agencies and people, to the War Department in the development of Camp McCoy as a permanent military camp; to the Committee on Armed Services.

249. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Horace A. Riggs, Lakewood, Ohio, on behalf of 6,000 to 7,000 stockholders of Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. (now Central Republic Trust Co.), of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to relief of stockholders of Central Republic Bank & Trust Co. (now Central Republic Trust Co.), Chicago, Ill., and restoration of funds illegally withheld therefrom; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, as we pray for Thy guidance and help, we know that Thou dost not intend prayer to be a substitute for work. We know that we are expected to do our part, for Thou hast made us, not puppets, but persons with minds to think and wills to resolve. Make us willing to think, and think hard, clearly, and honestly, guided by Thy voice within us, and in accordance with the light Thou hast given us. May we never fail to do the very best we can. We pray in the knowledge that it all depends on Thee. Help us then to work as if it all depended on us, that together we may do that which is well pleasing in Thy sight. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Monday, March 24, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 118) to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 21, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 220. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. an easement for communication purposes in certain lands situated in Virginia and Maryland; and

S. 221. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Under the agreement of last evening, I was to have the floor this morning at the convening of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understood the Chair to recognize the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In order that he might request the approval of the Journal. The Senator from Iowa is recognized and has the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senate now in executive session or in legislative session?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in executive session.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it was my understanding that the Lilienthal nomination was to be made the unfinished business of the Senate in executive session, and that the Senate would proceed as in legislative session to consider other measures which might be emergent in character. I had hoped that at this time we might resume legislative session in order that the Senator from Michigan might call up the joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, just to make it clear, let me say that, so far as I am concerned, I am happy to have that measure discussed, and have so informed the Senator from Maine. I merely want to clarify the parliamentary situation so there will be no misunderstanding about it.

Mr. WHITE. I do not think there is any misunderstanding.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the opinion of the Chair that if the Senate now goes into legislative session and returns to executive session, the Senator from Iowa at that time will be entitled to resume the floor.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I therefore move, Mr. President, that the Senate now resume the consideration of legislative business.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 77.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, my colleague the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] asked me to read into the RECORD the following statement:

I desire to withdraw my name as a sponsor of the amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 77 intended to be proposed by Mr. REVERCOMB for himself, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. MCGRATH.

This action is taken because it has been suggested to me, and I concur in the suggestion, that the language of the amendment might be construed to nullify the existing power of the Chief Executive to administer the present immigration laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the first committee amendment.

The first amendment reported by the committee was, on page 1, line 9, after the word "Nations", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That this authorization shall not be construed as delegating to the President or any officer, representative, or agency of the United States authority to conclude any agreement with the Organization; (a) authorizing any temporary, emergency, or other immigration or admission to the United States or its Territories or possessions of any refugees or displaced persons referred to in the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization; or (b) abrogating, superseding, suspending, or modifying any law of the United States; or (c) concerning any other matter, in contravention of existing law; or (d) concerning any other matter requiring action by the Congress, or either branch thereof, under the Constitution of the United States."

Mr. VANDENBERG obtained the floor.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like at this time, which I think is the proper time, to call up an amendment to be considered prior to the amendment which has just been stated.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think, if the Senator will permit me to say so, that his amendment should be offered as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to accept that suggestion, and, Mr. President, at this time I call up for consideration as a substitute for the committee amendment, the amendment which has been offered on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the committee amendment beginning on page 1, line 9, after the word "nations", and extending to line 12 on page 2, inclusive, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided, however*, That this authority is granted and the approval of the Congress of the acceptance of membership of the United States in the International Refugee Organization is given upon condition and with the reservation that no agreement shall be concluded on behalf of the United States and no action shall be taken by any officer, agency, or any other person (1) whereby any person shall be admitted to or settled or resettled in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions without prior approval thereof by the Congress, and this joint resolution shall not be construed as such prior approval, or (2) which will have the effect of abrogating, suspending, modifying, adding to, or superseding any of the immigration laws or any other laws of the United States."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief general statement regarding the pending joint resolution.

I think Senators are familiar with the postwar responsibilities which we confront in the conquered countries of central Europe. Included in those responsibilities is the responsibility for displaced persons, so-called. At the present time we are responsible for 588,000 refugees and persecuted persons, in Germany and Austria. They are living under the American flag. Our administration is responsible for what happens to them.

Up to the present time, and at the moment, this responsibility is divided into three parts. It is being administered in part by the Army, in part by what is left of expiring UNRRA, and in part by the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees.

As the Senate knows, UNRRA is about to expire. As the Senate knows, the Army has made no estimate to cover a continuation of its share of the responsibility in the next fiscal year. Therefore we confront the necessity of providing a new authority to handle our responsibilities in respect to what we will call generally displaced persons.

I repeat, there are at present 588,000 of them. I might add that while the total number of displaced persons originally amounted to seven or eight million, for whom we ourselves and other Allies were responsible, it is down to approximately 1,000,000, of which number, I repeat, we are responsible for 588,000.

Mr. President, the administration of this responsibility has cost the United States Treasury $130,000,000 in the fiscal year 1947. That is the expenditure which has been required to administer this responsibility. The question is—and it is the question pending in the Senate today—What will happen on July 1, when new auspices must be developed to handle this responsibility?

In order to handle it the United Nations has created an instrumentality known as the International Refugee Organization, to which all members of the United Nations are eligible, but in which not more, at a maximum, than from 15 to 20 are expected to participate, because the interest in the problem is confined within limits growing out of its nature.

The International Refugee Organization will take over the responsibilities of the Army of the United States, heretofore and presently exercised; the responsibility of UNRRA, presently expiring; and the responsibilities of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. It will present a united, organized control of the displaced-persons problem in Germany, Austria, and Italy.

What are the advantages of thus establishing what we will call, for brevity, "IRO," meaning the International Refugee Organization? What are the advantages? If we are to speak first, Mr. President, in terms of dollars and cents, the advantages are these: I repeat, on this problem we spent $130,000,000 in fiscal year 1947. Under IRO, our share of the expenditure for the same responsibility will be a maximum of $75,000,000. Therefore, at the outset, we confront a very substantial economy over the previous year, amounting to the difference between $75,000,000 and $130,000,000, or $55,000,000.

If we were to undertake on our own responsibility to operate the displaced-persons administration in Germany and Austria through the Army alone, which would be our only recourse if IRO were not established, it is estimated by the War Department that the expenditure for the next fiscal year would be $95,000,000 or $100,000,000. In other words, we confront an economy of at least $55,000,000 compared with the previous fiscal year; we confront an economy estimated at $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 under IRO, as compared with the burden we would bear if we were simply to turn this responsibility over to the Army on July 1, and that is our only alternative if IRO is not established.

Mr. President, there is another great advantage in IRO. The ultimate answer to the displaced-persons problem obviously is resettlement of displaced persons. The resettlement problem has been an exceedingly difficult one, but member nations in IRO include not only those which are responsible for the administration of displaced-persons camps; they also include a number of smaller nations which are interested in receiving displaced persons into their populations. It is calculated that there will be far greater impetus in respect to resettlement through the concentration of this responsibility in one place, where those who are responsible for the operation of displaced-persons facilities are joined together with those who are interested in resettlement. Therefore, there are the two contemplated advantages as a result of the enactment of the pending joint resolution; on the one hand, a very substantial cash saving to

the Treasury of the United States in respect to responsibilities which we cannot shirk, cannot evade, cannot ignore, and, on the other hand, the substantial advantage of a new impetus in respect to resettlement, which is the ultimate answer to the whole situation.

Mr. President, I think I have outlined in a general way the scope of IRO and the prospectus which is presented in the proposed legislation. The great fear which has been expressed among Senators in respect to it has been that somewhere, somehow, in some way, this particular IRO legislation in some fashion invades our immigration laws and commits us to an acceptance of displaced persons, regardless of existing statutes in the United States. There has been no purpose at any time, in anybody's mind, that the pending resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 77, should invade the immigration laws to the extent of a single comma. From start to finish it has been understood that it has nothing to do with immigration laws, is not intended to invade them, directly or indirectly, and is not contemplated as any sort of commitment, direct or indirect, in respect to our acceptance of displaced persons beyond existing immigration quotas.

In other words, the two subjects are totally unrelated in so far as the purposes of the sponsors of the legislation are concerned. Whether or not the United States is to participate in the acceptance of displaced persons beyond existing quota laws is entirely a matter for separate and distinct legislation, which must be handled and met and answered upon its own independent merits.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. But, if we should pass the joint resolution, would it not indirectly commit us to participate in finding a place for these displaced persons? I think 588,000 is a large number. If we were to contribute places for them within our own borders as we contribute money with which to care for them, it would mean a very large number in addition to the number permitted entry by our immigration laws. But, as I understand the Senator, that is not the purpose of the joint resolution, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is correct, and I cannot state it too categorically or too specifically or with too great finality. There is nothing in the proposal—and it was repeatedly so stated in the hearings by representatives of the State Department—which in any aspect makes any commitment of any nature whatsoever in respect to our receipt of displaced persons.

But in order to make that unequivocally clear, the committee undertook to write an amendment on the subject; and it was at that point that I ran into lawyer trouble. The committee said to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, that if he would be good enough to put in black and white an amendment which would close the door to any such possible immigration latitudes as are suggested by the question of the able Senator from Tennessee, the committee would be glad to adopt it; because it is perfectly clear that that is what is intended. So the able Senator from Wisconsin, in collaboration with some of his distinguished colleagues, including my able friend from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] submitted a text which they thought slammed the door and locked it and threw the key away.

We considered that text in the committee, and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia thought he found an attic window open. So we said, "All right, if there are any windows open, let us shut them." Therefore, it was concluded, with the assent of my able friend, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that we would adopt the Hickenlooper text on the theory that we were going a little further by way of protective device than had been suggested to us through the Judiciary Committee.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee thought everything was placid and settled and that all controversy had been eliminated, when he discovered to his consternation that the able Senator from West Virginia and one or two of his associates decided that the Senator from Iowa had left an attic window open. It is my understanding that finally the amendment submitted by the Senator from Iowa is satisfactory to all those who are undertaking to make it indubitably plain that this joint resolution has nothing whatsoever to do with our immigration. So far as I am concerned, inasmuch as I understand that the amendment applies to the text of the pending joint resolution and its restrictions are related to the business in hand, I have said that I am perfectly willing to substitute the amendment submitted by the Senator from West Virginia. In any event, I should like to make it as plain as I have failed to make it for the last 4 weeks of "lawyer trouble"—I should like to make it as plain as possible that there is nothing intended in this joint resolution to affect one single comma in our own immigration laws.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to know the extent to which the organization will be compelled to pay for the food, the clothing, the housing, and the transportation of displaced persons.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The organization will take over all responsibilities in all those aspects which have heretofore been borne either by the Army or by UNRRA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who will pay for those services?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It will be paid from the assessment upon the International Refugee Organization.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's view that $75,000,000 will be all that this Government will be called upon to furnish the Organization for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1947?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is the estimate of the Department that that is—I have forgotten the word used, but it is a word which indicates that the limit is a very close one, and contemplates a very close diet, and is of itself a minimum. But it is accepted by the Department as a maximum, and in order to make perfectly sure that the answer to the Senator's question is "yes," we wrote an amendment into the pending joint resolution which says that the authorization is limited to $75,000,000 for the present year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is that the appropriation shall not exceed that amount?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. How was the figure $75,000,000 determined as our share in this venture?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be very glad to tell the Senator. It involves a brief narrative, if the Senator will bear with me.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I will be glad to hear the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The question involves the whole subject of what share of expense the Government of the United States should carry in the United Nations in relation to the other memberships. There are two types of expenditures in the United Nations. One type is administrative and the other is operational. The administrative formula is standard because it applies to everything alike. The operational formula varies in respect to the operation for obvious reasons. The share of the United States for 1 year's administrative expense of the United Nations is 39 percent-plus.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of the entire amount necessary to operate the administrative functions of the Organization?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of all administrative budgets. I will say to the Senator that that figure was arrived at as follows—and I might as well make this explanation now, because it will apply to a number of other problems from the United Nations which will be on the floor of the Senate during the course of the present session of Congress.

At the first meeting of the General Assembly in London last winter a provisional allocation of funds was made because obviously at that time there was no basis for a permanent allocation. But a special committee was appointed to make a study of relative capacities to pay among the various member nations.

When we reached New York for the second meeting of the General Assembly we discovered to our consternation that this special committee, including in its membership the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States, had subscribed to the fact that the United States has 50 percent of the income-producing capacity of the entire earth at the present time. It was the view of many of us that in the first place those figures were too nebulous to be reliable; in the second place, that it was a serious threat to the sovereign equality of membership in an organization of this sort if any one member nation paid as much as half of its administrative expenses. So it fell to my rather embarrassed lot to try to drive down the administrative percentage from 50 percent to what we thought was an appropriate figure, namely 33½ percent. But some of our friends in the General Assembly gloried in the opportunity they confronted to insist that we

pay 50 percent, and my friend Mr.—well, my friends, the representative of the Soviet Union, were particularly engrossed with the idea that we ought to pay 50 percent.

I must confess to the Senator that I was almost down and out in the argument when it occurred to me to say to our Soviet friends one day, "Now listen: We like these compliments to our economic system, but we do not like expensive flattery, and I would suggest to you that if 5 percent of the people of this earth have got 50 percent of its income capacity we have got an economic system that had better be made mandatory on all members of the United Nations so that they can catch up with us."

That argument held the line of about 10 days, when my Soviet friend came back with what I thought was a pretty good answer. However, it took him 10 days to think of it. He said, "No; the explanation made by the delegate from the United States is incorrect. The 50-percent figure does not reflect the superiorities of the American economic system. It reflects the fact that not one bomb fell on America in World War I, and not one bomb fell on America in World War II." That was a pretty good answer. At any rate, the net result was a compromise for 1 year only, that our share of administrative expenditures in the various United Nations instrumentalities should be 39 percent plus.

We come now to the operational budget. Obviously the share of the United States in an operational budget bears somewhat upon the share of the United States in the particular problem involved in the operational budget. In other words, we would have a different percentage in a specialized agency which had general interest around the world, as compared with a specialized agency which represented a particular and peculiar and emphatic American responsibility, as in the instance of displaced persons. The Senator will remember that we are responsible for 588,000 displaced persons out of 1,037,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean displaced persons who have come to the American zone of German occupation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. They are in American displaced-persons camps or under our displaced-persons administration in the American zones in Germany and Austria. That means that our share of the DP problem in terms of displaced persons is something like 58 percent, but our operational figure was fixed as 45 percent of the total of 100 percent if all the nations joined the organization.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the next subject I was about to discuss with the Senator. What assurance have we——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me conclude my explanation. It was clearly recognized that all the members of the United Nations would not be interested in joining. For example, neither the Soviet Union nor any of its associated powers, let us say, have any interest in this problem because they handle problems of this nature in a totally different fashion. So if 15 nations join—I believe 12 have joined—we shall still pay 45 percent of 100 percent, which means that we shall pay about 55 percent of what is actually contemplated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of the whole amount necessary to——

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know where the other displaced persons are, by regions? He stated that the United States was responsible for more than half a million, now located within that part of Germany and Austria under our control.

Does the Senator know where the others are located and how they will be taken care of?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator has the hearings before him, he will find four charts which give all the detailed information.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry. I was very busy before another committee. I just returned to the Chamber, and I have not had the time to study the report. I thought probably it might be a good thing to have that information in the RECORD.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can tell the Senator roughly. Of 1,037,000 displaced persons and refugees, we are responsible for 588,000. The United Kingdom is responsible for 349,000. France is responsible for 61,000. The share which is here allocated to the United Kingdom does not include 200,000 Poles who were in General Anders' army, all of whom have been taken under the exclusive responsibility of the United Kingdom, at their own expense. That is the general breakdown.

Mr. ELLENDER. From the chart it appears that the Russians have some, also.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator repeat that statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. Are there any displaced persons in the Russian zone?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I think there are none.

Mr. ELLENDER. Have they all taken refuge in, or been shoved into, the American zone?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was in Europe last summer, and I was informed by high officials of the army that thousands moved into our zone of occupation. Some were forced in and others came over the border without authority. I was told that the Russians placed into the American zone as many displaced persons as they possibly could.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me answer the Senator before he goes further. Let us consider one question at a time. I think there are no displaced persons in the Russian zone.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know why that is?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes. I am about to tell the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to know.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no doubt that many displaced persons and refugees filtered over into the American and British zones. But the fundamental difference, which the Senator will immediately recognize, is that in the American zone we flatly refuse to permit any involuntary repatriation. In the Russian zone all repatriation is involuntary—or else voluntary; one or the other. So it is fundamentally a great American principle that displaced persons, refugees, and persecutees who are the victims of the war shall not be sent back to places where they are afraid of their lives if they go. We stand immutably against involuntary repatriation, and that is why we have camps. That is why the Russians do not.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be glad to yield as soon as I have completed my replies to the questions of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I learned a good deal while I was over there last summer. I was informed that thousands of displaced persons came to our zone not only because they expected better treatment than was accorded persons in other zones, but in the hope that we in America would open our hearts and cause the Congress to enact laws lowering the bars of immigration so that all of those in our zone would find a haven in America. I have made the statement on many occasions since my return from abroad that so far as I was concerned, I would not lend my support to change our immigration laws in any respect in order to permit them to come to this country. On the contrary, I am for stopping all immigration for a period of 5 years so that we can put our own house in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me comment at that point, so that we may not get off the track. If there is anyone over there who has any notion that through legislation such as the pending measure there is to be a free entry into the United States, it is because he has not heard about the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and other Senators who are making this measure so plain that no one can misunderstand it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am delighted and I desire to now associate myself with those distinguished Senators.

I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Will the organization have jurisdiction over all displaced persons, irrespective of their location? Will the same group of administrators and officials handle those in the American zone and the British zone as well as other zones?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are there any plans by which displaced persons will be given a home? Is there anything in sight, or has any plan been developed? Exactly how will the problem of relocation be dealt with?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the second phase of the matter to which I referred in my opening statement. The answer to this problem does not lie in appropriations for subsistence; the answer lies in successful resettlement.

The second fundamental function of the IRO is to proceed wherever possible to arrange for resettlement, and with the preliminary possibilities of that nature as described to the committee by General Hilldring, he hoped that arrangements for quite substantial numbers could be perfected by the organization within the next year in some South

American countries and in some of the low countries of Europe.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator any idea how long it will require to place these displaced persons?

Mr. VANDENBERG. None whatever. All I know is that we have them on our hands and that at least for the next 12 months we have to do something about it, and in the unanimous opinion of the Committee on Foreign Relations this is the best way to handle it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know whether any of the countries of the world have requested that some of these displaced persons be made available to them?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; I think they have.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know to what extent?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot answer the question with figures.

May I supplement my answer to the Senator from Louisiana? I have one specific exhibit. A joint declaration was made on February 18, 1947, by the Venezuelan Ambassador in London and the head office of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees that the Venezuelan Government would receive during 1947 a number of refugee immigrants which it is hoped will reach a total of 5,000 families, or approximately 15,000 persons.

Mr. ELLENDER. I noticed from press reports the other day that the French had suggested they could take some German citizens, and I assume the British will also take some.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot answer in detail. All I can say is that General Hilldring notified us that there are at long last some substantial prospects of resettlement.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask the Senator from Michigan if he does not agree with me—and I want to commend his attitude and that of others of the delegation—that the position which America takes on this subject is one further asset in building up our great American traditions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If we took any other attitude we would cut our American traditions from ear to ear.

Mr. TOBEY. That is correct. Regarding the apprehensions and fears which are expressed by some Senators and which brought about the progressive series of amendments and restored confidence in the attitude of the Senator from Michigan, have those apprehensions and fears now been allayed?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think they should have been.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator is always magnificent when he is on his feet, but it seems to me that it is regrettable that he had to exert so much mental and physical effort and take so much time of the Senate to carry through his convictions about the virtues and values involved in this matter. I am willing to take the word of the Senator from Michigan when he says "It does not"—period.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. It occurs to me that the Senator from Michigan has very eloquently stated the good work which is projected by some of the other nations of the earth in planning to assimilate some of these displaced persons. From what I have heard elsewhere and from the statement which the Senator has made, including some of the questioning, it seems to be a case of our wanting resettlement but not wanting to have any part in it.

I was particularly impressed with the Senator's statement regarding American traditions which we are so gloriously upholding in not sending displaced persons to countries where they would be oppressed. I thoroughly, wholeheartedly, and totally approve of that. We also have a tradition—or I thought we had—of offering some kind of a refuge for oppressed, persecuted, and downtrodden peoples. The Statue of Liberty which stands at the entrance of New York harbor has been greeted by many future citizens who have made their contributions to what America is today. I hope that on further reflection Congress may see fit at some time in the near future to set an example to the other nations of the earth and let it be a case of "do as we do" and not "do as we say."

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can understand the Senator's feeling. I simply say to him that for the purpose of this proposed legislation it is very important to keep the two subjects separated, because there is a sharp divergence of opinion respecting any additional latitude in our immigration laws. That subject will have to be threshed out on its own merits, in due season.

I do not see how there can be any difference of opinion regarding the wisdom of passing Senate Joint Resolution 77 and putting the United States into IRO, for unless we join it, we are left, first, with veritable chaos with respect to displaced persons in the German and Austrian zones under the jurisdiction of the United States; second, if we do not do this we confront an infinitely heavier expenditure for responsibilities which we cannot escape and cannot ignore; and third, because the IRO does offer an organized promise of resettlement.

I should like to keep the two subjects totally unrelated, because it is so desperately important that this particular thing should be done at once, because there are only 90 days left in which to organize our administration, and it is a terrific responsibility.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I desire to have the privilege of associating myself wholeheartedly with the sentiment expressed by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. After we become a member of this organization, will we be forced to continue our membership and to contribute to it until such time as all the displaced persons in Europe are relocated?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; we can file notice at any time, after 1 year, and retire from the organization 12 months later. So that in any event it would not have to be more than 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would not have to be more than 2 years if we wished to be relieved?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. In that connection, may I call the Senator's attention to the fact that General Hilldring testified, and I believe it was not disputed, that this problem ought to be solved in from 3 to 5 years. He declined to say that it could be solved within 2 or 3 years, but that it would be reduced year by year. The estimated cost was given as from seventy-one to seventy-three million dollars a year. Therefore a second amendment, which has not been read, was inserted in the joint resolution calling for an annual authorization as well as an annual appropriation, and the first authorization provides for not exceeding $75,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very glad the Senator has made that statement. I overlooked it. Instead of being presented as originally written, in the form of a continuing authorization, it contains an authorization for only 1 year, and we are to review the whole subject 12 months hence. As the able Senator from Georgia indicates, our best expert on the subject, General Hilldring, prophesies that the problem itself can be liquidated within from 3 to 5 years.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall not consume much time. I feel that it is really unnecessary to add anything to the very able and illuminating explanation given by the Senator from Michigan. The Committee on Foreign Relations considered this matter in great detail. We had before us General Hilldring, who has given a year or two of his time in Europe to the handling of this problem.

We are confronted with a situation, not a theory. The Army has on its hands in Germany these displaced persons and refugees. We are feeding them; we are housing them; we are clothing them. As has been suggested here, on account of our generous treatment of them, many more have come over the lines into the American zone from other zones. It has been our policy to put them on the rolls and to take care of them. Of course, this condition cannot continue indefinitely. We do not want to continue it indefinitely. The obligations we have assumed have placed this duty on the Army. It is felt that the Army should divest itself of this responsibility, and should devote itself to purely military and occupational tasks.

So this joint resolution has been devised, and under it we hope the expenditures will be considerably less than they are now under Army administration.

Of course, it is desirable to bring about the resettlement of these displaced persons when and if opportunity presents. In the hearings it developed that a number of countries have expressed an interest in obtaining certain numbers of immigrants from these sources. The organization has not yet been formed and it has not been able to bring about negotiations going into the details of the conditions under which such immigration should take place.

Let me say that we are faced with two alternatives: Either participating in the International Refugee Organization or continuing on our own responsibility, with perhaps increasing operations, increasing expenditures, and increasing difficulties. Those are the alternatives which are presented to us.

So far as the immigration laws of the United States are concerned, provision to cover that aspect of the case is meticulously made by the joint resolution. The three or four lawyers mentioned by the Senator from Michigan, with their skill and legal acumen, have prepared amendments to this measure which will make it absolutely clear and unequivocal, beyond any question of doubt, that this measure in no wise authorizes anyone to modify, suspend, circumvent, or evade any laws of the United States relating to immigration, or, for that matter, any other law of the United States.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that as we are situated, and in view of the alternatives which are presented to us, we should enact this joint resolution with the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], which has been accepted by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a letter was introduced, written by Gen. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] setting forth his views in behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 77, a measure to authorize United States membership in the International Refugee Organization.

In his letter, the Secretary of State makes the following statement:

> At the climax of the war in Europe, on April 20, 1945, to be exact, I transmitted to the leaders of the Congress an urgent message from the supreme commander of the Allied Expeditionary Force. In that message General Eisenhower referred to the unspeakable conditions found in the concentration camps then being liberated by our advancing armies. He invited the congressional leaders to make a flying trip to Germany to see for themselves "the full evidence of the cruelty practiced by the Nazis in such places as normal procedure."
>
> With a deep sense of responsibility, a bipartisan committee of 12 Senators and Representatives dropped their current business and departed by air for Germany. They saw for themselves, and through their eyes, the whole country saw, too. The report of this joint committee, signed by all 12 members, ranks in my opinion as an historic document. It described vividly the tragic plight of those who were victimized by the Nazis. It recorded firm determination to do everything possible to right the appalling wrongs perpetrated by the enemy. It was a moral mandate, to soldier and civilian alike, to exert every effort to help these unfortunate people.
>
> Almost 2 years have elapsed since that joint congressional report. More than 3,500,000 of our soldiers have been returned from the European battleground. Seven million displaced persons have been assisted to return to their homes from areas under the control of the western Allied armies. Many of the German war criminals responsible for the suffering and dislocation of these people have been tried and punished. However, some of the victims of Nazi concentration camps are still in displaced persons centers in our occupied areas. We also have many others who, although not actually confined in concentration camps, had been uprooted from their homes by the Nazis and brought to Germany for forced labor. They are still there. Why? Because we will not force them back against their will to the countries from which they were uprooted; and because they have not yet been resettled elsewhere. We are now faced with this pressing question: What is to happen to these people?

Mr. President, it was my privilege to be one of the congressional delegation that inspected the concentration camps at the invitation of General Marshall and the commander in chief of our military forces, and I saw first-hand hundreds of those who were victimized by the Nazis. I joined unanimously with the other 11 members of that delegation in the recommendations which were submitted to the Congress and to the Commander in Chief of our Military Forces. Many of those recommendations have been carried out.

It was my privilege, again, last November and a part of December to visit Germany and Austria; and, once again, I inspected several of the concentration camps called "displaced persons camps" in those two countries. I was dumbfounded to learn that the number in our German zone had increased to 456,000 at that time, and in the Austrian zone to more than 230,000, and that daily we were receiving thousands of displaced persons who were coming into the American zone under the definition of refugees and persecutees—terms which have become so broadened that we have taken into our zone thousands of persons, who are classed as persecutees, who have either been expelled or who have come to the American zone for help and aid because of the fear for their lives if they remain in the countries from which they came. I think the week I was there General Clark told me that more than 30,000 of them came that week into our zones in Germany and Austria.

Mr. President, if political persecutees are to continue to find refuge in the American Zones of Germany and Austria, that means that instead of thousands, there may be millions before this problem is solved. This is only the beginning; and so it is most important that the provisions and terms of the constitution under which the International Relief Organization is to operate shall be defined, and certainly we should know who are to define them.

In the light of the observations I have made, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan how these definitions can possibly anticipate the additional categories of refugees or persecutees who will emerge when the peace treaties are finally negotiated. I should like to make an observation before the Senator answers the question.

To be specific, I quote from a memorandum from A. A. Berle, Jr., released on February 10, on the Italian peace treaty, as follows:

> Even in peace treaties, I suppose, decent attention ought to be paid to the amount of misery they create. One effect of this treaty—

He was referring to the Italian treaty—

> will be the immediate migration of a great number of Italian citizens from territory to be turned over to Yugoslavia. They will, in fact, become homeless refugees in Italy.

That will be their plight. I read further from Mr. Berle:

> This is not what the treaty says. It is the result of a condition of affairs by which many thousands of Italians will not risk remaining in Yugoslav territory, where there exists a period of revolutionary terror, and where political revenge is being carried out with extreme ruthlessness. The number of added displaced persons can only be estimated. * * * And there is thus added another item to the black page of individual misery which so-called peacemaking in Europe has already caused.

That is a statement by Mr. Berle in reference to the question I have asked the distinguished Senator from Michigan, namely, what will happen to the refugees from the various countries when we sign the five peace treaties?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. First, in responding to the able Senator, I should say that I know he has not overlooked the fact that the letter from General Marshall, from which he read, unequivocally requests the passage of the pending joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes. I am not opposing the joint resolution. I am going to suggest some amendments to it, not, perhaps, with the idea that they will be adopted by the Senate, but to ask the distinguished Senator if he will not take them with him to conference in the event the House should amend the joint resolution. The amendments embody suggestions which I think would be helpful in considering the definitions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Any suggestions from the Senator are always helpful, and will always be welcome.

Mr. WHERRY. I should not want the Senator to answer the question with any feeling that I am going to oppose the resolution. I am merely here as one Member of the Senate trying to get what information I can, and to have the benefit of the Senator's good judgment as to definitions in regard to some of the aspects of the proposal.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Even when the Senator says, "Good morning," he says it so vehemently that I am always a little scared. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the answer to the Senator's question is that it must be found in the definitions in the Charter. As I understand, refugees are persons who have fled from their former homes in the face of persecution and of advancing armies. Displaced persons are people who have been taken from their former homes by force and introduced into other countries as slave laborers. However, the definition is of no very great importance.

I do not know whether the ultimate result of the peace treaties will be the creation of such a type of displaced-persons problem as that which we now confront, because it is my understanding that migration is already under way in those areas in a rather orderly fashion, and without any responsibility upon the occupying powers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. On the very point which the able Senator from Michigan has discussed, I wish to call attention to the language of the constitution to which we are asked to subscribe. I call attention to page 14, the language "Persons who will not be the concern of the Organization." This is a copy of the constitution itself.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What page?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am reading from a copy of the constitution as furnished by the Department of State. Among the persons who will not be considered as refugees are those enumerated. I read:

> 6. Persons who, since the end of hostilities in the Second World War * * * have become leaders of movements hostile to the Government of their country of origin, being a member of the United Nations or sponsors of movements encouraging refugees not to return to their country of origin.

I wish to say to the able Senator who is discussing this matter that I understand there are today about 30,000 nationals of Yugoslavia in Italy—and Yugoslavia is a member of the United Nations—who cannot return home because they were members of a hostile army. They cannot return home because they would be killed by the present regime in the country. Mihailovich, himself, was executed. This refers to persons some of whom served in the American forces, under the American flag. Under this language does the Senator think it is fair not to class them as refugees and as such entitled to receive the help of this country?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the first place, I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the language which he has read says: "Persons who, since the end of hostilities in the Second World War," and so forth. It is not my understanding that the forces of General Mihailovich, for example, were in rebellion following the termination of the war, and after the organization of the United Nations. I should say that any persecutees or refugees who are throw-backs from what happened during the war itself were eligible, but I submit to the Senator that we cannot maintain this particular organization for those who may be presently in revolt against the members of the United Nations which are setting up the organization to handle the situation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I call the attention of the able Senator from Michigan to the fact that it does not say in revolt against the United Nations. I read this language:

> Persons who, since the end of hostilities in the Second World War * * * have become sponsors of movements encouraging refugees not to return to their country of origin.

Of course, those people cannot return to the country of their origin. If the Yugoslavs referred to should go back to their former homes, they would be killed, and is not that equally true of some 200,000 Poles who fought alongside the British, who fought first against Russia and then fought against Germany, and cannot go back because they would be put into slavery by Russia, or executed?

I call the attention of the able Senator to the language in the agreement itself. If they "sponsor movements which encourage refugees not to return to their country of origin," they cannot be helped. That seems a severe provision. I am merely trying to point out some things in the document to which we are subscribing which I wish could be eliminated.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask the Senator again to distinguish between those of the type he defines, whose status was established before the termination of the war, and before the establishment of these new national governments—distinguish between them and those who subsequently may revolt against an established government which is a member of the United Nations.

If the Senator will permit me, if there is one thing more than another of which the United States has a right to be proud, in my opinion, it is that as to all the displaced persons, persecutees, and refugees to whom the Senator refers, whose status was created during World War II, the Government of the United States has stood like a concrete wall against their involuntary repatriation at any time. We had a bitter show-down on the floor of the General Assembly on the subject. We have insisted they should not be involuntarily repatriated, and they are all eligible to our assistance.

I call the Senator's attention to the language on page 12 of the printed text—I have not the original text here—subdivision 2 of section A, which particularly defines a refugee who is eligible as a person outside of his country of nationality or former habitual residence and who, as a result of events subsequent to the outbreak of the Second World War, is unable or unwilling to avail himself of the protection of the government of his country of nationality or former nationality.

In other words, it seems to me that the answer to the Senator's question is that all persons of the type he indicates are eligible up to the point where they rebel against member nations of the United Nations. So far as I am concerned, I think it is quite obvious that the line must be drawn at that point in an organization which is supported by the United Nations.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the able Senator from Michigan that I know full well the attitude taken by the United States toward persons who cannot safely return home, and I hope that our country and our Government will continue to maintain that attitude. It is for that very reason that I am asking why these people who cannot return home are excluded from being considered as refugees.

Let me say to the able Senator, on this line, that what he has read from the record is the general rule; what he last read is the general application. I have that language before me. But if the Senator will turn to another page, he will note that exceptions are made, and definitions are provided of persons who are not to be considered as refugees. After the general rule is prescribed, the able Senator knows the application of an exception which says:

> Those persons who, since the end of hostilities in the Second World War * * * have become sponsors of movements encouraging refugees not to return to their country of origin.

I say it is absolutely against the principle for which this country has stood and to which it has adhered to compel persons to return to their former homes, there to be executed or mistreated; yet we find that this agreement to which we are asked to subscribe today violates that policy and principle as to persons who sponsor those who refuse to return because they are in danger. I have the concrete example of some 30,000 Yugoslavs and some 200,000, I am told, Poles.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that something ought to be done to that part of this agreement. The purpose of the agreement to look after these people is lofty; it is splendid; but when we make an exception of that kind it is not right and does not accord with what we have done heretofore.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Everything the Senator has said totally certifies the distinction I drew for him in respect to this problem. We are in complete agreement as to what this language means. I say again that those who are not eligible are "persons who, since the end of hostilities in the Second World War, have participated in any organization having as one of its purposes the overthrow by armed force of the government of their country of origin, being a member of the United Nations."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator continue to read?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Just a moment. In other words, we are not recognizing as persecutees or refugees those who are in rebellion against member nations of the United Nations, and I submit that we would object very strenuously if anybody applied any other sort of rule to us. Now, what is it the Senator wants me to read?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The able Senator is reading section (a), with which I have no dispute, and which I have not mentioned. I want the Senator to read section (b). Read it to us.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am reading from part II.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Part II, section (b).

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well; section (b) means exactly the same thing.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Please read it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It reads:

> Have become leaders of movements hostile to the government of their country of origin being a member of the United Nations or sponsors of movements encouraging refugees not to return to their country of origin.

I say again that this applies to those who are acting against member nations of the United Nations. I do not understand how anybody can expect the United Nations to sponsor a movement which offers a sanctuary to those who try to overthrow members of the United Nations.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I agree heartily; but that is not the point I have raised—action to overthrow the governments of the members of the United Nations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is what the provision says.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But the Senator read very clearly this language "or"—that is in the disjunctive—"sponsors of movements encouraging refugees not to return to their country of origin."

That can mean only one thing, that anyone or any group that sponsors refugees and encourages them not to return to their homes because of what might happen to them, cannot be treated as refugees and receive help under this organization. I can see no other meaning.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I see that the Senator now is confining his observation to the final phrase.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have, from the beginning, sir; and it is the only phrase I have read.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It reads "or sponsors of movements encouraging refugees not to return to their country of origin."

I submit to the Senator that, so far as the individual rights of persecutees or displaced persons or refugees are concerned, it is covered elsewhere in the charter. This particular language refers to those who are engaged in the organized effort to keep us in the business of supporting displaced persons the rest of their lives. We confront a very serious problem in these camps in respect to organized movements about any repatriation, voluntary or otherwise; and obviously, among five or six hundred thousand people of this type there is plenty of opportunity for exploitation of the largess of which they are the beneficiaries. In my opinion this language is aimed against those who are "sponsors of movements encouraging refugees not to return to their country of origin."

It does not have any effect upon any refugee himself who, under the definition, is entitled to be protected. It applies only to the sponsors of movements to make displaced persons permanent and to make our responsibility in Germany and in Austria go on forever.

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

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the only explanation I can give, if I repeated it 50 times.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not going to ask the able Senator for another explanation, because I hope his explanation is correct. I wish the provision had been written in a way that would sustain his explanation. I hope it is correct, but the language of this agreement as I read it hardly justifies that explanation.

In another part of this very constitution it is provided that persons who will not accept or will not act in good faith under the direction of this organization, of course, cannot be treated as refugees.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for raising the question he has raised. It is one of the questions I propound later in my remarks. I also want to thank the able Senator from Michigan for his answers.

I think, however, that the fact that two very able Senators disagree on the language of that particular section is further evidence that there is a question as to what the terms are. The terms should certainly be defined in language that we all understand. They should be so defined because, when the matter comes before an international organization, one may well believe interpretations will be made which will suit each and every country individually, if anything can be gained thereby. That has been our experience with similar organizations. Furthermore, beyond the shadow of a doubt this is not merely a temporary organization. It will be of lengthy duration. I cannot draw any other conclusion.

The testimony that the performance of this task will require from 3 to 5 years ought to be the basis for the program upon which we prepare to act when we ratify the constitution. I believe it is unfair to say that this is a temporary organization. I believe the Senator from Michigan himself will agree that this is a task that will be carried on for years if we perform it as it is expected that it shall be performed, and resettle these displaced persons. That will require considerable time. I think it will require much more than 2 years. I think it will require at least 5 years, and I think the proposed appropriation of $75,000,000 is merely the first appropriation. I think next year, the following year, the year following that, and the year thereafter there will be succeeding appropriations which we will be called upon to make to carry on the work of the international organization.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, if the Senator does not propose to make the appropriation for the International Refugee Organization in that aspect, he will have to favor the making of a larger one for the Army to do the same job.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I usually agree with the distinguished Senator from Michigan because I have confidence in his judgment and I follow his leadership in respect to foreign-relations problems, but I cannot agree with that particular statement. I have seen so much of so-called international spending, so much of so-called cooperation, under which the United States of America has actually paid the bill, that I think the time has come, if we are to go into these international organizations, when we should appraise our experience with UNRRA and other organizations. I think it would be more economical for the United States to take upon its own shoulders this responsibility, spend its own money as it feels it should for relief and for refugees, rather than to put it into the pot of an international organization.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. If that is the Senator's belief, then he should be opposing the joint resolution which the Senator from Michigan is advocating.

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to that, I should like to state to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I have gone along with a considerable amount of legislation in order to expedite matters, but I have a perfect right in connection with the pending measure to make my own wishes and thoughts and desires known. I can vote for the pending joint resolution conscientiously and go along with it with the expectation and hope that the recommendations I am making shall be taken to conference to be considered by the conferees, so that some of the terms of the joint resolution may be defined more clearly. I hope my recommendations may be considered in conference.

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Senator from Michigan to say that, of course, if we do not do it through the international organization we will have to do it through a military appropriation. Does the Senator from Nebraska question that statement?

Mr. WHERRY. No; I do not question it. The Senator from Michigan said it would cost more money to do it through the military organization. I said I questioned that statement.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator think we could assume the complete burden through the military organization for less than it would cost through the international organization?

Mr. WHERRY. I think I can convince the Senator that we are practically assuming the complete burden, anyway.

On pages 15 and 16 of the constitution, the allocations for member nations which are entitled to come into this organization are set forth in tables A and B, but is it not a fact, I ask the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that only 11 have signed the International Refugee Organization?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; but the constitution of the organization cannot come into effect until 15 have signed, representing 75 percent of the budget.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the chairman. But only 11 have signed so far, and only 1 of them has signed unconditionally; that is, only 1 has ratified the constitution without reservation, and that is the United Kingdom.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that according to all testimony the chief reason for the delay is the fact that we for perfectly sound reasons are unable to take the leadership, and obviously this is our show.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not quarrel with that statement. I think the Senator from Michigan has done everything he could to obtain action. But the point I make is that only 11 signatures are affixed to the constitution, and only 1

nation, the United Kingdom, has ratified the constitution without reservation.

Of the 11 nations which are signatory to the constitution and whose contributions with ours make up 70 percent of the budget, how many are now receiving or have received loans or grants from the United States? I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan if it is not true that with the exception of one of those countries we have made loans and grants to them all in order to keep them going?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not have the list before me, but if we have made such loans I assume they were made for sound reasons and sound purposes. Will the Senator from Nebraska name one or two of them? I do not have the list before me.

Mr. WHERRY. The list appears at the bottom of page 17.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall read the list. It is as follows:

Canada, Dominican Republic, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Liberia, Netherlands, Norway, Philippine Republic, United Kingdom, United States.

Yes; we have made loans to the Philippine Republic, but the mere fact that we have made loans on a soundly contained basis for other reasons does not reflect, in my opinion, upon the integrity of the attitude of the Philippine Government in agreeing to take its share of this responsibilty.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I realize that the distinguished Senator can take the position that any loan we make is sound. I merely have to point out that we entered into the Bretton Woods agreements, and we made various foreign loans. We made one to France and one to Great Britain. All I have to do is to call to mind the huge sums we have loaned which I doubt very much will be paid back. The history of such loans is that they are not paid back. Eighty percent of them are not repaid. So in reality what it is proposed that we do here is to advance money to these 11 nations to finance this program on the theory that we are getting something in return from them, when in reality the United States is paying the bill and the international organization is framing the policy with respect to what we shall do in our zone, which includes most of the displaced persons.

The constitution which we are called upon today to ratify was signed by Warren R. Austin, subject to congressional approval, December 15, 1946. Since that time world conditions have changed and the policy of the United States has changed notably with respect to the sphere of influence of the Soviet Union, which is evidenced by the President's recent proclamation of his all-out war against communism at home and abroad. According to Dean Acheson's own statement, made in the hearings, the vast majority of these refugees now in our zones are political refugees from the Soviet sphere of influence.

I quote Mr. Acheson's words:

The problem, then, is that of the remaining displaced persons, about 1,000,000 people, of whom some 600,000 are in the United States zone.

Of these people, almost all come from the countries of eastern Europe. Perhaps a third are registered as Poles, a fifth as Balts, a fourth as Jews, and smaller fractions as Yugoslavs and citizens of the Soviet Union, stateless, and of miscellaneous origin.

In view of the change in policy, does the distinguished Senator from Michigan now feel that this problem should be handled by an international board in which Russia has membership and may have a determining voice?

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The International Refugee Organization has been set up against the constant, persistent, relentless opposition of the Soviet Union. It does not belong to the organization. It will not sign. None of its component countries will sign, and it will have nothing whatsoever to say about the administration of the organization.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no bar against Russia becoming a member. There is no bar against a country which is a satellite of Russia becoming a member if it sees that it can get something out of the organization and at the same time help frame the policies with respect to the resettlement problem.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It had not occurred to me that I am not sufficiently suspicious of communism to be adequately diligent against hypotheses of this nature. I can only say to the Senator that if he had faced the bitter opposition, the persistent, the constant opposition of the Soviet Union and its associate powers in connection with this problem, an opposition which is perfectly understandable inasmuch as this organization is committed to the principle that there shall be no involuntary repatriation of refugees and persecutees—if the Senator had faced that opposition day by day by day, he would not indulge in what to me is the rather fantastic notion that for some reason which is entirely beyond my comprehension they are going to offer to join an organization which would require them to surrender the very fundamental principle upon which they deal with displaced persons, namely the principle that displaced persons shall be handled as pawns to suit the state.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly our experience with UNRRA, which was mentioned a few moments ago as an international agency, ought to be a warning to us before we go into the proposed international organization, if in any way this organization could be used as an instrument by Russia to further her own interests. I appreciate the answer of the distinguished Senator from Michigan; but I think this organization could be used by Russia and her satellite countries to further their own interests.

Let me quote from Mr. Clayton's statement about UNRRA. I opposed UNRRA for the very reason that I think we ought to go into this organization with our eyes open. I doubt very much if any of us have gone into this thing with our eyes open. I did not see the charter until last Thursday night, and I doubt if other Senators have much information about it. That is no reflection upon them. We were told that if we went into UNRRA, other nations would also contribute, and that the money would not be used to feed armies, or for political purposes, or other uses not intended. We were even denied the right to make inspections to see where food was needed, and where it went. With respect to UNRRA, I offered an amendment which was defeated on the floor of the Senate.

What does Mr. Clayton say about UNRRA?

The committee is, I am sure, aware of the position taken by the Department of State and the President regarding post-UNRRA relief. It has not seemed wise or proper to meet the remaining needs through an international agency. Instead it is believed that the problem which remains can best be handled directly between the individual contributing countries and the recipient countries. The Secretariat of the United Nations will be useful as a clearing point for the exchange of relevant information.

One of the major arguments advanced by the United States representatives in making clear this position regarding relief in 1947 was that the problem, although of utmost urgency and seriousness, was not of the magnitude of past years and could be handled more efficiently and expeditiously without the cumbersome mechanism of an international relief agency.

This argument is still valid. Some of the UNRRA countries no longer require free assistance; others, not as fortunate, need relatively small amounts of additional assistance to carry them through another year. Thereafter it is expected that they will be able to stand on their own feet. In addition we feel that we can more effectively adapt our program to meet changing needs and can maintain better supervision over the use of our funds and supplies by dealing directly with the countries needing assistance.

As I stated a moment ago, I saw how UNRRA worked. I think General Clark will substantiate the statement that I was one American who got into the Russian-occupied zone. I went 50 miles into the zone. I was told that I was the first American who had been there since General Clark was stationed at Vienna.

I talked with a Russian colonel, who admitted to me, first, that they were diverting food to feed the army, in direct violation of the international agreement with respect to occupied countries. Secondly, he told me that there was no inspection of UNRRA food in that country, and no investigation as to needs, or where the food went. Third, they used our food and supplies to build up a difference between a Russian worker, an Austrian worker, and those whom they actually wanted to starve to death. That is the experience with UNRRA, an international organization which was conducted by an international body. I stated then, and I say now, that we should think a long time, especially when we furnish the money which others distribute. In addition to our own direct contribution, we make an indirect contribution. We ought to have a good deal to say about the policy as to displaced persons in the next 5 years.

Do we intend to have an international board, on which Russia may be a member, define the terms with respect to persons who will not be the concern of the organization?

Once again I turn to the page cited by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. Here are listed the exceptions, the persons who will not be the concern of the organization. I ask, What is the definition of war criminals? What is the definition of quislings? What is the definition of traitors? Who is to determine these definitions?

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There is a term used which I should like to have defined, and that is the term "persons of German ethnic origin."

Mr. WHERRY. I am coming to that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be glad to hear the Senator's comments on that definition.

Mr. WHERRY. Was Mihailovich a traitor? Yet under these definitions he would not be entitled to relief.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I totally disagree, because this definition applies to those who are rebels in the postwar world against member nations of the United Nations; and Mihailovich was not in that category.

Mr. WHERRY. There are men just like Mihailovich who in the postwar period are doing the same thing. My judgment is that they would not be entitled to protection.

Who is to determine who are persons of German ethnic origin? Let me read this exception:

> Persons of German ethnic origin, whether German nationals or members of German minorities in other countries, who—
>
> (a) Have been or may be transferred to Germany from other countries;
>
> (b) Have been, during the Second World War, evacuated from Germany to other countries;
>
> (c) Have fled from, or into, Germany, or from their places of residence into countries other than Germany in order to avoid falling into the hands of Allied armies.

What would happen to the 5,600 German members of the Buchenwald concentration camp? They were German people who refused to cooperate with Hitler. Under this definition they would not be entitled to relief if they were refugees or persecuted persons in Germany.

I also visited a Lithuanian camp. Three thousand persons in that camp refused to cooperate in the puppet countries which were set up, so they were evacuated into Germany. Are they eligible for relief? They are of German origin. They speak the German language; and yet they are foreclosed by this definition.

"Persons of German ethnic origin" is the language of the definition. That means traits, customs, and language.

Reading further from the definition:

> Whether German nationals or members of German minorities in other countries—

What about Polish nationals who speak the German language, whose parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents were Germans, and who fought all the way through with the Allies? Are they to be denied this relief?

I am not sure about another thing which has just come to my attention. I refer to the last paragraph which the Senator from West Virginia read. Syria is a member of the Council, or will be a member of the Council if she qualifies. She is one of the members mentioned, and yet the Syrian Government warned 13,000 Syrian Jews that unless they publicly renounced Zionism and surrendered all Jewish refugees attempting to reach Palestine—I suppose they are probably not leaders, as the distinguished Senator has classified them—they will be sentenced to death, along with the captured refugees and any others assisting them. In other words, they must renounce Zionism in order to return to their homes.

I believe that there has been sufficient debate upon some of these provisions to show that amendments should be made to explain some of the definitions. I have an amendment which I should like to present.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. For the purpose of this agreement, I should like to see better definitions, so that we may know just what we are agreeing to. I ask the able Senator from Michigan to advise us what is meant by "persons of German ethnic origin." What is the meaning of the term as used in this agreement?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I have never examined the precise phrase to which the Senator refers. I know what the object is. The object is to exclude ex-enemy nationals from the jurisdiction of this organization. Ex-enemy nationals are under a totally different responsibility in Germany and Austria. They are under the responsibility, so far as subsistence is concerned, of the Army and the civilian military government. If the service of DP camps were extended to all ex-enemy Germans, the problem would be increased from 588,000 to six or seven millions. Obviously that is impossible, and I think it is not in harmony with the theory upon which this particular operation is established.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wonder why, in framing this language, the words "ex-enemy Germans" were not used.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that would have been preferable.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have looked up the word "ethnic" as found on page 877 of Webster's International Unabridged Dictionary, and there the definition is given as follows:

> 1. Pertaining to the Gentiles, or to nations not converted to Christianity; heathen; pagan—opposed to Jewish and Christian.
>
> 2. Relating to community of physical and mental traits in races, or designating groups of races of mankind discriminated on the basis of common customs and characters.

In using the word "ethnic" I wonder who is to determine whether the person involved is a religious man, or whether he is a Christian. It is unfortunate that in such agreements language is used which is so elastic that persons cannot be classified under it. It is impossible to determine what is meant. Why was not the term "ex-enemy Germans" used? I think it is exceedingly unfortunate that words are used here which have meanings which really cannot be defined or classified.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his observation. I feel that these definitions should be made plain. But as I stated in my opening remarks, it is not my purpose in any way to delay enactment of this proposed legislation, because it is needed. I agree in toto with everything the distinguished Senator from Michigan has said about the emergency character of the joint resolution and that it must be enacted, because the Army is furnishing food and UNRRA is performing the administration. I agree that when UNRRA expires this Nation must be prepared to take over and feed these displaced persons. In view of the fact that world conditions have changed in the past 2 months, I was hopeful that the arguments made and the colloquy engaged in today might prove the basis for further consideration of the joint resolution and clarification of the definitions.

I shall now read into the RECORD an amendment for which I ask the consideration of the Senator from Michigan, so that if amendment is made in the House and if amendments are to be added to the constitution, there will be no delay in launching the machinery. The amendment is as follows:

> At the end of line 12, page 2, strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof a semicolon, and add the following: "*Provided further*, That this authority is granted and the approval of the Congress of the acceptance of membership of the United States in the International Refugee Organization is given upon condition and with the reservation that the Organization shall not discriminate for or against (a) persons otherwise eligible who refuse to return to their country of origin, the present government of which cannot guarantee personal and political liberty; (b) persons who have endeavored to reestablish the independence of their country of origin as it existed on August 23, 1939; and (c) persons solely because of their racial or religious origin or affiliation: *And provided further*, That as a condition precedent the Organization shall agree (a) to permit free access of the United States Government officials for the purpose of observing whether the assistance authorized is utilized effectively; (b) to permit representatives of the press and radio of the United States to observe freely and to report fully regarding the utilization of such assistance; and (c) to make such provisions as may be required by the President of the United States for the security of any article, service, or information received pursuant to this joint resolution."

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for giving his time. I agree with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] that because of the tremendous responsibilities upon his shoulders it was a physical effort for the Senator from Michigan to stand here and answer a great many questions. I hope the Senator will forgive me. I believe I have suggested definitions of terms to which the Senator ought to give his further attention, and I hope when that is done it will not require as much of his

physical effort as has been required in answering my questions on the floor this morning.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator by way of benediction that he owes me no apology for anything. I am grateful to him for his discussion. It has been very illuminating. We disagree in respect to some interpretations, but the Senator is always interesting and able.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Has the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia for himself, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] been accepted by the proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 77?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the very able exposition of the position of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as he described his position with reference to the joint resolution. There is no argument between us on the object of the resolution which has been offered. I realize fully the plight of these unfortunate people. There are more than a half million of them today in the American zone. I realize that it is a problem for America to solve. I further realize that we have undertaken to solve the problem and have the obligation to follow it through. I subscribe to the view that other nations should join together in the administration of the work of mercy and in solving the problem which confronts us. But too often in preparing to perform a good work, when agreements are drafted containing the language which will constitute the guide for action, words are used that have no bearing and should have no part in the obligation which is being undertaken.

The amendment which has been offered to the resolution on behalf of myself and the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is solely for the purpose of removing any question of doubt whatever that under the guise of authority of this resolution persons may be brought into this country without the consent of Congress which, from the beginning of our Nation, has had control of the entry of immigrants to America. I am delighted that the Senator from Michigan joins me in that. He has, however, taken a view in which I do not join, and that is that there is nothing to be found in the constitution of the International Refugee Organization which endangers or bears upon the entry of people into this country.

I believe the able Senator talked about having lawyer trouble. I say to him with all kindness and friendship that he would have had no lawyer trouble whatsoever if he had listened and followed, and if his committee had gone along with, the Judiciary Committee, which became very much concerned with this problem—particularly so because it deals with the subject of immigration into our country. I do not wish to give the Senator any more lawyer trouble, but I am compelled to disagree with the view he takes; namely, that there is nothing in the agreement or constitution bearing upon the immigration question.

I desire to point out now, first of all, that there was no doubt in the minds of the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee that this subject involved and touched very closely upon the general subject of immigration and our established immigration laws, so much so that every member of the Judiciary Committee signed a letter to its chairman, the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], asking him to take up this subject and see to it that the immigration laws of the United States were not transgressed by any action taken upon this joint resolution. As a result of that action, a proposed amendment, generally like the amendment now before the Senate, was submitted. That was not drawn entirely by those who have offered it; that amendment, Mr. President, is the work of counsel of the Judiciary Committee, the legislative counsel of the Senate, and counsel in the Library of Congress.

I wish to point out now, if I may, the places in the constitution of the International Refugee Organization where definite reference is made to subjects involving immigration or the entry of people into the United States, whether they be called refugees or immigrants. I read from page 2 of the International Refugee Organization resolution of the General Assembly, dated December 27, 1946, and coming from the Department of State:

> Having considered the constitution of the International Refugee Organization and the arrrangement for a preparatory commission as approved by the Economic and Social Council;
>
> Considering that every effort should be made to provide for the early establishment of the International Refugee Organization and the provision of measures during the interim period designed to facilitate such establishment;
>
> Therefore—

Now I pass over (a), (b), (c), and (d), and come to paragraph (e).

It "urges members of the United Nations to give the most favorable consideration to receiving each into its territory at the earliest possible time, so far as may be practicable for permanent resettlement, its fair share of the nonrepatriable persons who are the concern of the International Refugee Organization and this in conformity with the principles of the Organization."

Mr. President, that is an appeal to all members of the United Nations—and we are one of them—to take as many refugees as they can, as soon as they can, into their borders; and the conclusion is inescapable that the refugee problem is tied in to the immigration question and our immigration laws. So, from the standpoint of some of us, it became very important to see to it that the laws of the Congress which control immigration shall be maintained inviolate, and that we shall not, by signing this agreement and passing this joint resolution, thereby becoming a member of the Organization, surrender the power of Congress over the subject of the entry of persons into the United States. That was the question.

Let us go further into the question whether there is any link between the subject of immigration and the pending joint resolution. Under article II of the so-called proposed constitution of the International Refugee Organization, we find what its purposes are generally intended to be. I read now from paragraph (b):

> With respect to persons for whom repatriation does not take place under paragraph 1 (a) of this article to facilitating—

Paragraph 1 (a) deals with repatriation, sending the people back to their homeland, when that can be done with safety to them.

It is one of the powers and purposes——

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am reading from the constitution of the International Refugee Organization. I wish every Member of the Senate had a copy of it. I sent to the Department of State, and I have one of the early copies and also one of the later prints of it.

Mr. LANGER. I have one in my hand, but the numbers of the articles do not correspond at all.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I regret that very much. These were sent to me, as I have said, from the Department of State. I shall be very happy to place them in the hands of any Senator as soon as I finish using them for the purpose of my remarks.

Mr. President, continuing with what these powers are with respect to resettling people:

> (i) Their reestablishment in countries of temporary residence—

Now we are dealing with the refugees—

> (ii) The emigration to, resettlement and reestablishment in other countries of individuals or family units, and
>
> (iii) As may be necessary and practicable within available resources and subject to the relevant financial regulations, the investigation, promotion or execution of projects of group resettlement or large-scale resettlement.

Mr. President, that language can mean only one thing; namely, that among the purposes of this Organization there is added the purpose of resettling these persons—about a million of them, I believe, who today are in Europe—in various parts of the world.

This agreement undertakes to have the United States pay 45 percent of the cost of conducting the work of the International Refugee Organization. Is that provision significant? This country must keep within its Congress, its legislative body, the sole power to deal with immigration. If the United States places that power in the hands of this international organization, and if the United States pays 45 percent of the cost, based upon the idea of our great wealth, do we not know that 45 percent of those refugees will be brought to the United States? So, Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment, as I have said, is to

see that nothing is surrendered in the way of the sovereignty of the United States over the subject of permitting persons to enter the United States.

It is interesting to note that when the first resolution came before the Foreign Relations Committee, it contained no provision whatsoever, in any language, guarding against a change in the immigration laws of the United States.

I do not doubt for a minute—and let no one think that I question—the earnestness of those who have expressed the view that this proposal has nothing to do with immigration. But I do question their conclusion, I do question their judgment, because it is written—and I have read the provision—into the Constitution that one of the first purposes of the organization is to resettle persons permanently anywhere in the world. The amendment I have offered, to use the language of the Senator from Michigan, is designed to close every window against an attack upon the sovereignty and the power of this Government to control the entrance of alien peoples into America.

Mr. President, to show that there was difference of opinion, I have before me a memorandum prepared by able counsel who have given attention to this subject, and who advised the members of the Committee on the Judiciary upon it. Without reading from it at length, at this time, I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Is there objection?

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

MEMORANDUM RE MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION (H. DOC. NO. 145)

SYNOPSIS

1. Under the provisions of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization the organization is vested with power to "conduct negotiations and conclude agreements with governments." The scope of these agreements involves resettlement of immigrants.

2. There is no power vested in Congress to conclude agreements. The President, under his general executive power and frequently under legislative enactments, is the only agency of the United States vested with power to conclude such agreements.

3. The authorities hold that the operative effect of agreements executed by the President is the same as the operative effect of a treaty, namely that such agreements prevail over contrary statutes.

4. It is suggested that the acceptance by Congress of the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization be conditioned upon the future approval by Congress of any agreement negotiated or entered into by the President. Precedent for this is found in the United Nations Participation Act of 1945.

I. CHRONOLOGY

(a) February 12, 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization referred the problem of refugees and displaced persons to the Economic and Social Council for examination and report.

(b) February 16, 1946, the Economic and Social Council established Special Committee on Refugees and Displaced Persons.

(c) June 1, 1946, Special Committee on Refugees and Displaced Persons reported to second session of Economic and Social Council. This report included a draft of a constitution for the proposed International Refugee Organization.

(d) June 21, 1946, the Economic and Social Council adopted, after revising and amending, the draft constitution.

(e) December 15, 1946, the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization, having made certain changes in the draft constitution, approved the same.

(f) December 16, 1946, Senator Warren Austin, the United States representative to the United Nations signed the constitution of the International Refugee Organization subject to subsequent approval by the Congress.

(g) February 24, 1947, President Truman recommended that the Congress authorize the United States to participate as a member of the International Refugee Organization.

II. PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION, HEREIN UNDER SCRUTINY

Among the functions and powers vested in the International Refugee Organization, under the terms of article 2, are the following:

"(e) to conduct negotiations and conclude agreements with Governments;"

* * * * *

"(i) to undertake any project appropriate to the accomplishment of the purposes of this Organization;

"(j) to conclude agreements with countries able and willing to receive refugees and displaced persons for the purpose of insuring the protection of their legitimate rights and interests insofar as this may be necessary;

"(k) in general, to perform any other legal act appropriate to its purposes."

Section 3 of article 9 of the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization provides as follows:

"3. In the performance of their duties, the Director-General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any Government or from any other authority external to the Organization. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the Organization. Each member of the Organization undertakes to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Director-General and the staff and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities."

Article 15 of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization provides as follows:

"The relationship of the Organization with the governments or administrations of countries in which displaced persons or refugees are located and the conditions under which it will operate in such countries shall be determined by agreements to be negotiated by it with such governments or administrations in accordance with the terms of this constitution."

III. PROCEDURE FOR ACCEPTANCE

Section 1 of article 18 of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization provides as follows:

"(a) States may become parties to this constitution by:

"(i) Signature without reservation as to approval;

"(ii) Signature subject to approval followed by acceptance;

"(iii) Acceptance.

"(b) Acceptance shall be effected by the deposit of a formal instrument with the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

As noted in the chronology (supra) on December 16, 1946, Senator Warren Austin, the United States representative to the United Nations, signed the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, subject to subsequent approval by the Congress.

It will be observed that the procedure for acceptance by the United States of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization does not contemplate treatment of such constitution as a treaty within the purview of the constitution of the United States. Under the provisions of section 2 of article II of the Constitution of the United States, the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." Under the provisions of article VI of the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution "and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

The message of the President, recommending that participation as a member of the International Refugee Organization by the United States be authorized, was addressed not to the Senate but to the Congress, and it is contemplated that authorization may be made by a simple majority of both Houses of the Congress, rather than by two-thirds of the Senators present.

IV. STATEMENT OF ISSUES

1. If Congress authorizes participation as a member of the International Refugee Organization by the United States, who will be empowered on behalf of the United States "to conduct negotiations and conclude agreements" with the International Refugee Organization?

2. Can such agreements have the effect of suspending contrary laws of the United States?

3. What steps, if any, can Congress take to insure that if Congress authorizes participation as a member of the International Refugee Organization by the United States, the laws of the United States will not thereafter be affected by "agreements" without congressional sanction?

V. CONSIDERATION OF ISSUE 1

"Governmental power over external affairs is not distributed (between the National Government and the several States) but is vested exclusively in the National Government. And in respect of what was done here (in making an executive agreement with Russia) the Executive had authority to speak as the sole organ of that Government. The assignment and the agreement in connection therewith did not, as in the case of treaties, as that term is used in the treaty making clause of the Constitution (Article II, sec. 2), require the advice and consent of the Senate" (*United States* v. *Belmont* (1937), 301 U. S. 324, 330).

"The President of the United States is intrusted with the right of conducting all negotiations with foreign governments and is the judge of the expediency of instituting, conducting, or terminating such negotiations in respect to claims against foreign governments. (Executive) agreements of such adjustment or settlement of such claims are not submitted to the Senate" (*State of Russia* v. *National City Bank* (1934), 69 F. 2d 44, 48).

"That document (the Constitution) contains, however, no definition of a treaty and no statement declaring under what circumstances a conventional arrangement purporting to bind the United States must be dealt with according to the procedure that is mandatory in the case of treaties. The reference to an 'agreement or compact' with a foreign power which no State of the Union is permitted to enter into without the consent of Congress indicates the familiarity of those who framed the Constitution with the habit of States to conclude international agreements of lesser dignity, which by reason of their form or content, as well as the methods employed in perfecting the contractual relationship, were not dealt with as treaties by the persons or countries which found it convenient to have recourse to them" (International Law (1945), Charles Cheney Hyde, vol. 2, p. 1405).

"In a memorandum by the Solicitor (Nielson) for the Department of State (1922) agreements made by the Executive and not

submitted to the Senate were classified as (1) 'agreements made pursuant to authority contained in acts of Congress', and (2) 'agreements entered into purely as executive acts without legislative authorization'" (Digest of International Law (1943), Green Haywood Hackworth, vol. 5, p. 390).

Query: Would not acceptance by Congress of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, which constitution provides for "agreements," raise the presumption that Congress is, irrespective of other "Executive power" of the President, vesting in him, as a matter of legislative enactment, the power to conclude on behalf of the United States such agreements? This query is pertinent in view of the quotation immediately preceding and also in view of the following quotations:

"In addition to the authority of the President under the Constitution to negotiate and sign treaties with foreign governments and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to ratify them, the Executive is empowered without legislative sanction to conclude with foreign governments certain classes of agreements which are not classified as treaties in the sense in which that term is used in the Constitution. There agreements are concluded by virtue of the authority inherent in the Chief Executive under the Constitution, and are confined to subject matter within the purview of his constitutional authority" (ibid.).

"Perhaps there is no exact definition possible of the expression 'Executive agreements.' It is doubtless used to include international agreements made by the Executive (whether under statutory authority or not), but excluding those made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In this sense it is obvious that the term comprises agreements and acts of a quite varied nature; for while such an agreement may finally be made by the President or under his direction, it may in some cases have a very different basis of authority from others; it may rest on a statute; it may follow a treaty; it may be an exercise of the power of the President under the Constitution and without the aid of statute or treaty, such a modus vivendi or an agreement for the determination of claims of American citizens against another country; or it may, as in the case of an armistice, be his act as Commander in Chief" (International Executive Agreements (1941), Wallace Mitchell McClure, p. 277).

"Whatever distinction there is between treaties and executive agreements must be found, not in the practices and doctrines of international law, but in our own unique constitutional law. By common practice under that law the term 'treaty' is used to refer to every agreement, whether written or verbal, important or unimportant, with one or more foreign nations which, prior to ratification by the President, receives the consent of two-thirds of the Senate, and which is never submitted for approval to the House of Representatives. The term 'executive agreement,' on the other hand, is used both colloquially and in scholarly and governmental writings as a convenient catch-all to subsume all other international agreements intended to bind the United States and other governments. Despite many attempts to make distinctions between treaties and executive agreements in terms of form, subject matter, and legal practical consequences, and however surprising or even shocking the conclusion may be to any who have not examined the record, this common usage is the only distinction that the facts of our constitutional law and practice will sustain * * * there are no significant criteria, under the Constitution of the United States or in the diplomatic practice of this Government, by which the genus 'treaty' can be distinguished from the genus 'executive agreement,' other than the single criterion of the procedure or authority by which the United States' consent to ratification is obtained. More explicitly, agreements with other governments, when consummated pursuant to congressional authorization or when subsequently sanctioned by Congress, have the identical legal and practical consequences both under the municipal law of the United States and at international law, as treaties, consented to by two-thirds of the Senate" (Treaties and Congressional-Executive or Presidential Agreements (1945), Yale Law Journal, 54: 181, 197).

At this point it is pertinent to direct attention to an illustration of (a) executive agreement pursuant to congressional authority and (b) executive agreement entered into purely as an executive act without legislative authorization.

(a) Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (June 17, 1930, 48 Stat. 943) the Congress provided that the President, "whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose (in the act) declared will be promoted by the means (in the act) specified, is authorized from time to time (1) to enter into foreign-trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof; and (2) to proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign-trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign-trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder."

(b) An illustration of an executive agreement entered into purely as an executive act without legislative authorization was the agreement of the President to transfer destroyers in exchange for the use of certain British naval and air bases. (See 39 Op. A. G. 484; Executive Agreement Series No. 181).

Conclusion on issue 1

From the foregoing authorities it is concluded that if Congress authorizes participation as a member of the International Refugee Organization by the United States, the Constitution of which provides for "agreements with governments," the Congress will by such authorization either (a) vest, as in the case of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, power in the President to conclude such agreements or (b) give sanction to an organization with which the President could, irrespective of legislative authorization, conclude such agreements.

VI. CONSIDERATION OF ISSUE 2

As was noted in the citation of the authorities referred to in V of this memorandum, the operative effect of an executive agreement is not distinguishable from that of a treaty. Although the procedure to be observed in consummation of a treaty differs from the procedure followed in consummation of an executive agreement, the legal practical consequences are the same.

Article VI (paragraph 2) of the Constitution of the United States reads:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

It is well settled that a treaty has the effect of repealing all preceding Federal law in conflict with it, whether unwritten, as the law of nations or admiralty and common law, or written as acts of Congress (6 Op. Atty. Gen. 293). See also *Whitney* v. *Robertson* (8 S. Ct. 456, 124 U. S. 194).

In the course of his message recommending that the Congress authorize the United States to participate as a member of the International Refugee Organization the President stated:

"The Organization to be created will have no governmental powers. It can in no way alter the statutes of any of its members."

It is submitted that, although the Organization can in no way alter the statutes of any of its members, such alteration could be made under the terms of the "agreements" provided for in the constitution of the Organization, which agreements, it is submitted could be made and entered into on behalf of the United States by the President.

VII. CONSIDERATION OF ISSUE 3

As will be noted by reference to III of this memorandum there is no provision for a conditional acceptance by the Congress of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization. As to whether or not a conditional acceptance would be regarded by the Organization as either (a) rejection or (b) total acceptance, no authorities are available.

It is suggested, however, that precedent exists for Congressional limitations on Executive agreements based on legislative action. Section 6 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 provides in part as follows:

"The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces * * *.

"*Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purpose armed forces, facilities, or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreement or agreements."

Further authority for the Congress to limit the scope of Executive agreements, based on legislative enactment, is found in the following quotation:

"In short, we are of opinion that, so far as a treaty made by the United States with any foreign nation can become the subject of judicial cognizance in the courts of this country, it is subject to such acts as Congress may pass for its enforcement, modification, or repeal" (Head Money cases (1884), 112 U. S. 580, 599).

Suggested procedure

1. A conditional acceptance based on a proviso that the laws of the United States shall not be suspended by any such agreements and that any such agreements shall first be submitted to Congress for approval or disapproval. (Similar to Participation Act of 1945, supra.)

2. As an alternative, accompany the acceptance with legislation in which are provided standards as a basis for executive agreements. This would follow the plan of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, referred to, supra.

The foregoing is based on the assumption that the authority for the executive agreements would be derived from the acceptance by the Congress of the International Refugee Organization. If, however, an exercise of such authority is derived from the general executive power apart from act of Congress it is suggested that Congress, before it accepts the Constitution, request a statement from the President as to the policy which he will pursue in regard to agreements which may affect existing laws of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, this memorandum sets forth very clearly authority after authority, decisions of the courts one after another, which bear upon the question of whether or not the immigration laws are under the control of the Congress; and we are called upon today to determine whether control shall

remain there. Also they deal with Executive agreements, something that we cannot permit to be used on this subject. I say that unless the pending joint resolution shall be amended as proposed, there will have been taken away from the Congress its power over immigration. I submit upon this brief as a legal proposition, that it is one of the greatest threats to the sovereignty of the American Government.

The Senator from Michigan said—and he stated it fairly, and I was very glad to hear it—that he wants the joint resolution, quoting his language, "so plain that nobody can misunderstand it." If he wants it so plain—and all of us join with him in that—that no one can misunderstand it, then let him accept my amendment, which cannot be misunderstood in the clear language in which it is drawn. As I said, it was drawn by able counsel.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from West Virginia is deserving of commendation for his solicitude in behalf of the integrity of our immigration laws. During the war many hundreds of thousands of alien refugees entered the United States in violation of our immigration laws, and little if anything was done to apprehend them. Only a few days ago there appeared an article in one of the local daily newspapers from which I quote:

> Estimates of illegal entries range from 500,000 to almost a million a year. Even half of the lowest estimate would be considerably higher than the current annual rate of 138,000 legal immigrants.
>
> Attorney General Clark estimated last year that illegal alien entries totaled 2,000 daily, with only half of these persons apprehended by the Government.

It is apparent that, although fighting ceased almost 2 years ago, aliens are still entering our country, and the Department of Justice faces a serious challenge in attempting to meet that situation. I am in complete accord with the Senator from West Virginia that we should demand the right for the Congress to determine whether these alien refugees should enter our country, and we should make no concessions, under the terms of the proposed legislation currently before this body, which would in any degree deprive Congress of its authority. I sincerely trust that the Senator will continue to defend the position he has taken, because in doing so he will render outstanding service to the Nation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I deeply appreciate the remarks of the able Senator from Idaho. I am delighted to have his aid in this movement, because there is involved indeed a threat to our own country. I wish to discuss a little later, in a review of the history of immigration, some of the points which have been brought out by the able Senator from Idaho, and I appreciate the remarks he has made.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is quite apparent to me, from reading the joint resolution and other literature relating to the proposal, that the main objective is to nullify the immigration laws of the United States, or to circumvent them in some manner. If that be true, and that is the intention of the proposed legislation, am I to understand that the Senator from West Virginia is proposing an amendment which would prevent the very thing I have suggested?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is my earnest belief that the adoption of my amendment, which is drawn after careful consideration, after advice of counsel, will stop any construction of the joint resolution which would take from Congress complete control over immigration. If it is not adopted, then by the joint resolution Congress will surrender its control over the immigration laws.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If that be the case, why should Congress pass this joint resolution which would call for the expenditure of $75,000,000 or more a year and then add the Senator's amendment which would prevent the Organization from doing what it proposes to do? Would it not be more logical and economical and consistent merely to refuse to pass the joint resolution, and thus save the $75,000,000 or more a year?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I recognize the problem of the refugees and their maintenance, and the continuance of the duty we have to look after them somewhere, to see that they do not starve, to see that they are clothed; but I say that when we undertake that task, we can do it without surrendering the control of the Congress over the immigration laws. I wish to save control of immigration in the Congress, and that is why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I agree with the Senator. I think that practically every American citizen has a great deal of sympathy and human understanding for the displaced persons, and each of us individually wants to do everything possible to alleviate their suffering and improve their present condition. But to do that is it necessary to do what is proposed in the pending joint resolution, which would destroy the power of Congress to control immigration into this country?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The power of Congress will not be destroyed if my amendment shall be adopted.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I mean without the Senator's amendment. It is possible the joint resolution may be passed without his amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the amendment shall not be adopted, I shall have to vote against the joint resolution, and I think other Senators entertain the same feeling. It has been indicated that the amendment may be agreed to, but unless the amendment shall be adopted, I say to the Senator from Texas that we cannot enter this organization with any certainty that control of immigration will remain in the Congress.

Mr. O'DANIEL. In other words, if the Senator's amendment shall be agreed to, it will involve this Nation spending $75,000,000 or more per annum to remain in the same position regarding our immigration laws as if we did not pass the joint resolution at all?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct; yes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, answering the last point made by the distinguished Senator from Texas, he seemed to imply that we were spending $75,000,000 for some useless purpose.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I did not think he made that point. I did not so understand him.

Mr. SMITH. I got that impression. I merely want, in defense of the Senator from Michigan who presented the case originally, to say that he pointed out that we had to consider taking care of these people in our own military zone in Germany at a greater cost than would be involved if we participated in the refugee program.

I might say also while I am on my feet that the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I have the honor to be a member, felt that the governing clause in article II, from which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has been reading, is section 1, which, referring to resettlement and reestablishment, says:

> In countries willing and able to receive them.

We understood, of course, that that meant willing to receive them under their own laws.

We were all willing, I will say to the Senator from West Virginia, to accept any amendment that would make that absolutely clear, and without any question or equivocation, and therefore we were all perfectly willing to accept the amendment which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has offered. As the distinguished Senator from Michigan has said, there is no debate about it. It is merely a question as to what form the amendment should take, whether the language, which seemed to us sound, as offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and which appears in the report of the committee, or the amendment which the Senator from West Virginia now offers. So we are now discussing which is the best way to do it, and as I say we are willing to accept the one which the Senator from West Virginia has offered.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. I am delighted to hear his statement. I talked to the Senator from Iowa; we have had conversations about this question; and of course I am quite hopeful that my amendment will be agreed to. It was drawn after very careful study and counsel of those who considered it in order to make crystal clear the purpose to protect the immigration laws of the United States.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But referring to the question asked by the Senator from Texas, and the answer by the Senator from West Virginia, I do not quite

agree that, unless the amendment or the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia is adopted, the question of immigration will be wide open. I am fully convinced that if the amendment as adopted by the committee and written into the bill is agreed to, the situation will be amply and completely safeguarded and taken care of. However, the Senator from West Virginia did not agree that the amendment adopted by the Foreign Relations Committee was ample. I think everyone was agreed that we wanted to make this an air-tight prohibition. Several of us looked over the amendment, or the substitute, as offered by the Senator from West Virginia, and I will say I think it will do the job as well as the amendment adopted by the Foreign Relations Committee. Either one of them will do the job. But I have certainly agreed to abandon any claim for support to the amendment adopted by the Foreign Relations Committee, and to support, so far as my vote is concerned, the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia. I merely wanted to clarify the fact that I do not agree that his amendment has any more strength, or plugs up any more holes, than the one the Foreign Relations Committee adopted, but I am perfectly willing to go along with him, perfectly willing to have his amendment adopted, and perfectly willing to do anything that we can to strengthen this prohibition.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Now we are getting closer and closer together. I am sure that I have never intended to attack the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, and I certainly would not do it now, after the speech he has just made.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. The amendment that the Senator from West Virginia is offering to the pending joint resolution does not change the situation in reference to illegal entries into the United States which are supposed to have occurred heretofore, does it?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No. Of course, that is an administrative problem, and one I want to speak to, beginning in a few minutes. That is a question of an investigation that must be made. It must be cleared up before I think we should ever take any step toward changing the immigration law. We must have a clear understanding of it, and that will come only after a thorough investigation, when we can see and obtain the full and complete and clear picture of the immigration subject, and have definite information of the people who have entered the United States during the past few years.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to say to the Senator from West Virginia that I am very strongly in favor of what he is attempting to do. I think it has to do with one of the most vital issues now confronting the Nation. In the interest of all who have come to this country, and of all those who have been here for years, I believe it essential that immigration should be under the definite control of Congress. The statement by the Senator from Idaho taken from a newspaper has been rumbling around the Senate since I have been a Member of it. I have heard repeatedly from the members of the Immigration Committee that during the last 5 years, contrary to the immigration laws, anywhere from 500,000 to 2,000,000 people have come into this country. It is my hope that the Senator will not stop with the amendment he is now offering, but will go ahead and plug up all the loopholes and do all of the things which may be necessary in order to keep faith with our immigration law.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the able Senator from New Jersey. I want to say to him that there is no question that today should be of greater interest to the American people, for the future of the country, than through knowledge of what has happened in the last few years not only under the immigration laws but particularly outside the laws.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. It is not about his particular amendment, which I know he understands perfectly, and I think I do, too; but a question has been raised about which I want to ask the Senator's interpretation. For instance, it has been suggested—and if the Senator from Michigan were here he might say it is "more lawyer trouble"—that the amendment might relate to some other agreements entirely outside the particular agreements authorized by the pending joint resolution. What is the Senator's position?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator mean to indicate there is some other agreement?

Mr. HATCH. I am not indicating anything. I merely want the Senator to explain what I know he means, that his amendment applies only to matters covered by this particular resolution.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the whole scope of it. I did not for a moment consider that there was any agreement anywhere dealing with the entry of people into this country until this was brought up. Is there one?

Mr. HATCH. Not that I know of.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There is none that I know of.

Mr. HATCH. But I simply want to make it clear that we are dealing with this particular matter only.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We are; but I want to say that if there is any other agreement dealing with the entry of people into this country, I want it laid before the Senate of the United States, and laid before the other House so that it may be revealed. Certainly as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I should like to know.

Mr. HATCH. I might say to the Senator that I am quite sure there is no other agreement, and there could not be under existing laws. We are clear on that. I am merely pinning it down now that the Senator's amendment relates to this agreement only.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me put it this way: The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia relates to all agreements which might enable people to come into this country, and the whole scope that the Senator has understood was within this resolution.

Mr. HATCH. That is correct; there is not anything else? Now, one other question. There is perhaps a suggestion—I do not know whether it is a correct interpretation or not—in connection with the prior approval mentioned in line 4 on page 2, that that language, being general in its terms, might not even permit the admission into this country of those who are entitled to admission under present immigration laws, unless prior approval were specifically given by Congress. I know that is not the intention.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is certainly not the intention. I want to make that statement clear that the present entries under our quotas are not to be disturbed in any manner whatever.

Mr. HATCH. And exactly what the Senator is trying to do is to prevent any change, any alterations in the present law?

Mr. REVERCOMB. In the present law of entry by quota.

Mr. HATCH. So if a person is entitled to be admitted into this country under existing law, he would not have to come to Congress to obtain prior approval.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. I think that clears up that point. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, we are dealing as a matter of fact with a situation under which persons, whether they be refugees or not, seek entry into this country. I feel that in the discussion just preceding my remarks at this moment it has been clearly pointed out that there is a relationship between the pending question and the general subject of entry and immigration into this country. The joint resolution before us has been so amended and changed from the draft originally advocated by the State Department that the control of and the entry of persons into the United States, if this amendment is adopted, would continue under the control of the Congress. Had this change not been made, it is my view that Congress would have surrendered its control over this subject and the immigration laws of the country would have been circumvented and ignored. This view which I express is sustained by counsel of the Judiciary Committee, the legislative counsel of the Senate, and counsel in the Library of Congress. Thus we seek—and I believe effectively—to keep immigration solely within the control of the elected Congress of this country.

The subject of immigration at this time is particularly important. There are thousands upon thousands of people in the torn countries of Europe who seek entrance here. It is similar to the situation that came as an aftermath of the First World War. Of course, it is more accentuated and larger in scope today.

The problem was met with wisdom at that time, insofar as laws were enacted. It is to be hoped that it may be wisely met today for the maintenance of the

strength and security of America. I may add that I hope the enforcement and administration of the laws today will help carry out their purpose.

Not only is there a great clamor by those who desire to come here, but there are many in America who seek with great pressure and by every force they can use to compel the opening of the gates of this country to a greater flood of immigration.

There is a definite appeal to the feelings of our people for those unfortunate persons who as victims of the ravages of war and because of political turmoil in their own country find themselves unable to return to their homelands. There are doubtless countless thousands who could stay in Europe with security, but they have a natural desire to come to a land which does not have to rebuild its economy such as those countries which knew the destruction of war. This latter class wants aid in a way which necessitated years ago the establishment of an annual quota system to regulate entry here. But at once we are confronted with a question of whether it is best to aid them where they are, in or near their native lands, or to place upon the people of this country the inherent burdens and dangers, both economic and political, of bringing them here.

The answer must be definite laws that will maintain the security and the strength of America.

HISTORY OF IMMIGRATION

As we approach this problem it is well to review our history of legislation on this subject. For over 100 years after the adoption of the Federal Constitution we had no organized control of immigration. Mass immigraton, in fact, was actively urged; immigrants came across the Atlantic in continuous waves, packed into immigration ships like herrings. Early American passenger brokers did a thriving business at $25 a head at the European gangplanks. Ship agents took up posts in England, Ireland, and other congested zones of Europe, soliciting mass migration, selling steerage space. Come one, come all, was our philosophy. Expanding American corporations sent labor scouts abroad, "contracted" for laborers, brought them to the United States by the steerage shiploads. Immigrant banks boomed in the principal Atlantic seaports. Immigration land frauds became a major early American racket.

Our first immigration law passed on July 4, 1864, was, in fact a law not to curtail in any way but an act to encourage immigration. It provided for a Commissioner of Immigration appointed by the President, under the direction of the Department of State, and it established the first United States Immigration Office in New York City, with a superintendent and one clerk. The Congress of 1864 charged the Commissioner, Superintendent, and clerk with the duty to protect such immigrants from imposition and fraud while providing them information and expediting their travel to their destinations. The first act of Congress on this subject was to protect the immigrant from us rather than to protect us from the immigrant.

Since 1864 various Congresses have slowly passed legislation to protect this country from the immigrant. The reason for this change of policy and the need for it is apparent because the influx of people from other lands was so great that very soon an economic situation as to sustaining them arose, and thoughtful persons foresaw a country crowded and economically ruined. So restrictive legislation followed. From entries of more than a million a year when there were no restrictions, immigration has been cut down legally, or by Congress to less than 200,000 a year for permanent residence or under permanent visas. I may add that in the year 1907, 1,285,349 people came to this country. In 1914—as recently as that year—1,218,480 persons came to our shores.

With the growth of restrictions certain persons were kept out because of their physical conditions. Thus there was a bar against those with contagious diseases, prostitutes, imbeciles, cripples, and finally, in 1918, legislation was enacted excluding and expelling aliens who were members of anarchistic or similar classes preaching the overthrow of the United States Government by force.

Following the First World War there arose, as before stated, a situation similar to that which we have today and Congress met it in the interest of this country. It was the intent of Congress, 3 years after the First World War, to limit the immigration of aliens who had proved to be least assimilable. It was thought at first that quotas based on the 1910 census, 3 percent of the foreign born of each nationality resident in the United States in 1910, would build up an increasing assimilable population. Congress discovered, however, it had based the quota legislation in 1921 on the wrong census year; that between 1890 and 1910 there had been a heavy immigration from southern and eastern Europe.

In 1924, therefore, Congress revised the immigration law again and restricted the nationalities to 2 percent of the 1890 census. This legislation proved ineffectual, one loophole being that it was based on the immigrant's residence rather than his birthplace. All an alien had to do, for example, was to become a legal resident of a favored country and he could enter the United States under that nation's quota. Some of that is being practiced today, but outside the law of the land.

In the year 1924 Congress enacted the national origins provision of the Immigration Act of that year, which became effective July 1, 1929. The national-origins provision was adopted primarily as a basis for determining quotas, but, in its broader sense, it represented the will of Congress to preserve the traditions and political system of the United States by preferable admittance of those who would be, because of their own characteristics and history, more readily assimilated into our own national life, customs, and views of government.

That law became effective July 1, 1929, and is the basic immigration law under which we have lived since that date. These quotas, which now limit immigration for permanent residence to some 153,929 quota aliens each year, nonaccumulative, permit the entry here of 65,721 people from Great Britain; 25,957 German born, and 17,853 emigrants born in Ireland. Quotas for other countries of birth are Poland, 6,524; Italy, 5,802; Sweden, 3,314; Netherlands, 3,153; Russia, 2,712; Norway, 2,377; Denmark, 1,181; Switzerland, 1,707; Austria, 1,413; Belgium, 1,304; Hungary, 869; Yugoslavia, 845; Finland, 569; Portugal, 440; Lithuania, 386; Greece, 307; Rumania, 377; Spain, 252; Syria and Lebanon, 123; and 100 immigrants a year born in the other nations of the world. The quota is divided among nations under the immigration laws of today.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator any figures showing whether all the quotas were taken up by the various nations last year?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall reach that subject; but in immediate answer to the Senator's question I will say that the quotas of countries in northern and western Europe were not filled, and have not been filled for many years. Quotas from southern, eastern, and central Europe have been overcrowded for a number of years with waiting lists.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has digressed a little. I will ask him to digress again, for this question: Has the Senator the figures showing how many aliens entered the United States in 1946?

Mr. REVERCOMB. A total of 108,721.

Mr. McKELLAR. Were there any who entered illegally, in addition to the 108,721?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator that the 108,721 came in under the law. We have heard statements as to many entering illegally. It is stated that more have entered illegally than legally. Perhaps the Senator heard the statement of the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] a moment ago quoting the Attorney General of the United States, whose department is charged with the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws. One of the very purposes of the statement I am making today is to urge upon the Congress an early and complete investigation and revelation of the entire situation, particularly as to illegal entries into this country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very happy to know that the Senator is interested in that subject. I am very much interested in what he has to say about it. I think we ought to reduce the quotas, instead of permitting aliens to continue to come into this country at the rate of 108,721 a year.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We certainly ought to eliminate unlawful entry into this country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In connection with unlawful entry into the United States, I am reminded that the other day I read that under the proposed cut of the budget the offices of the customs and immigration authorities would be reduced to the

point where they would not have a sufficient number of men even to patrol our own borders.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I hope that nothing will interfere with sincere, honest enforcement of the immigration laws.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I can assure the Senator from New Mexico and all other Senators that there will be sufficient funds to enforce the law against immigrants entering the United States illegally.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to have that statement from the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. I have never doubted for a moment that there would be sufficient funds to carry on the Government effectively.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I hope the Senator from Tennessee, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, will bear this thought in mind, because illegal entries into the United States along certain borders present a most serious problem. If the force is reduced so that the job cannot be done, illegal entries will be increased many times.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is very comforting to me to know that Senators realize that this is a serious problem and one which has been serious for years. In the course of my remarks today, and before I conclude, I should like to point out some of the practices which have been uncovered, and which I trust may be ended.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say to the Senator that in my humble judgment no subject of greater importance could be brought before this body or the other body of Congress than the question of enforcing our immigration laws. The information which the Senator is presenting to the country is coming at a most appropriate time. I thank the Senator for what he is doing. He is engaged in a very fine work.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I deeply appreciate the kind remarks of the able Senator.

Since 1931, it may be stated in passing, the aliens of northern and western Europe have used less than 32 percent of their permanent quota allocations, while there has been a long, crowded, waiting list for those requesting entrance into this country from central and southern Europe.

According to the United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, in the years 1900 to 1946, 19,446,910 aliens have been admitted into the United States for permanent residence.

That figure is surprising and shocking to many people in this country. In 46 years, 19,446,910 have entered legally and taken up permanent residence in the United States. Of course, since 1929 the limitation upon the permanent residents has been 153,000 a year. In the year 1907, 1,285,349 aliens entered. We had no quota system at that time, and in several years more than 1,000,000 entered annually into this country.

Assimilability is not rhetorical but basic. It is the very basis of the national origins provision of the Immigration Act of 1924, which was a realistic attempt to preserve some homogeneity in our population, which is so necessary among people dwelling togther under one government and as one nation. Any other course is bound in time to lead to internal dissension and continuous strife, and perhaps to the destruction of the very basis of our form of government, which has permitted us to grow into a strong nation of people.

It may be interesting to point out the distribution of those who have come into America. Most of our foreign-born population is to be found in the northern rather than in the southern States, for it is in the northern region of our country that over 80 percent of the foreign-born immigrant stock is concentrated—more than 20 percent being jammed into the State of New York. The areas of greatest concentration are to be found in the highly industrialized States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan. Less than 6 percent of the total permanent immigrants are in the southern region, including the immigrants and citizens of Mexico originating in southern California, the border and Gulf States.

In addition to the annual permanent quotas for immigrants, totaling approximately 153,929 visas, there have sprung up, especially since 1933, other classifications under which aliens can come to the United States in numbers equaling and often exceeding the annual quota figures. Foreigners can come into the United States "in transit" to another country. They may also enter the United States with "temporary" visas.

Beginning with the rise of Hitler and increasing with the expansion of fascism and nazism, many thousands of aliens entered the United States each year, legally, under these classifications. Many thousands of other aliens entered the United States illegally by jumping ships on which they had purposely taken temporary jobs as seamen; by way of the Mexican border; and in small boats from Cuba. In 1939 investigations by some of the specialists of the State, War, and Navy Departments convinced the investigators that many more aliens were in the United States out of quota than under quota. They consulted Congressional committees. In 1940 Congress passed, for the first time in the history of the United States, an alien registration act. Any foreigner in the United States who failed to register and fill out the recording forms truthfully was subject to severe penalties. It is generally considered that 90 percent of the aliens registered. At my request the Attorney General has furnished me with a statement, dated December 26, 1940, showing those aliens who registered under this law classified by country of birth and sex. A total of 5,009,857 unnaturalized aliens registered under that act in 1940.

I here ask unanimous consent to insert at this place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement consisting of four pages, showing the registered aliens in the United States classified by country of birth, and sex, in 1940.

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

Registered aliens in the United States, classified by country of birth and sex

[Dec. 26, 1940]

Country of birth	Total	Male	Female
Total	5,009,857	2,340,770	2,669,087
Austria	193,505	84,825	108,680
Austria-Hungary	94,893	40,116	54,777
Belgium	16,358	7,957	8,401
Bulgaria	4,596	3,476	1,120
Czechoslovakia	73,909	28,527	45,382
Denmark	30,385	18,837	11,548
Estonia	1,931	1,203	728
Finland	50,758	25,484	25,274
France	34,427	14,906	19,521
Germany	321,080	149,160	171,920
Great Britain	299,653	130,958	168,695
Northern Ireland	31,198	12,475	18,723
Irish Free State	160,098	50,966	109,132
Greece	83,102	52,283	30,819
Hungary	117,828	47,310	70,518
Italy	703,445	298,713	404,732
Latvia	7,177	3,026	4,151
Lithuania	87,369	39,995	47,374
Netherlands	33,335	18,751	14,584
Norway	68,979	38,906	30,073
Poland	446,462	179,140	267,322
Portugal	74,471	40,753	33,718
Rumania	32,664	13,045	19,619
Russia	370,308	156,237	214,071
Spain	40,743	27,668	13,075
Sweden	103,407	57,815	45,592
Switzerland	24,822	14,070	10,752
Turkey	44,741	22,197	22,544
Yugoslavia	56,532	31,427	25,105
Other Europe	13,578	7,909	5,669
Arabia (Saudi)	609	558	51
China	41,024	33,066	7,958
India	4,108	3,381	727
Iraq (Mesopotamia)	476	275	201
Japan	92,623	56,920	35,703
Korea	3,564	2,584	980
Palestine	2,887	1,759	1,128
Persia (Iran)	1,992	1,042	950
Siam	176	148	28
Syria and Lebanon	25,209	11,129	14,080
France (Asia)	74	47	27
Great Britain (Asia)	2,511	2,030	481
Portugal (Asia)	30	26	4
Other Asia	262	222	40
Australia	4,232	2,051	2,181
New Zealand	1,464	745	719
France (Pacific)	126	69	57
Great Britain (Pacific)	218	115	103
Japan (Pacific)	41	32	9
Netherlands (East Indies)	574	385	189
Portugal (Pacific)	11	9	2
Philippine Islands	84,730	79,597	5,133
United States possessions (Pacific)	4,238	637	3,601
Other Pacific	33	14	19
Egypt	1,278	675	603
Union of South Africa	1,666	846	820
Ethiopia	45	38	7
Liberia	228	205	23
Belgium (Africa)	37	16	21
France (Africa)	1,035	587	448
Great Britain (Africa)	661	523	138
Italy (Africa)	80	44	36
Portugal (Africa)	70	39	31
Spain (Africa)	54	27	27
Other Africa	110	72	38
United States	73,141	10,668	62,473
Canada	467,258	208,227	259,031
Newfoundland	14,823	5,509	9,314
Mexico	423,519	230,694	192,825
Costa Rica	1,209	612	597
El Salvador	1,092	459	633
Guatemala	1,184	598	586
Honduras	1,162	617	545
Nicaragua	1,471	672	799
Panama	2,383	1,144	1,239
Cuba	16,207	9,357	6,850

Registered aliens in the United States, classified by country of birth and sex—Con.

[Dec. 26, 1940]

Country of birth	Total	Male	Female
Dominican Republic	2,899	1,198	1,701
British West Indies	62,747	30,186	32,561
Dutch West Indies	1,602	903	699
Haiti	697	432	265
Canal Zone	369	215	154
Other North and Central America	11,863	5,497	6,366
Argentina	4,016	2,123	1,893
Bolivia	198	127	71
Brazil	5,088	2,736	2,352
Chile	1,921	1,339	582
Colombia	3,174	1,622	1,552
Ecuador	882	643	239
Peru	1,513	1,046	467
Paraguay	93	28	65
Uruguay	426	243	183
Venezuela	3,290	1,427	1,863
British Guiana	2,312	1,171	1,141
Dutch Guiana	285	208	77
French Guiana	22	15	7
Other South America	32	18	14
Unknown	3,126	2,056	1,070
Born on board ship	714	398	316
None or blank	896	528	368
Europe, not specified	13	6	7

Date of entry of registered aliens in the United States, classified by sex

[Dec. 26, 1940]

Date of entry	Total	Male	Female
Total	5,009,857	2,340,770	2,669,087
Prior to 1880	32,739	13,858	18,881
1880-89	117,790	61,251	56,539
1890-99	239,605	120,561	119,044
1900-09	1,080,654	553,314	527,340
1910	182,900	87,694	95,206
1911	151,822	66,820	85,002
1912	216,750	98,817	117,933
1913	287,230	129,419	157,811
1914	154,646	69,126	85,520
1915	62,648	29,710	32,938
1916	82,803	38,149	44,654
1917	46,371	23,265	23,106
1918	43,195	23,389	19,806
1919	91,322	47,827	43,495
1920	194,672	82,856	111,816
1921	163,980	59,105	104,875
1922	134,693	59,124	75,569
1923	217,840	106,962	110,878
1924	106,352	53,621	52,731
1925	92,765	41,717	51,048
1926	107,305	52,084	55,221
1927	107,828	52,572	55,256
1928	106,468	49,148	57,320
1929	110,797	50,389	60,408

Date of entry of registered aliens in the United States, classified by sex—Con.

Date of entry	Total	Male	Female
1930	89,722	39,882	49,840
1931	39,329	17,492	21,837
1932	30,370	11,560	18,810
1933	30,210	11,806	18,404
1934	39,315	15,320	23,995
1935	45,671	17,607	28,064
1936	56,861	22,560	34,301
1937	83,556	34,888	48,668
1938	100,860	45,086	55,774
1939	109,705	51,503	58,202
1940	142,463	72,028	70,435
Unknown	108,620	30,260	78,360

Mr. REVERCOMB. I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement showing registered aliens in the United States for selected countries of birth by State of residence, as of December 26, 1940.

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

Registered aliens in the United States, for selected countries of birth by State of residence, Dec. 26, 1940

State of residence	Country of birth							
	Italy	Canada	Poland	Mexico	Russia	Germany	Others	Total
United States	703,445	467,258	446,462	423,519	370,308	321,080	2,277,785	5,009,857
Alabama	892	333	131	78	255	412	3,031	5,132
Arizona	217	518	82	26,807	177	218	3,935	31,954
Arkansas	545	220	118	190	108	503	1,705	3,389
California	52,749	40,693	5,282	146,439	19,970	19,952	257,379	542,464
Colorado	3,093	1,122	639	6,908	5,004	1,104	9,603	27,473
Connecticut	41,818	15,937	24,232	51	11,534	4,937	50,619	158,128
Delaware	1,726	246	1,172	15	572	333	2,364	6,428
District of Columbia	2,154	1,031	553	90	2,063	1,057	7,804	14,752
Florida	3,035	5,465	699	183	1,089	1,779	29,077	41,327
Georgia	237	492	272	29	546	484	3,127	5,187
Idaho	289	1,412	55	315	308	409	5,444	8,232
Illinois	35,292	18,728	53,352	11,921	26,800	28,981	154,996	325,070
Indiana	2,357	2,603	5,680	2,771	2,010	3,973	24,991	44,385
Iowa	1,203	1,153	433	1,268	1,358	4,516	14,717	24,648
Kansas	697	706	598	5,053	1,664	1,591	5,646	15,955
Kentucky	647	451	225	41	404	948	2,842	5,558
Louisiana	7,021	461	199	1,040	328	843	7,418	17,310
Maine	1,105	35,272	777	21	968	215	8,875	47,233
Maryland	6,182	1,347	5,362	84	6,548	3,934	14,335	37,792
Massachusetts	53,989	91,654	30,956	94	26,907	4,179	156,642	364,421
Michigan	17,856	77,990	48,189	4,751	15,653	12,705	125,959	303,103
Minnesota	1,254	6,108	2,363	1,210	3,484	4,205	42,809	61,433
Mississippi	881	105	62	183	104	217	1,667	3,219
Missouri	7,699	1,552	3,229	1,965	5,508	5,327	18,270	43,550
Montana	713	2,149	179	1,065	1,180	465	8,026	13,777
Nebraska	1,302	615	869	1,977	3,340	2,539	8,291	18,933
Nevada	1,042	330	25	799	56	211	3,655	6,118
New Hampshire	697	18,236	2,105	11	1,060	307	8,122	30,538
New Jersey	72,582	6,721	36,291	298	20,239	24,820	118,248	279,199
New Mexico	366	173	54	9,909	89	242	1,569	12,402
New York	250,253	62,385	122,937	3,600	145,202	130,803	542,321	1,257,501
North Carolina	179	498	103	19	191	352	2,865	4,207
North Dakota	15	1,684	309	108	1,766	576	6,024	10,482
Ohio	26,901	9,410	23,391	1,461	11,691	11,547	118,637	203,038
Oklahoma	424	596	285	1,419	601	676	2,945	6,946
Oregon	1,983	6,573	453	340	2,384	1,914	20,777	34,424
Pennsylvania	71,952	6,153	53,127	1,526	31,172	16,976	189,114	370,020
Rhode Island	11,924	11,745	3,335	10	1,793	715	23,048	52,570
South Carolina	70	180	106	10	199	199	1,424	2,188
South Dakota	59	452	139	94	873	935	4,848	7,400
Tennessee	1,132	393	344	52	541	553	2,122	5,137
Texas	3,345	1,768	1,162	183,758	1,507	3,757	18,601	213,898
Utah	984	603	39	796	78	863	7,124	10,487
Vermont	659	10,826	765	9	349	136	3,183	15,927
Virginia	771	855	405	37	1,027	884	6,114	10,093
Washington	3,982	17,019	1,296	425	3,222	3,025	52,667	81,636
West Virginia	5,284	430	2,679	210	1,405	479	13,175	23,662
Wisconsin	3,332	3,428	11,083	940	5,911	14,767	35,666	75,127
Wyoming	298	225	150	1,434	700	146	2,964	5,917
Alaska	52	479	31	17	147	116	2,563	3,405
Hawaii	34	295	45	23	123	98	90,829	91,447
Puerto Rico	90	29	12	87	14	43	14,579	14,854
Virgin Islands	2	5	5	2	2	10	3,827	3,853
American Samoa	0	1	0	0	0	7	97	105
Canadian commuters and visitors	19	2,108	20	18	31	5	461	2,662
Mexican commuters and visitors	6	7	2	1,242	3	4	82	1,346
Foreign address	2	16	0	12	0	0	32	62
Others and unknown	53	272	56	304	50	88	1,530	2,353

Mr. REVERCOMB. By request, I ask that the clerk read from the last exhibit or statement I have offered, the portion which shows the location, by States, of the alien residents of our country. I refer to the total number of alien residents registered in those States under the act of December 26, 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read the matter referred to from the preceding table.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. A moment ago, when we were discussing the question of illegal entry, it occurred to me that some testimony was given recently before a committee of which I and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] were members. The Assistant Commissioner of Immigration testified before our committee, when he appeared there in regard to another matter, that on the southern border, for the first 7 months of this year, 99,000 persons have actually been apprehended. Of course, he had no knowledge of how many other persons had crossed the border and had not been apprehended. He further testified that the problem is increasing to such an extent that they expect in the coming year to apprehend nearly 200,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator for that information, which is most interesting and very helpful. I wish to say that that is another reason for having a complete investigation made of this matter, and for using in connection with it every facility of the Government, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Do the figures which have just been read show the number of registered aliens in the various States?

Mr. REVERCOMB. They were the ones who registered in 1940, under the 1940 Act, and were not citizens. They were aliens in the United States—more than 5,000,000 of them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator from West Virginia have any knowledge of the pretext or other method which was used by such persons to enter the United States? Were they here on visitors' visas? I should like to know what information the Senator from West Virginia has on that subject.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not have any information on it. I rather suspect that persons who had come into the United States illegally would not have registered. I doubt that they would have. So we do not know how many aliens were illegally in the United States, in addition to the 5,000,000 who registered. That is my own thought upon the subject.

Thus, at the beginning of the year 1941, there were more than 5,000,000 unnaturalized persons resident in this country. Of this number, 491,591 were natives of Germanized zones of Europe; 1,235,477 were natives of Russia and the Soviet satellite zones. Here is something timely which I wish now to call to the attention of the Senate, in connection with the important issue of world communism and the great question which confronts us in that connection. It is well to bear these figures in mind, for we know the German Bund was active in the United States, its leaders being German immigrants subsequent to the First World War, many of whom became naturalized citizens. Mr. President, that fact has significance, particularly with respect to the other figure I have given you.

Today there are perhaps more than twice as many in this country from Communist-dominated areas, and it cannot be doubted that much of the communism that has spread through America to the point of danger will be found coming from these immigrants who were nurtured in this philosophy.

We shall soon consider what steps we shall take with respect to Greece and Turkey. It has also been suggested that we should take steps along the same lines, to protect Korea from communism. So we hear the cry that we must protect others from communism. I say that we have a more immediate duty, one that is upon our own doorstep—namely, to protect this country from communism, a communism that doubtless is largely led by those to whom we have given haven in this country.

Within the last few days the President of the United States has found it necessary and has seen fit to issue an order to drive Communists and those with the Communist line of thought from positions in the departments of Government. The order is a good one, but it has been a long time in coming, and I earnestly wonder how effectively such an order will be administered. As to that we must wait and see the result. But can we expect the same department heads who have harbored Communist actors within their departments to now rid this Government of them? I doubt that that will ever come about, in fact, until in some instances those department heads themselves are changed. That Communists are in these departments must be recognized from the fact of the issuance of the President's order alone.

Returning to the figure of registration of 5,009,857 aliens, the Immigration Service estimates that this alien population decreased, as of July 1, 1946, to an estimated $3,050,000 aliens, as a result of naturalization, emigration from this country, and death. There was a rush for naturalization after the Registration Act became law, and 1,437,000 of the 1940 aliens had been rushed through citizenship mills between the beginning of 1941 and July 1, 1946. Just how good citizens these 1,437,000 hastily approved persons will become remains to be seen. They did not desire citizenship until they were revealed to be living here within this haven while maintaining their allegiance to their native countries. Then they rushed to become citizens.

To the alien statistics of 1940 there will now have to be added the figures for the aliens who entered the United States during the years 1941 to 1946. I have been furnished two tables of statements dealing with entries from June 30, 1939 to 1946, by Mr. Ugo Carusi, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, under date of March 20, 1947. I ask unanimous consent at this point to have included as a part of my remarks a table entitled "Immigrant Aliens Admitted, by Countries of Last Permanent Residence, Years Ended June 30, 1939 to 1946."

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

Immigrant aliens admitted, by countries of last permanent residence, years ended June 30, 1939–46

Countries	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946
All countries	82,998	70,756	51,776	28,781	23,725	28,551	38,119	108,721
Europe	63,138	50,454	26,541	11,153	4,920	4,509	5,943	52,852
Albania	229	152	2			1	1	9
Belgium	683	1,713	1,816	346	120	126	71	1,718
Bulgaria	129	87	135	15	3	6	3	8
Czechoslovakia	2,896	1,074	314	137	102	136	64	267
Denmark	306	250	244	84	100	61	43	194
Estonia	93	75	41	14	14	26	16	9
Finland	411	233	244	44	49	29	29	29
France	1,907	2,575	4,801	4,430	1,201	387	201	5,708
Germany	38,515	21,520	4,028	2,150	248	238	172	2,598
Great Britain:								
England	2,739	5,850	7,368	838	901	1,210	2,784	30,922
Scotland	277	263	295	51	71	96	192	1,586
Wales	42	45	51	18	2	15	53	1,044
Greece	907	811	268	174	229	226	176	367
Hungary	1,348	1,902	330	186	75	87	54	49
Ireland (Eire)	1,101	749	211	70	132	68	125	526
Italy	6,570	5,302	450	103	49	120	213	2,636
Latvia	168	288	97	27	21	24	16	29
Lithuania	290	262	242	52	43	37	19	14
Netherlands	1,259	2,097	823	139	77	71	50	355
Northern Ireland	88	90	61	13	33	44	302	1,290
Norway	527	488	369	72	71	127	61	248

Immigrant aliens admitted, by countries of last permanent residence, years ended June 30, 1939–46—Continued

Countries	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946
Europe—Continued								
Poland	3,072	702	451	343	394	292	195	335
Portugal	422	448	1,101	437	395	431	570	578
Rumania	421	333	122	67	45	70	77	19
Soviet Russia	59	40	41	60	32	41	18	72
Spain	257	259	300	234	254	271	156	227
Sweden	342	518	518	205	58	58	45	643
Switzerland	1,237	1,211	1,375	585	123	33	39	766
Yugoslavia	1,090	652	142	73	29	93	88	65
Other Europe	753	465	301	186	49	85	110	541
Asia	2,162	1,913	1,801	564	334	227	442	1,633
China	642	643	1,003	179	65	50	71	252
Japan	102	102	289	44	20	4	1	14
Palestine	1,066	850	268	150	107	45	133	483
Syria	207	111	14	24	9	8	18	90
Other Asia	145	207	227	167	133	120	219	794
Canada	10,501	10,806	11,280	10,450	9,571	9,821	11,079	20,434
Newfoundland	312	272	193	149	190	322	451	910
Mexico	2,640	2,313	2,824	2,378	4,172	6,598	6,702	7,145
West Indies	2,231	2,675	4,687	1,599	2,312	3,198	5,452	5,878
Central America	530	639	1,239	805	1,218	1,985	3,423	2,338
South America	915	1,115	2,216	989	693	1,160	1,609	2,633
Africa	218	202	564	473	141	112	406	1,516
Australia	159	156	137	100	97	461	1,261	5,111
New Zealand	54	51	57	20	23	116	364	898
Other countries [1]	138	160	237	101	54	42	987	7,372

[1] Chiefly Philippine Islands.

Source: U. S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to file as a part of my remarks a table or statement furnished me on the same date by Mr. Carusi. It is entitled "Immigrant Aliens Admitted, by Nationality, or Country or Region of Birth, Years Ended June 30, 1939, to 1946."

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

Immigrant aliens admitted, by nationality, or country or region of birth, years ended June 30, 1939–46

Nationality or country or region of birth	Total	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946
Total, all countries	433,427	82,998	70,756	51,776	28,781	23,725	28,551	38,119	108,721
Europe	268,987	68,198	56,254	36,989	14,881	8,953	8,694	10,141	64,877
Albania	429	217	156	8	1	3	10	5	29
Belgium	4,658	329	482	1,212	428	210	135	92	1,770
Bulgaria	428	117	108	108	14	11	23	11	36
Czechoslovakia	9,900	3,127	2,247	1,848	598	375	341	289	1,075
Danzig, Free City of	400	183	106	42	13	6	9	8	33
Denmark	1,700	303	287	328	122	142	119	108	291
Estonia	513	112	99	70	28	21	28	19	136
Finland	1,743	514	314	394	81	113	72	58	197
France	10,910	923	858	2,015	1,151	524	232	207	5,000
Germany	86,652	33,621	26,854	13,307	4,945	1,295	1,360	1,260	4,010
Great Britain:									
England	43,034	2,423	2,241	3,614	1,117	1,114	1,135	2,627	28,763
Scotland	5,679	619	607	538	284	287	357	515	2,472
Wales	1,942	92	53	71	41	43	47	100	1,495
Greece	3,490	841	735	284	216	309	292	235	578
Hungary	5,075	1,321	1,682	663	306	167	227	132	577
Ireland (Eire)	5,101	1,494	1,021	358	182	227	146	286	1,387
Italy	17,849	6,780	5,805	731	69	81	177	320	3,886
Latvia	1,140	241	209	192	111	65	66	50	206
Lithuania	1,776	418	359	273	152	139	105	86	244
Luxemburg	376	25	25	86	98	23	2	11	106
Netherlands	4,343	674	1,154	1,154	224	199	217	111	610
Northern Ireland	2,702	187	176	138	73	112	92	340	1,584
Norway	2,544	575	555	485	118	123	195	114	379
Poland	28,242	7,315	4,768	4,688	2,376	1,647	1,420	1,222	4,806
Portugal	3,376	484	485	371	190	301	429	562	554
Rumania	3,090	679	610	346	317	230	249	234	425
Soviet Russia	8,627	1,901	1,779	1,761	800	444	433	399	1,110
Spain	2,639	379	396	372	243	318	291	238	402
Sweden	1,855	378	450	306	124	113	90	67	327
Switzerland	2,843	639	640	785	250	127	50	70	282
Yugoslavia	3,360	1,050	776	271	126	99	178	184	676
Other Europe	2,571	237	217	170	83	85	167	181	1,431
China	1,632	317	296	357	88	56	72	109	337
India	834	51	72	101	25	40	43	95	407
Japan	322	79	75	103	20	16	9	3	17
Palestine	959	254	257	59	62	47	35	52	193
Syria	702	190	112	67	51	36	42	61	143
Turkey in Asia	950	244	180	82	85	77	76	90	116
Other Asia	1,356	169	203	165	101	81	72	150	415
Canada	74,111	8,151	8,303	8,428	8,519	7,235	7,023	8,866	17,586
Newfoundland	3,134	342	295	207	179	194	363	513	1,041
Mexico	32,073	2,265	1,914	2,068	2,182	3,985	6,399	6,455	6,805
West Indies	17,390	1,192	1,147	1,122	978	1,116	2,299	4,660	4,876
Central America	10,889	450	446	659	711	1,181	1,876	3,395	2,171
South America	7,090	625	697	742	572	474	899	1,326	1,755
Other America	30	11	1	----------	6	7	1	----------	4
Africa	2,306	167	193	281	142	83	75	267	1,098
Australia	7,110	151	155	141	108	82	425	1,179	4,869
New Zealand	1,560	59	58	53	21	28	108	356	877
Philippine Islands	577	58	68	91	28	9	15	15	293
All other and unknown	1,415	25	30	61	22	25	25	386	841

Source: U. S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the number shown on these statements are for lawful entries into the country, and do not consider or show those who have entered the United States illegally. A great many aliens came into the United States with "intransit" visas, being "in transit," according to their promises, for Cuba, Mexico, or some other part of the world; but they are still in the United States. This particular method of entering the United States and remaining here has required the specific connivance of foreign as well as American officials. During the war over 750,000 aliens were admitted into the United States under temporary quota transit visas, and Congress has not yet been advised as to what has become of them. During the period from 1925 to 1944, 1,280,716 immigrants gained entrance into the United States under quota visas. There were 1,143,158 who entered the United States as nonquota immigrants during the same years. It is evident, therefore, that very careful supervision over nonquota immigration is as important as such supervision over quota entry. The figures I have just read are taken from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Monthly Review, August 1945, pages 187–189.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Of course the Senator is aware of the fact that only a few months ago it was shown on the Senate floor that these immigrants, or refugees, whatever we may call them, did not pay any income tax. It was estimated they had derived income of $800,000,000 without paying any income tax on it. Of course, the Senator is aware also that at the very time when our veterans cannot get homes, these people are living in houses which they either bought or have rented.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The able Senator from North Dakota has made a very valuable contribution to the discussion, and I am glad he has done so.

It must be remembered that in addition to the quota immigrants admitted to this country—153,929 are admitted for permanent residence—others are admitted for temporary stays. Still others are admitted under the preferential quota or nonquota admittance. Such entrance, temporary or preferred, is granted to foreign government officials, their families, attendants, and employees, and properly so; for "temporary" business visitors; for "temporary" pleasure visitors; for continuous travel through the United States in transit to another country; to carry on trade under treaties; to husbands and wives of United States citizens; to unmarried children of United States citizens; to natives of the other American republics and Canada, their wives and unmarried children; to ministers of religious denominations, their wives and unmarried children; to "students"; and to laborers under special agreements with other governments for temporary work, then to be returned. All of the foregoing are not included within the quota of 153,929 who may enter for permanent residence. It is doubtless these who enter outside the quota of 153,929 who are the ones that give us trouble and stay here without legal right to do so.

I urge that the Eightieth Congress proceed to ascertain the whole situation with respect to those who are validly here and those who live here against the laws we have set up for the protection of this country. Certainly no move should be made toward changing our immigration laws until these facts have been clearly ascertained and the true picture made known to the American people. Suffice it to say that there are among us many more from other countries than it was intended should be admitted under our laws.

This whole subject should be approached in a fair, sound, and practical way, with the welfare of this Nation and our people as the primary guiding principle in any step that is taken on the subject.

Many of those who have come from other lands have become great and useful citizens and have contributed much to the advancement of the United States. On the other hand, we are today beset with the advocates of political ideologies principally fostered by those who came here to find a haven among us. Also, we cannot ignore the economic situation that confronts America when millions of our own young men recently returned from the battle fronts are seeking to reestablish themselves in economic security in this country and to rear and maintain their families and to progress under the standards of free American people. It would be tragic to destroy their opportunities through an influx of people from other lands.

We cannot blind ourselves to true conditions if we are going to serve in truth the welfare of America, our own Nation, and if we are going to maintain a good living standard and keep secure the Government which we have sworn to uphold.

America will never turn a deaf ear to the distress of any people anywhere. Certainly she has poured forth her millions and her billions of dollars of wealth to aid the needy. But she must be practical enough to see that in this course of philanthropy she does not destroy her own people while helping others to get the best that can be obtained under the conditions we confront.

Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a very interesting program which has recently been embarked upon by Canada. From their pages we can take a lesson today. They live so close to us that their problems are quite the same as ours.

Canada is proceeding upon a program under which it takes in a limited number of persons for farm work. This has sound appeal to Americans, in whose country there is today a shortage of farm workers.

It is interesting to observe a breakdown of the permanent visas which our Foreign Service officials abroad issued to aliens for permanent entry into the United States under the existing annual quota. In the year 1945, as appears in the hearings of the Senate Committee on Immigration, of a total of 38,119 visas examined after the aliens had entered the United States, only 497 had been issued to farmers or agriculturists and only 225 to farm laborers, while 21,434 visas were issued to aliens whom the American officials found to have no occupation. The complete audit may be of value: 2,852 were listed as professionals; 1,451 were listed as proprietors; 2,120 were craftsmen; 497 were farmers, agriculturists; 225 were farm laborers; 3,715 were clericals, salesmen; 1,495 were domestic servants; 886 were laborers, outside of farmers; 21,434 were found to have no occupation. That was for the year 1945; year before last.

CANADIAN PLAN

In contrast to such a selection of immigrant stock for the United States, in a turbulent year of reorganization, reconversion, and other national problems, we have the far more enlightened immigration program of Canada. The Canadians would not allow 21,434 aliens with no occupations to enter Canada in 1945, or any other year. Nor would they allow refugees to enter Canada merely because they were refugees. When the Canadian Parliament was shown evidence that the prewar immigration into Canada had changed the percentages of the racial and national components of the Canadian population, it abruptly closed the door on all immigration from Europe pending a Crown study of Canada's need for further immigration.

The Canadian Parliament became convinced that the immigration of refugees had introduced liabilities rather than assets into the nation. The Finnish refugees admitted indiscriminately in the early 1920's for example, had become a turbulent element in Canada's political life.

A Canadian commission was assigned the task of surveying Canadian requirements for additional population. It found that the philosophy that Canada was a great undeveloped country capable of supporting, and advantageously using, several hundred thousand colonizing immigrants to be an economic fallacy. If it is an economic fallacy in Canada, it certainly would seem to me to be an economic fallacy in the United States. The previous maximum population growth of Canada, between 1901 and 1911, when it was opening up the rich prairie provinces on a large scale, was 180,000 a year. Compare this with those who entered the United States in excess of 1,000,000 per year for several years during the same time.

This Crown inquiry furnished the answer in 1946 for Canada toward groups who had been publicly advocating the free immigration of farmer-refugees from Europe and the Middle East.

Canada is proceeding upon a program under which it takes in a limited number of persons for farm work. This has sound appeal to many an American.

To balance off the shutting of Canada's door against refugee immigration the Canadian Government announced an experimental project. This is in process of being done. This is not ancient history, or in years past. This is what Canada is doing today. Some 200,000 members of the Polish Army which had

fought valiantly with British troops against Germany and which also had fought against the Russian conquest of Poland, could not return to their homeland except as slave labor of the Soviet Government. Canada planned that if it had enough specific applications and agreements from approved Canadian farmers 4,000 of these Polish soldiers would be brought into Canada as farm workers. A commission was sent across the Atlantic to interview Polish veterans and select applicants after careful investigation.

This group of highly selective immigrants is now en route to Canadian farms and dairy establishments. The immigrants average 29 years of age, are unmarried, have had at least 8 years of farm experience similar to the work they will do in Canada, and have signed up to work for Canadian employers for a minimum of 2 years at regular local wages. Canadian farmers, on the other hand, have been required to sign contracts for at least one full year's employment of the immigrant, under Government specifications as to pay, shelter, food, and labor. The Government may change the place of employment and may reassign the immigrant to another employer for reason. For the 2-year period, the immigrant is in Canada on probation. After that he will be given citizenship, if he earns it.

Canada's 1947 immigration will be highly restricted, selected through personal investigations of trained officials who were sent abroad to open interview offices last December 1946, in Paris, Brussels, The Hague, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Greece. The landing in Canada of immigrants of all classes and occupations is otherwise prohibited, except for, first, British subjects with means of self-support until employed; second, United States citizens with means of support; third, wives or children of legal residents, after inspection; fourth, fathers, mothers, or unmarried children of legal residents, after inspection; fifth, farmers having sufficient means of buying and operating Canadian farms; sixth, fiancees of legal residents, after inspection; seventh, selected veterans of the Allied armed forces, with honorable discharges, and eighth, orphaned children of the war, after inspection, and these children are called the perfect immigrant for assimilation.

In the sixth century St. Benedict, famed for providing an asylum for refugees of that era, laid down the immigration rules of his monastic order:

> If any pilgrim monk comes from a distant country and wishes as a guest to dwell within the monastery, and will be content with the customs which he finds in the place * * * he shall be received for as long a time as he desires. But if he hath been found gossipy and contumacious in the time of his sojourn as a guest, not only ought he not to be joined to the body of the monastery, but also it shall be said to him, honestly, that he must depart. If he does not go, let two stout monks, in the name of God, explain the matter to him.

In the rule of that famed monastery may be found the very heart of the principle that should guide the formation of any immigration plan.

It has been very difficult under the administration of our immigration laws to deport undesirables from this country. I am advised that there are many deportation cases that have been pending for years. Under Saint Benedict's formula of having two stout monks explain the matter to him if he fails to leave when he was unwanted is not within our laws but perhaps we can take a suggestion from it.

Therefore, it becomes all the more important that very complete inspection be made of all those entering this country, particularly with a view to seeing to it that not only may they be self-sustaining to avoid an economic problem but that they in truth may be expected to accept our customs and our way of government.

It was intended under our immigration laws as they are written that persons applying for entrance to this country under our quotas must first have visas or permits issued to them by our foreign representatives in the country of origin of the immigrant. It is my belief from information given me that it will be shown that this precaution and requirement has been ignored in many instances by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and that our foreign representatives have been bypassed in order that there may be brought here persons to whom they did not issue visas.

I want to point out on that situation an ingenious device which officials of our own Government helped to contrive, found in the Canadian agreement of 1935 which permitted aliens here on temporary visas to enter Canada, stay 1 day, and return to the United States and become permanent residents of this country. This agreement was made as a result of a conference held in 1935 between representatives of the Canadian Embassy, the Canadian Immigration Service, the State Department and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which would permit the temporary entry into Canada of aliens in the United States who were proceeding to Canada for the sole purpose of applying for admission visas solely for the purpose of circumventing the act of Congress.

Under this agreement I charge that we have suffered one of the greatest executive abuses of our immigration laws in the history of this country. The only qualification, aside from the usual qualifications of health and morals, required for a person going to Canada for readmittance to the United States was that he had resided in this country for 6 months. It appears that he was never questioned as to how he got into this country. The result has been that many undesirables have been admitted for permanent residence by first getting into the country by any means, legal or illegal, living here 6 months and then being sent by our Immigration and Naturalization Service to Canada for 1 day's stay in order to be legally readmitted.

This action on the part of the Immigration and Naturalization Service defeats every purpose for which the national origins provision of 1924 was enacted. The purpose of that law was, first, to restrict immigration; and, second, to select immigrants from restricted quotas who would more easily be assimilated into the American way of living and ideas of government.

I have had explained to me by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization that this was done after they had been here for 6 months, because they could not return to their native countries and go back and come back again; it was a matter of convenience of travel. I want to say, Mr. President, to me that does not excuse an evasion of the laws, because it was their duty to return to a point where the foreign visa should be issued by the representative of America, and into that situation I ask that the Senate make its inquiry.

I want to call attention to an order which was issued by President Truman on December 22, 1945, which put into effect a program for the admission into this country, under the framework of the existing immigration laws and regulations, of displaced persons and refugees from Europe. These included about 1,000 persons who had been brought into this country without visas and placed in Camp Oswego, N. Y., so that they could become permanent residents although they entered contrary to law, and that the quotas should be filled from displaced persons and refugees principally natives of central and eastern Europe and the Balkans.

Naturally as a result of this order giving selection to these refugees, those who had been waiting in their countries and were not classed as displaced persons or refugees were pushed aside and the quotas closed to them.

Up to March 1, 1947, a total of 9,918 of these displaced persons had been authoritatively admitted to the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point to place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement furnished me by the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice, entitled "Displaced Persons Admitted to the United States by Country of Birth, as of March 1, 1947."

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

Displaced persons admitted to the United States by country of birth, as of March 1, 1947

EUROPE

Albania	1
Austria	398
Belgium	36
Bulgaria	10
Czechoslovakia	726
Danzig	36
Estonia	41
Finland	5
France	36
Germany	3,428
Northern Ireland	2
England	7
Scotland	1
Greece	2
Hungary	283
Eire	1
Italy	13
Latvia	191
Lithuania	239
Netherlands	27
Norway	2
Poland	3,620

Rumania	130
Sweden	2
Switzerland	9
Turkey	1
U. S. S. R.	356
Yugoslavia	256
Other Europe	2
Total, Europe	9,851
ASIA	
China	8
India	3
Iran	6
Palestine	2
Syria	2
Turkey in Asia	5
U. S. S. R. in Asia	4
Total, Asia	30
AFRICA	
Cameroons	1
Egypt	3
Possessions of France	2
Possessions of Great Britain	1
Total, Africa	7
PACIFIC	
Possessions of Great Britain	1
CANADA	
Canada	3
WEST INDIES	
Dominican Republic	1
CENTRAL AMERICA	
Costa Rica	1
SOUTH AMERICA	
Argentina	2
Bolivia	4
Peru	1
Uruguay	1
Venezuela	1
Total, South America	9
United States	13
Born on shipboard	1
Unknown or not reported	1
Grand total	9,918

Mr. REVERCOMB. On May 25, 1946, the President wrote to the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, in which he said:

You will recall that on December 22, 1945, I issued a directive on the subject of immigration, in which I stated, among other things:

"The decision has been made, therefore to concentrate our immediate efforts in the American zones of occupation in Europe. This is not intended however entirely to exclude issuance of visas in other parts of the world.

"In our zones in Europe there are citizens of every major European country. Visas issued to displaced persons and refugees will be charged, according to law, to the countries of their origin. They will be distributed fairly among persons of all faiths, creeds, and nationality."

I have been informed that 90 percent of the nonpreference quotas are now being allocated to displaced persons in American zones of occupation in Europe, which means that many persons in other countries are denied the opportunity to emigrate to the United States, even though eligible to enter.

It is my view that the State Department should now give serious consideration to lessening the allocation to the American occupied zones, thus enabling displaced persons in other areas, as well as eligible persons residing in their native countries, to enter the United States under the nonpreference quotas.

It will be seen that the President, therefore, in May of last year lessened his former directive of permitting the taking in of other people and made the statement that 90 percent of the nonpreference quotas were given over to the refugees and advised the Secretary of State that others should be considered from that time on, but it is plain from the information furnished me by the Department of State that refugees were continued thereafter to be admitted under the quotas into this country, until they had exceeded the figure of 9,000, which I have just stated, and which appears in the table which I asked to have printed in the RECORD.

Congress has seen the necessity for prohibiting the immigration of persons having contagious diseases, idiots and lunatics, Asiatics, prostitutes, people convicted of moral turpitude, and finally anarchists believing in the overthrow of the United States Government by force. It is largely a matter of continued protection of the great growing American population that not only must we keep out these undesirables who have been classified under the headings above because harmful to this country, but such limitations must be strictly enforced.

The United States at the present time and in the foreseeable future certainly for its welfare needs very little immigration. It can continue, I believe, to assimilate those who enter here under the fixed quotas of our law if those charged with the enforcement of the law will see to it that selected immigrants are brought in. Naturally preference should be given to those who are kinsmen of the immigrants who have settled here and who have proved their right to receive citizenship.

We must recognize the liabilities that arise from importing revolutionaries and revolutionary intellectuals who, should we have reason to deport them, cannot be returned to the country of their origin.

Our primary interest must be in the welfare of the United States. This does not prevent us from aiding individuals when in need wherever they may be, but certainly we are not called upon to take in members of unassimilable persons from abroad or to take in any number who cannot wholly adopt our way of life.

The scrutiny and appraisal of all applicants for American immigration visas must be under the selective responsibility of the United States consular officers abroad and under the executive administration of the Department of State.

There should be a Board of Immigration Visa Review appointed by the President, with the approval of the Senate, and the membership of that board might well be representatives of the Departments of State, War, Navy, Justice, Labor, Agriculture, and Commerce. This board could prepare and present to Congress at regular intervals advice for the exclusion of certain persons and for the admittance of others.

Congress should require publication in the Federal Register, or in a separate volume, of the names and qualifications of all immigrants to whom United States visas are being issued abroad prior to the immigrants' departure for the United States.

The American problem in dealing with those who come here is both economic and political. Although the economic problem is perhaps the more important and controlling from a realistic point of view, the philosophies and political propaganda of certain groups must definitely be taken into consideration in these serious times.

It is true that the liberal traditions on which the United States was founded as a land of freedom and opportunity, open to all races, all religions, have permitted all peoples to enter here and that is in keeping with the traditions which we preserve.

We have obtained through immigration some of our best citizens, many of them ancestors of our best citizens of this time. They had strong characters and were urged toward America by their personal love of freedom and democracy. Naturally we also received those who came to the United States because of economic reasons—to make more money and accrue more property. The fact that our Constitution and laws protect personal property from seizure and confiscation was of importance to the money-making mind; it guaranteed the immigrant that if he made his fortune in the United States he could keep it for his children and his descendants.

This brought strong people among us.

But in recent days, we have the communistically inclined mind with respect to property and its ownership, and over the last few decades there has been constant turmoil throughout the countries of Europe.

European people have historically been at each other's political and economic throats, embroiling this country, and Canada as well, in the wars of their enmities and ideologies.

There is certainly no good sense in any program that imports a great segment of European agitation into the American hemisphere. While some observers of today's world advocate the importing of these people into the United States as a device in lieu of exporting the products of our industries overseas, such a theory overlooks the fact that if we import here unassimilable agitators it would be similar to setting our own time fuse for an internal explosion among us, such as they have been accustomed to in their own countries.

It seems to me that if we are to be sound in our system of future immigrations, we must receive here those only who are free from the germs of communism that they may not bring their contagion into this country.

To accomplish this, we may well consider the plan followed this year by Canada. We must, first, organize a program where the persons, before they are granted their visas to leave, are known to be individuals of skill, character and health; second, we must know that when they arrive here, there is a place for them where they are needed; third, we must compile and organize lists of industries and work places and farms throughout the United States which will agree to provide those selected with gainful employment, good training in American ideals, and opportunities to become worthwhile citizens.

The kind of immigration we need must be obtained selectively under laws enacted by the Congress.

Such laws, if honestly administered for their real purpose, can permit under the quota systems already established in this country a reasonable entrance here of persons who can be assimilated not only into the American way of political thinking but also into those occupations where they are in fact needed and where they will have the opportunity to make progress.

The question is one that demands our early attention.

But before we turn to that we must be fully apprised of the real situation today which through the recent years of the turmoil of war has caused to be brought into this country many who have not fitted here and who are a festering source of trouble so long as they stay here. Only through selective immigration under definite quotas, and deportation of those who have proven unwilling to accept sound American ways can we hope to have a settled future and give haven to the right kind of people.

CONCLUSION

The facts which I have brought to the attention of the Senate I believe to be revealing enough to make us hesitate in moving to change our immigration laws or to consent to the bringing into this country of groups of persons who do not enter under the established quotas or law.

I urge upon the Senate the necessity for further and complete investigation into every phase of our immigration problem. Canada has done that and as a result of its investigation has closed its doors to general immigration except restricted entry of farm workers. I do not urge the complete closing of the door to immigrants, but I do urge that no change be made in the laws of the land as they are now established and, more than that, that we move now to see that those laws are complied with by our officials and that those who enter here be admitted upon a selected basis.

From such an investigation there should be revealed completely to us every phase of this problem so that we may deal with it intelligently and fairly. In approaching it we should be realistic in facing facts; we should stand squarely upon what is best for this country.

We know the threat of subversive activities; we know that communism, with its vicious purposes and its hidden boring-in tactics already has sent its Trojan horsemen into the United States. How many are here has never been authentically determined, and that would be a difficult task. In a recent article in the magazine Life it was estimated that there was a membership of 100,000. That number may seem small, but I have heard it to be the boast of Communists that for every 1 member they have 10 who subscribe to their ideals and their purposes.

In the recent hearings upon the nominations before the Atomic Energy Committee and before the Committee on Public Works it was brought out—and there is no doubt about it whatsoever—that Communists attempted to bore into the control of the Tennessee Valley Authority's operation. Those who admittedly had been members of the Communist Party told of such activities. Certainly, if they had planted themselves in this one industry, they must have planted themselves elsewhere in our country.

That they have infiltrated into positions of government is revealed by the order of the President of the United States issued only last Saturday, March 22, demanding that they be removed from all positions in the executive branches of the Government. They are present and with us, and their very existence ties in closely with the admission of persons from other lands.

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has just stated that a number of Communists were found in the Tennessee Valley Authority. That is correct. I invite his attention to the fact that, as shown by the evidence in both cases—both the Lilienthal case and the Clapp case, one before the Senator's committee and the other before another committee—it was indubitably shown that four of those men in the TVA were outstanding Communists, namely, R. O. Neihoff, James T. Ramey, Paul W. Ager, and Herbert S. Marks. All four of them have been moved by Mr. Lilienthal from the TVA to the Atomic Energy Commission. So the Senator can see just what progress the Communists are making in the TVA and in the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of addressing a question to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am about to conclude, and I hope that I may not be interrupted by debate upon any of the pending nominations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I can assure the Senator that I shall not take very much of his time. I merely wish to address one question to the Senator from Tennessee, which I think is necessary to clarify the record at this time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I would like to yield to the Senator. I want to accommodate him; but while he may not intend to do so, he may incite extended argument. I will yield later to the Senator to put his question. I should like to proceed at this time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, let me state to the Senator from West Virginia the reason I ask him to yield to me, and let me give him assurance before I ask him to yield. A statement was just made by the Senator from Tennessee referring to the political associations of certain men, as I understood him to say, proved in the hearings on the nominations to have been Communists. I merely wish to make a statement in that connection. I do not care to argue the question. I do not believe that the statement of the Senator from Tennessee should stand unchallenged at this point, because it might not be answered. I merely wish to make a statement.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand that the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Tennessee are not in agreement upon that subject as well as other subjects, but I will proceed now with my remarks.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator yield if I promise not to take more than half a minute?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I recall, the record will show that there is no acceptable evidence in the record regarding these nominations that any of the four men were Communists.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I decline to yield further on that subject. That question was laid aside so that we might dispose of the pending joint resolution. We know from the President's order and from other evidence that such persons are present among us. Their very existence ties in closely with the admission of persons from other lands.

I enlist now the aid of the Department of Justice to give to Congress a full and complete report upon the picture of immigration. How many have entered here illegally? How many are remaining in this country unlawfully?

Under the Department of Justice is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. That the activities of Communists are known to the FBI is made fully clear in the speech of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, its Director, last fall at the national convention of the American Legion in San Francisco.

Cannot the FBI, in the Department of Justice, be helpful in ascertaining for public knowledge the numbers of persons who, in truth, have entered this country, so that we may know how many are here illegally before we attempt to change any law dealing with the subject?

Let us proceed to do what is best for this country and for our people. Let us proceed to maintain here our own form of government and not endanger it through the admission of persons who may bring to us, and carry among us, the contagion of political disease; and let us not destroy the economic progress of our people here in a day of reconstruction.

We can maintain our own strength and at the same time be helpful—yes; even beneficent—to those in need elsewhere, but we should not take any step without first considering the effect of it upon the future well-being of this Nation.

Too many people are engaged in promoting what to them seems best for foreign people rather than what is best for us—the people and Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I desire now to submit and have made a part of my remarks on this subject a report which I prepared and which was filed with the steering committee of the Republican Members of the Senate, and ask that it be printed as a part of my remarks.

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

REPORT TO THE SENATE REPUBLICAN STEERING COMMITTEE ON THE POSSIBLE ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS TO THE UNITED STATES

PREFACE

On November 19, 1946, I was advised by Senator TAFT, chairman of the Republican Steering Committee, that, at the committee meetings on November 12, 13, and 14, I had been chosen to prepare an advisory report to the committee on the subject, Possible Admission of Displaced Persons.

Senator TAFT's letter stated that the Steering Committee desired preparatory work

done on the subject for the consideration of the new conference and the committees which it will create. The Steering Committee felt that it had no right to adopt or even recommend a program to the conference of the Eightieth Congress.

Accordingly, I have attempted herein to report only such facts as are pertinent and obtainable without making specific recommendations. I have, however, indicated the points upon which a legislative program may focus hereafter.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONAL ORIGINS

Any program for the admission of displaced persons must necessarily encompass considerations of America's immigration history, and the existence of, and the reasons for, present policies and laws.

In 1924 Congress enacted the national origins provision of the Immigration Act of that year, which became effective July 1, 1929. The national origins provision was adopted primarily as a basis for determining quotas, but in its broader sense, it represented the will of Congress to preserve the traditions and political system of the United States by preferable admittance of those who would be, because of their own characteristics and history, more readily assimilated into our own national life, customs, and views of government.

The national origins distribution of the population was arrived at through a study of records of the 1920 census. The study showed that 43.5 percent of the population in 1920 was of colonial stock, those whose ancestors were enumerated in the first census of 1790, and that 56.5 percent of the population was of post-colonial stock, immigrants and their descendents who came to the United States after 1790.

An effort was made to trace the national origins of these two groups and the estimates, when completed, indicated that practically all colonial stock originated in northern and western Europe, 77 percent being of British origin. Of the postcolonial stock, 65 percent originated in northern and western Europe and 27 percent in southern and eastern Europe.

Based on this distribution, the first proclamation, establishing quotas on a national origins basis, was made on March 22, 1929, and put into effect July 1, 1929.

The national origins provision was an item of the legislative program of the Republican Party in the 1920's. It was enacted by a Republican Congress and put into effect by the proclamation of a Republican President. It is essentially a landmark of Republican achievement and has helped to preserve some homogeneity in our population, so necessary to harmony among people dwelling together under one government and as one nation.

OPPOSITION TO THE NATIONAL ORIGINS PROVISION

The national origins provision was opposed in some quarters, at the time of its adoption, on the ground that it discriminated against certain nationals who desired to enter the United States. Our immigration laws have long discriminated against Orientals, not because of racial prejudice but because it was recognized that if Orientals were not restricted they would inundate the country by sheer force of numbers. The national origins provision applied the same principle, though less severely, to southern and eastern Europe.

We have been able, until recent times, to assimilate among us those who came to us because the majority of them were akin to us in traditions and willingly undertook to fit themselves into our life here.

Due to distortions and dislocations caused by the recent war, the view is now being advanced that the United States should revalue its policy on immigration and national origins to the end that persons who have been dislocated or displaced in Europe may enter this country in excess of established quotas. The persons who would be affected by the plan are principally from eastern and southern Europe.

The appeal for such a change is based upon the plight of those not enemies who have been driven from, or who have voluntarily left, their native countries. Apparently little consideration is given by these advocates to the effect upon the well-being of this country of admitting large groups here at this time.

An outstanding statement on that basis came from Hon. Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Director of UNRRA, in an address made by him at New York, November 2, 1946.

There is quoted herewith the text of Mr. LaGuardia's speech as reported by the New York Herald Tribune:

"The most pathetic and difficult problem facing the world today is that of displaced persons. There are about 830,000 men, women, and children homeless, hopeless, and confused in UNRRA camps today.

"The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, known as UNRRA, is the official international agency of 48 nations. It is really one of the beautiful things that has come out of this terrifying war period. It has carried on its work in the spirit of the brotherhood of man. I can, with all propriety, talk of the good work of UNRRA, for I had nothing to do with its organization and the work in the early difficult period. Credit for that is due entirely to Gov. Herbert H. Lehman, its first director general, who served up to a few months ago.

"Displaced persons are persons who were displaced from their homes by reason of the war and who were nationals of the United Nations or persecuted by the enemy. This last group consists of all those, regardless of their nationality, who were obliged to leave their homes or were deported therefrom by action of the enemy by reason of their race, religion, or activities in favor of the United Nations.

"LIVING SPACE INADEQUATE

"Shelter for the displaced persons is provided by the military and on an emergency basis. This has been sufficient to prevent disease and exposure, but living space and sleeping quarters are inadequate and below a proper level for habitation over the prolonged period that the displaced persons must remain in them. The food is provided by the armies of occupation—the United States, United Kingdom, and France.

"In addition to displaced persons, there were men and women who were forcibly taken from their homes and brought to Germany for slave labor. When hostilities ceased, 6,000,000 men, women, and children from other countries were in Germany. Over 5,000,000 were repatriated to their own countries by the armies of occupation. This was a gigantic undertaking, and the armies deserve credit for the humane and expeditious way in which it was carried out.

"The residue of some 830,000 in UNRRA camps and perhaps another 100,000 scattered presents a world problem. Some of the people do not want to return to their own homes because of the horrifying memories of having seen members of their own family and friends deliberately murdered in cold blood by the Nazis—others because their homes have been destroyed and all family ties lost, and still others who do not like the new governments in their old homelands.

"COERCION FORBIDDEN

"Many were themselves politically active. In some instances where there was civil war, many of them had participated on the losing side. This is particularly true of Yugoslavs and the former residents of the Baltic states, as well as Poles. Many of them have been subjected to constant propaganda against returning to their own home. This condition is now being corrected and accurate information is made available. No one is forced to return to their country of origin. There have been a great many misstatements concerning this policy, but I can assure you that I have issued orders that no one should be coerced if he has any personal objection to returning to his country, as well as that no one should be coerced under threat or otherwise not to return.

"I have had splendid cooperation from the United States, United Kingdom, and French Governments. Only recently I presented a plan which was approved by all three governments, and now 60 days' rations are given to all Polish citizens on their return home. Within the first 3 weeks of this month 32,000 Poles are reported to have returned to Poland. In the case of the Yugoslavs I have encountered some difficulty in getting new liaison officers into Austria. This, I feel, is because of some misunderstanding which I hope soon to have cleared. While repatriation has increased, the sum total population of the displaced persons is not decreasing appreciably, because of the large number of infiltrees now coming from Poland.

"The Jewish people from eastern Europe who are infiltrating into the western zones of Germany and Austria, I have ruled, are entitled to the UNRRA care as displaced persons.

"The British military authorities in Germany deny them D. P. status and refuse them shelter and food. We have protested this treatment, pointing out that the British agreed at international conferences to the inclusion of these Jews in the definition of refugees in the proposed I. R. O. constitution and to UNRRA's assumption of care for them.

"I personally took up the matter with the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Clement Attlee, and sought to prevail upon him to accept our interpretation of the agreement. The United States and French Governments did. The British Government refused to change its policy. Therefore these infiltrees coming from Poland are all crowding into the American zone, making living conditions in the camps even more congested, more uncomfortable than before.

"UNRRA carries on, with the assistance of the voluntary agencies working with it, programs to prevent the mental and physical deterioration of displaced persons and to provide knowledge and skills helpful in adjustments after repatriation.

"Ninety percent of all children between the ages of 5 and 16 in assembly centers in Germany are estimated to be attending school.

"Vocational instruction courses are adapted to accelerate repatriation by providing quickly taught skills or by refreshing technical knowledge.

"DATA ON SKILLS COMPILED

"A compilation of data concerning the skills, previous experience, and other qualifications for employment of the displaced persons was called for by the UNRRA Council. This survey has been completed in the United States, British, and French zones in Germany. UNRRA now has a compilation by occupation and by major nationalities of 345,281 persons. These people are classified under more than 100 different specific trades.

"Measures have been instituted to encourage repatriation by increased dissemination of information about the home countries. UNRRA has called on the governments of origin and the occupying armies for better and greater cooperation.

"UNRRA shall continue its various operations with respect to displaced persons only until June 30, 1947, unless prior to that time they are undertaken by the International Refugee Organization or by any interim

commission or by any other appropriate body designated by the United Nations.

"There are now pending for approval before the General Assembly of the United Nations a constitution for the IRO and an arrangement for a Preparatory Commission. Both these instruments were approved by the Economic and Social Council and referred to the General Assembly. UNRRA has been assisting in the deliberations of that council and its various committees in a consultative capacity.

"BUDGET OF $160,851,000

"The Economic and Social Council has approved a provisional budget for the first financial year totaling $160,851,000. It is not enough, but a good start.

"The largest group of displaced persons are the Poles, numbering 319,680. The second group in size are the Balts—that is, Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians—with a total of 177,200. Then the Yugoslavs, with about 30,000. There are about 110,000 displaced persons of the Jewish faith. There are 299 camps operated by UNRRA in addition to 16 centers operated by voluntary agencies.

"The plight of the little children is heartrending. The children who were kidnaped from their homes or had their parents murdered is another example of the Nazi brutality and degradation.

"UNRRA has found in Germany approximately 10,000 unaccompanied children out of the unknown thousands of children who were kidnaped by the Germans from the neighboring countries and brought to Germany to be nazified or used for slave labor. They are called hidden children, as they were found not with other displaced persons, but as a part of the German population, in institutions in private homes. They were found by search teams who began to look for them in January 1946, as a result of rumors of the existence of these United Nations children, of requests from the national governments, and of reports by camp inmates.

"GERMAN RECORDS USED

"Information leading to their discovery was largely obtained as a result of military regulations requiring German local officials to report on United Nations nationals in their localities. In addition, records from German sources, particularly from various ex-Nazi organizations, have been utilized. Countries are unable to estimate how many children have been removed but they are making every effort to secure a census of their cities and towns and obtain lists of their lost children. We will never know the accurate figure.

"There is now sufficient evidence, both from Nazi sources and from national governments, to establish the fact that organized raids were made on the countries adjacent to Germany for the purpose of removing large groups of children. The children were taken from their towns and villages and brought into Germany by truck or train load. After a period of 'Germanization,' during which the children were carefully screened for intelligence and physical superiority, some were placed in German families, particularly those of high Nazi standing, or in German institutions. Those best equipped were sent to special schools where potential SS men were being educated.

"Others considered inferior were designated for use as guinea pigs in Nazi eugenics laboratories. Many were deliberately and cruelly destroyed.

"The problem of the displaced persons is one that must be intelligently, constructively, and humanely met. It cannot be delayed. Human beings cannot be placed in a deep freezer of indifference awaiting debates of diplomats and decisions of politicians. This stock pile of human misery cannot be left abandoned after UNRRA ceases its activities on June 30, 1947. The work of repatriation will continue, and yet the best we can hope for is to repatriate perhaps 150,000 more. That will still leave several hundred thousands that must be placed.

"And there is only one way to do it, and that is for every country to do its share. By doing its share I do not mean contributing money to feed them and keep them in continued confinement in camps. There is a great deal of salvageable usefulness and happiness in these people. No country has done as much in expressing sympathy and understanding than our own. Yet to date we have not done much really constructive. We must set the example.

"If every country would take its proportionate share of these people it would not only save hundreds of thousands of souls but would benefit the country. Why, here in New York City alone we could employ 20,000 housemaids, and the same is true of the rest of our country. Our classification shows 77,000 farmhands. They are needed not only in this country but in many others. In a new land these people will be useful citizens. Kept in camps they will deteriorate and become useless. Turned loose in the economy of Germany they will create a political problem.

"PRESIDENT HELPFUL

"President Harry Truman has been most understanding.

"I have submitted a plan that would permit the allocation of unused immigration quotas for a short period in order to provide a haven for these people. I am confidently hopeful that if the United States would take 150,000 or 175,000, the United Kingdom would then relent and would change its present restrictive policy on immigration to Palestine. Nothing will be done by Great Britain until the United States does something. Brazil has already presented a plan. Canada and Australia will surely follow our example as soon as we take our share of the unfortunate but promising people. Bolivia and Venezuela, Peru and Chile are interested. Yes; all countries will follow our lead.

"In this, like many other problems, the United States must set the example. This, as in other cases, is because of our fortunate position and the leadership which has come to us. This job should be completed in 1947. The morale and physical resistance of these unfortunate people cannot hold out much longer. They have a right to live. These are the mourners and must be comforted. These are the meek. These are the hungry. These are the thirsty. These are the strangers. These are the sick. These are the imprisoned.

"APPEAL TO CHRISTIANITY

"We have a responsibility. Yes; we have a mandate from the Highest. Here is the opportunity of practicing that which we have preached for nearly 2,000 years. Here we have an opportunity to demonstrate that finally a wicked world has learned the lesson of the Son of God, Prince of Peace.

"'When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.

"'And before him shall be gathered all nations.

"'Then shall the King say unto them, come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.

"'Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we Thee an hungered, and fed Thee, or thirsty, and gave Thee drink?

"'When saw we Thee a stranger, and took Thee in? Or naked, and clothed Thee?

"'Or when saw we Thee sick, or in prison, and came unto Thee?

"'And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto Me.'" (Matthew xxv: 31–40.)

DISPLACED PERSONS IN EUROPE

In an effort to provide the committee with the latest available figures on the numbers and origins of displaced persons in Europe, I asked the War Department on December 4, 1946, to furnish me with certain detailed information, which report of the War Department in its entirety is submitted herewith:

"REPORT OF CIVIL AFFAIRS DIVISION, WAR DEPARTMENT, DECEMBER 4, 1946

"1. There are no figures available on the number of displaced persons in the Russian occupied zone of Europe.

"2. The following figures show the number of displaced persons in and out of camp by nationality in the United States zone of Germany as of November 15 by Office of the Military Government:

Nationality	In camp	Out of camp	Total
I. UNITED NATIONS DISPLACED PERSONS			
Belgian and Luxemburgian	35	1,648	1,683
Czechoslovakian	342	7,124	7,466
Estonian	15,024	2,566	17,590
French	41	2,082	2,123
Latvian	45,242	7,586	52,828
Lithuanian	29,713	3,600	33,313
Norwegian	22	193	215
Polish	126,610	33,060	159,670
Russian	7,587	11,076	18,663
Yugoslav	6,540	11,403	17,943
Stateless	12,458	17,806	30,264
Others and unclassified	22,042	23,725	45,767
Jews	126,729	34,708	161,437
Total	392,385	156,577	548,962
II. AUSTRIANS AND ITALIANS			
Austrians	49	10,294	10,343
Italians	487	3,604	4,091
Total	536	13,898	14,434
III. EX-ENEMY DISPLACED PERSONS			
Bulgarian	27	763	790
Hungarian	78	17,726	17,804
Rumanian	531	4,820	5,351
Total	636	23,309	23,945
Grand total	393,557	193,784	587,341

"3. The following information from Headquarters, United States Forces in Austria, furnishes data as of October 31 on displaced persons in United States zone of Austria and United States Vienna area:

I. United Nations displaced persons (most of these are in camp)

Nationality:	*Number*
Albanians	8
South and Central Americans	728
Armenians	117
British	24
Czechs	6
Estonians	528
Greeks	5
Latvians	1,263
Lithuanians	1,010
Poles	6,127
Russians (Soviet)	470
Russians (white)	7,352
Stateless	2,635
Sudanesian	1
Turks	17
Ukraines	7,873
United States	150
Yugoslavs	7,064
Jews (permanent)	8,461
Jews (transient refugees)	26,571
Total, United Nations	70,410

II. Ex-enemy displaced persons (all of these are out of camp)

Nationality:	*Number*
Bulgarians	166
Germans	13,580
Hungarians	7,389
Rumanians	1,263
Volksdeutsche	69
Baltic Volksdeutsche	34
Bulgarian Volksdeutsche	23
Czech Volksdeutsche	1,060
Danish Volksdeutsche	3
Holland Volksdeutsche	1
Hungarian Volksdeutsche	5,903
Latvian Volksdeutsche	3
Lithuanian Volksdeutsche	111
Polish Volksdeutsche	6,482
Rumanian Volksdeutsche	37,527
Russian Volksdeutsche	1,974
Yugoslav Volksdeutsche	49,055
Sudetendeutsche	29,711
Total, ex-enemy	154,354
Grand total	224,764

"4. The following figures are for all displaced persons in the British and French occupied zones of Germany in assembly centers as of October 15, 1946, as shown from the *UNRRA* report No. 33.

Nationality	Number	
	British zone	French zone
Belgian and Luxemburger	218	106
Czechoslovak	406	266
Dutch	651	268
French	141	359
Polish	165,749	20,011
Russian	315	86
United States of America	256	82
Yugoslav	13,719	987
Estonian	13,481	786
Latvian	45,517	2,314
Lithuanian	24,334	2,384
Austrian	68	68
Hungarian	3,959	688
Italian	100	203
Rumanian	1,796	349
Jewish	13,121	1,930
Others and undetermined	21,733	2,560
Total	305,564	33,447

NOTE.—Figures on the French zone include those only in UNRRA centers—figures for DP's in military-operated centers are not available.

"5. The following figures are furnished on displaced persons in UNRRA assembly centers in the British and French zones of Austria for the month of September. These figures are from an UNRRA report and figures for later date are not available.

Nationality	Number	
	British zone	French zone
Czechoslovak	15	42
Estonian	55	46
Greek	3	2
Italian	5	8
Latvian	307	61
Lithuanian	114	74
Polish	3,688	2,688
Turkish	43	2
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	102	13
Yugoslav	6,903	94
Ex-enemy	60	59
Jewish	3,578	
Stateless	67	7
Undetermined	213	624
Other	22	15
Total	15,175	3,735

"6. The following figures are for displaced persons in Italy in all zones, occupied and unoccupied, as of the month of September. This information is from an UNRRA report.

Nationality	Number in UNRRA centers	Number outside UNRRA centers
Albanian	18	36
Austrian	223	763
British	42	30
Czechoslovak	455	1,235
French	57	115
Greek	693	398
Lithuanian	149	124
Polish	4,108	5,124
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	59	174
Turkish	47	133
Yugoslav	465	1,654
Ex-enemy	1,930	3,457
Other and unclassified	266	603
Total	8,512	13,846

NOTE.—In addition to the above figures on displaced persons in Italy, there are 12,328 displaced persons as of Nov. 12, 1946, most of whom are Yugoslavs and Poles who are a combined US-UK responsibility. All of these are in Allied-controlled operated camps."

REPORT OF MR. GEORGE MEADER, CHIEF COUNSEL TO THE SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

On September 12, 1946, Senator Mead, then chairman of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, announced through the press that the committee would investigate military government in Germany. Afterward Mr. George Meader, chief counsel to the committee, was sent to Europe to make the investigation, and Mr. Meader's findings were made public on December 4, 1946.

Much of Meader's report is foreign to matters within the scope of this inquiry, but his observations on displaced persons are timely and informative. That portion of Mr. Meader's report is submitted herewith. Particular attention is directed to the statement that this Government has agreed to accept 2,250,000 expelees in its zone in Germany.

"There are at the present time approximately 150,000 Jewish displaced persons in United States zone of Germany, of whom less than one-quarter were in Germany during the war. Their number has increased by 120,000 since January 1, 1946, and they are continuing to come. It is estimated that there are 100,000 Jews left in Poland, of whom the United States will eventually have to care for well over half. There are 180,000 Jews in Hungary whom the Russians are at present not permitting to leave. The United States continues to accept into its zone the Jews, as well as any other eastern European people who can present a plausible claim that they are persecuted for racial or religious reasons or for political beliefs favorable to the Allies.

"At Babenhausen there were 3,000 newly arrived Jews who had come from Poland. The Babenhausen camp had been opened for only about 2 weeks prior to my visit. It was at that camp where a trainload of Jews had refused to get off the train because the camp was not good enough. When the Army authorities threatened to turn the train around and send them back where they came from they still did not get off the train. The Army authorities did turn the train around, but instead of taking them back took them to another camp.

"These persons are, for the most part, penniless and do not desire to work, but expect to be cared for, and complain when things are not as well done as they think they should be. Mr. Goldman, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Director of the camp, said that he had not been able to get more than 400 of the 3,000 to do any work, even fixing up their own dwelling space. When he did get any work out of them, it was because of offering special inducements, such as extra cigarettes.

"It is very doubtful that any country would desire these people as immigrants. I spoke with a Jewish girl at Babenhausen, who said she was a block leader, and asked her who had paid for the transportation of these persecutees through Poland and Czechoslovakia. She said it was the Jewish organization. I spoke with representatives of the American Joint Distribution Committee, both in Vienna and Paris, and they denied that their organization defrayed transportation costs for these people, and insisted that this mass migration was a spontaneous movement generated because of pogroms and persecution in Poland. These representatives observed that the best way to solve the problem of what to do with these 150,000 Jews was to permit them to migrate to Palestine.

"The Army authorities were unable to state the source of the financial support for transporting these trainloads of Jews, who all seem to be coming into our zone. They suspect strongly, however, that the American Joint Distribution Committee is doing it in spite of their protestations to the contrary. General McNarney stated that he believed Mr. Schwartz, who is head of the Paris office, would admit they were furnishing the transportation.

"It would be important to know two things: First, whether there is, in fact, persecution in Poland, or whether it is simply alleged without any basis; second, it would be important to know whether these mass migrations are spontaneous or are encouraged by paying train fare and otherwise for the purpose of building up a pressure in the United States zone in Germany to further Zionist objectives. There is a very serious question of policy involved as to whether or not the United States taxpayers, without formally passing upon the question, should be compelled to finance a minority political program. Whatever the policy may be, and it may very well be that the Congress would desire to appropriate funds for this specific purpose, the facts should be known and the policy should be formulated with the full knowledge of those facts.

"The War Department sought to close the camps of displaced persons, other than the Jews, and treat the occupants merely as Germans. It is said that considerable pressure developed from various racial and religious groups within the United States sufficient to cause a reversal of this War Department policy on a very high level. Programs have been initiated to arrange with South American countries, particularly, to accept some of these displaced persons as immigrants. Little progress has been made because the South American countries want to accept only the cream, leaving the least desirable persons still in our care.

"This problem is a difficult one. Because it forms the basis for a large proportion of the appropriations made for military government, the Congress should be fully and accurately informed as to all the facts with regard to it.

"Upward of five and one-half million displaced persons have been repatriated or resettled. The repatriation of the 'hard core' of one-half million is difficult for a variety of reasons, ranging from inertia or a preference to stay where they are and be cared for to a fear that if they return home they will be either killed or abused.

"Many of them are cared for in encampments, the German Army barracks being used for this purpose in many places.

"Of the 535,000 displaced persons in the United States zone, 410,000 are in camps and 125,000 are living with the German population.

"Displaced persons are presently requiring the attention of some 800 United States Army officers and men, of whom approximately 500

are devoting full time to this duty. An estimated 10 percent of the effort of military service troops in the American zone is also devoted to displaced persons. Approximately 1,400 United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel aided by some 600 personnel of various voluntary agencies, are also caring for displaced persons. United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration furnishes no food, clothing or 'amenity supplies,' such as soap and cigarettes. It provides supervision only.

"United Nations displaced persons are accorded a basic ration of 2,000 calories per day, and persecutees, including Jews, receive an extra 200 calories. Statistics show all age groups and both sexes of these displaced persons to be overweight. However, an explanation of this condition has been offered in that the ration contains a substantial proportion of starchy foods which tend to create fat.

"The finding of employment for displaced persons presents an additional problem which appears to have no satisfactory solution. It has already been pointed out that a number of displaced persons have thus far been able to support themselves outside centers. However, among the estimated 275,000 employables only about 40–50 percent are employed, and such employment includes a substantial number engaged in vocational training within the centers. Approximately 53,000 are employed by the United States forces, and a certain number are engaged in their own center administration. The basic difficulties of employment for displaced persons are that their centers are often located distant from centers of employment; the German reichsmarks which they earn have no foreign-exchange value; they may not buy in the rationed German economy; and finally they must compete with indigenous labor. Certain of them—notably the Balts—show a willingness and desire for work; others, including the Jews, do not want to work. The entire problem is rendered more acute in the light of the unavoidable moral and physical deterioration resulting from long periods of idleness and dependence on outside charitable support.

"The lack of employment opportunities for displaced persons may contribute in part to the general security problem which they have created for the occupying forces. Black-market activities have offered a convenient substitute for regular employment, and certain criminal elements have committed numerous crimes of violence. This is an aspect of the displaced persons problem which has received little publicity but has been a source of constant worry to those responsible for the maintenance of order. Accurate statistics can probably never be obtained; however, those furnished are worthy of note in passing.

"G–5 Division, United States Forces, European Theater, reports that incidents involving displaced persons dropped from a weekly average of 225 during the winter to a low of 163 in July. More revealing, perhaps, are the figures taken from the Weekly Intelligence Summary of G–2 Division of the same headquarters. Examination of these figures over a period of 23 weeks in the first half of the current year discloses reports of 4,116 thefts, 219 homicides, and 890 assaults, and available figures indicate that better than 50 percent of those reported may be considered verified.

"Unfortunately the shortage of clothing in the earlier stages of displaced persons' care necessitated the issuance of items of United States Army uniform to them; accordingly, a substantial number of these depredations must have been charged up by the Germans to United States soldiers. (Uniforms for displaced persons have since been dyed.)

"The security situation is not eased by the fact that United States forces are strictly limited in the extent to which German police may be used in Jewish and Soviet centers. This policy was largely the outcome of an incident which occurred last March in a Jewish center near Stuttgart, when German police, partially supported by United States troops, were used to conduct a justified raid, during which a near riot occurred and one Jewish displaced person was shot and killed. The matter was immediately taken up by Jewish groups in the United States, with the result that a new procedure for the use of German police in displaced persons centers was established, whereby German police might only enter such centers in numbers limited to one or two essential individuals, unarmed, accompanied by adequate United States military personnel, and then only for the purpose of identifying persons or evidence connected with a crime committed outside the center—this although in the Stuttgart case the official findings were to the effect that the actions of the German police were not unwarranted.

"In summing up the security aspect of the displaced persons question, it must not be overlooked that the Germans must gaze with some bewilderment upon the conditions the United States permits to exist, and the behavior of the displaced persons themselves appears to be a strange expression of gratitude for the hospitality which they are receiving from the Americans.

"The cost of caring for displaced persons has been estimated at $12 per month per person for food ($13.20 for persecutees) and $49 for an initial outfit of clothing, with a $5 monthly maintenance cost. The estimated cost of caring for displaced persons plus 15,000 civilian internees (the costs are computed together) for fiscal year 1947 comes to $108,500,000 and for fiscal year 1948 to $109,400,000. These figures come under the appropriations, actual and proposed, for government and relief in occupied areas. They do not take into account the cost of United States military and civilian personnel required to handle displaced persons matters, the share of the cost of tactical and service troops so required, the use of military vehicles and fuel therefor for displaced persons' transportation, nor the items paid by the German economy such as telephone, housing, medical supplies and equipment, medical services, or housekeeping personnel.

"No solution for the problem is presently in sight. Originally the matter was in the hands of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. However, late in 1945, Headquarters, United States Forces, European Theater, realized that this committee was not going to solve the problem. In December a plan was submitted to the War Department for repatriation of certain groups, the closing of centers, and the turning over to the German economy of those persons not desiring repatriation. This plan followed a distressing course of delay for policy coordination in Washington, for consultation with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and eventually on April 24, 1946, the War Department notified Headquarters, United States Forces, European Theater, that the Secretary of State had announced the decision to defer closing of the centers until after the United Nations Assembly should have an opportunity to consider the matter in September (later delayed to October) and that the War Department had no prior knowledge that such an announcement would be made. Plans are now being considered in Frankfurt for eventually turning over certain displaced persons to the German economy with safeguards set up through voluntary organizations; however, these plans are not yet definite.

"The position of the other zones with respect to displaced persons offer a sharp contrast. The British zone has some 300,000 displaced persons in centers. However, as of July 1 the British ceased to accept displaced persons into their centers and, in addition, the British classify Jews according to their nationality rather than merely as Jews. The displaced-persons problem in the French zone is negligible, and it is estimated that the French have approximately 33,000. The Soviets have chosen the other possible alternative in handling their displaced persons; namely, they ignore them. When asked for information on this matter the Soviets have merely replied, "We have no displaced-persons problem," and at a recent meeting at Geneva the Soviets admitted the presence of 69 displaced persons.

"The position of the United States with respect to displaced persons is one of continuing to accept all Jews and all "persecutees" into a zone which is already beset with serious housing and food shortages and thus to place an additional burden on the United States occupation authorities in Germany.

"A decision must ultimately be reached as to whether the United States desires to continue indefinitely its largesse at the cost of over $110,000,000 per year and untold problems.

"There are over 1,000,000 German refugees in the United States zone. They are a primary responsibility of the Germans themselves, but each gets his 1,550 calories a day, at United States expense. "Expellees" are ethnic Germans expelled from Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Poland pursuant to the Potsdam Agreement. The United States has agreed to accept 2,250,000 expellees in its zone. Although the British and Russians have also accepted large numbers of expellees, the French, claiming that they were not a party to the Potsdam Agreement, agreed to the acceptance of only 150,000 expellees of a special category. It turns out that there are not that many, but only a few thousand, in that category."

REGISTERED ALIENS

After the opening of hostilities in Europe in 1940, our Government, in the interest of national defense, required registration of all aliens. The statistics on registered aliens are pertinent to this inquiry because they indicate what nationals acquire citizenship and the rate of assimilation. I have therefore obtained and submit herewith three statistical tables concerning registered aliens:

Registered aliens in the United States, classified by country of birth and sex, Dec. 26, 1940

Country of birth	Total	Male	Female
Total	5,009,857	2,340,770	2,669,087
Austria	193,505	84,825	108,680
Austria-Hungary	94,893	40,116	54,777
Belgium	16,358	7,957	8,401
Bulgaria	4,596	3,476	1,120
Czechoslovakia	73,909	28,527	45,382
Denmark	30,385	18,837	11,548
Estonia	1,931	1,203	728
Finland	50,758	25,484	25,274
France	34,427	14,906	19,521
Germany	321,080	149,160	171,920
Great Britain	299,653	130,958	168,695
Northern Ireland	31,198	12,475	18,723
Irish Free State	160,098	50,966	109,132
Greece	83,102	52,283	30,819
Hungary	117,828	47,310	70,518
Italy	703,445	298,713	404,732
Latvia	7,177	3,026	4,151
Lithuania	87,369	39,995	47,374
Netherlands	33,335	18,751	14,584
Norway	68,179	38,906	30,073
Poland	446,462	179,140	267,322
Portugal	74,471	40,753	33,718
Rumania	32,664	13,045	19,619
Russia	370,308	156,237	214,071
Spain	40,743	27,668	13,075

Registered aliens in the United States, classified by country of birth and sex, Dec. 26, 1940—Continued

Country of birth	Total	Male	Female
Sweden	103,407	57,815	45,592
Switzerland	24,822	14,070	10,752
Turkey	44,741	22,197	22,544
Yugoslavia	56,532	31,427	25,105
Other Europe	13,578	7,909	5,669
Arabia (Saudi)	609	558	51
China	41,024	33,066	7,958
India	4,108	3,381	727
Iraq (Mesopotamia)	476	275	201
Japan	92,623	56,920	35,703
Korea	3,564	2,584	980
Palestine	2,887	1,759	1,128
Persia (Iran)	1,992	1,042	950
Siam	176	148	28
Syria and Lebanon	25,209	11,129	14,080
France (Asia)	74	47	27
Great Britain (Asia)	2,511	2,030	481
Portugal (Asia)	30	26	4
Other Asia	262	222	40
Australia	4,232	2,051	2,181
New Zealand	1,464	745	719
France (Pacific)	126	69	57
Great Britain (Pacific)	218	115	103
Japan (Pacific)	41	32	9
Netherlands (East Indies)	574	385	189
Portugal (Pacific)	11	9	2
Philippine Islands	84,730	79,597	5,133
United States possessions (Pacific)	4,238	637	3,601
Other Pacific	33	14	19
Egypt	1,278	675	603
Union of South Africa	1,666	846	820
Ethiopia	45	38	7
Liberia	228	205	23
Belgium (Africa)	37	16	21
France (Africa)	1,035	587	448
Great Britain (Africa)	661	523	138
Italy (Africa)	80	44	36
Portugal (Africa)	70	39	31

Registered aliens in the United States, classified by country of birth and sex, Dec. 26, 1940—Continued

Country of birth	Total	Male	Female
Spain (Africa)	54	27	27
Other Africa	110	72	38
United States	73,141	10,668	62,473
Canada	467,258	208,227	259,031
Newfoundland	14,823	5,509	9,314
Mexico	423,519	230,694	192,825
Costa Rica	1,209	612	597
El Salvador	1,092	459	633
Guatemala	1,184	598	586
Honduras	1,162	617	545
Nicaragua	1,471	672	799
Panama	2,383	1,144	1,239
Cuba	16,207	9,357	6,850
Dominican Republic	2,899	1,198	1,701
British West Indies	62,747	30,186	32,561
Dutch West Indies	1,602	903	699
Haiti	697	432	265
Canal Zone	369	215	154
Other North and Central America	11,863	5,497	6,366
Argentina	4,016	2,123	1,893
Bolivia	198	127	71
Brazil	5,088	2,736	2,352
Chile	1,921	1,339	582
Colombia	3,174	1,622	1,552
Ecuador	882	643	239
Peru	1,513	1,046	467
Paraguay	93	28	65
Uruguay	426	243	183
Venezuela	3,290	1,427	1,863
British Guiana	2,312	1,171	1,141
Dutch Guiana	285	208	77
French Guiana	22	15	7
Other South America	32	18	14
Unknown	3,126	2,056	1,070
Born on board ship	714	398	316
None or blank	896	528	368
Europe, not specified	13	6	7

Date of entry of registered aliens in the United States, classified by sex, Dec. 26, 1940

Date of entry	Total	Male	Female
Total	5,009,857	2,340,770	2,669,087
Prior to 1880	32,739	13,858	18,881
1880-89	117,790	61,251	56,539
1890-99	239,605	120,561	119,044
1900-09	1,080,654	553,314	527,340
1910	182,900	87,694	95,206
1911	151,822	66,820	85,002
1912	216,750	98,817	117,933
1913	287,230	129,419	157,811
1914	154,646	69,126	85,520
1915	62,648	29,710	32,938
1916	82,803	38,149	44,654
1917	46,371	23,265	23,106
1918	43,195	23,389	19,806
1919	91,322	47,827	43,495
1920	194,672	82,856	111,816
1921	163,980	59,105	104,875
1922	134,693	59,124	75,569
1923	217,840	106,962	110,878
1924	106,352	53,621	52,731
1925	92,765	41,717	51,048
1926	107,305	52,084	55,221
1927	107,828	52,572	55,256
1928	106,468	49,148	57,320
1929	110,797	50,389	60,408
1930	89,722	39,882	49,840
1931	39,329	17,492	21,837
1932	30,370	11,560	18,810
1933	30,210	11,806	18,404
1934	39,315	15,320	23,995
1935	45,671	17,607	28,064
1936	56,861	22,560	34,301
1937	83,556	34,888	48,668
1938	100,860	45,086	55,774
1939	109,705	51,503	58,202
1940	142,463	72,028	70,435
Unknown	108,620	30,260	78,360

Registered aliens in the United States, for selected countries of birth by State of residence, Dec. 26, 1940

State of residence	Country of birth							Total
	Italy	Canada	Poland	Mexico	Russia	Germany	Others	
United States	703,445	467,258	446,462	423,519	370,308	321,080	2,277,785	5,009,857
Alabama	892	333	131	78	255	412	3,031	5,132
Arizona	217	518	82	26,807	177	218	3,935	31,954
Arkansas	545	220	118	190	108	503	1,705	3,389
California	52,749	40,693	5,282	146,439	19,970	19,952	257,379	542,464
Colorado	3,093	1,122	639	6,908	5,004	1,[illegible]04	9,603	27,473
Connecticut	41,818	15,937	24,232	51	11,534	4,937	59,619	158,128
Delaware	1,726	246	1,172	15	572	333	2,364	6,428
District of Columbia	2,154	1,031	553	90	2,063	1,057	7,804	14,752
Florida	3,035	5,465	699	183	1,089	1,779	29,077	41,327
Georgia	237	492	272	29	546	484	3,127	5,187
Idaho	289	1,412	55	315	308	409	5,444	8,232
Illinois	35,292	13,728	53,352	11,921	26,800	28,981	154,996	325,070
Indiana	2,357	2,603	5,680	2,771	2,010	3,973	24,991	44,385
Iowa	1,203	1,153	433	1,268	1,358	4,516	14,717	24,648
Kansas	697	706	598	5,053	1,664	1,591	5,646	15,955
Kentucky	647	451	225	41	404	948	2,842	5,558
Louisiana	7,021	461	199	1,040	328	843	7,418	17,310
Maine	1,105	35,272	777	21	968	215	8,875	47,233
Maryland	6,182	1,347	5,362	84	6,548	3,934	14,335	37,792
Massachusetts	53,989	91,654	30,956	94	26,907	4,179	156,642	364,421
Michigan	17,856	77,990	48,189	4,751	15,653	12,705	125,959	303,103
Minnesota	1,254	6,108	2,363	1,210	3,484	4,205	42,809	61,433
Mississippi	881	105	62	183	104	217	1,667	3,219
Missouri	7,699	1,552	3,229	1,965	5,508	5,327	18,270	43,550
Montana	713	2,149	179	1,065	1,180	465	8,026	13,777
Nebraska	1,302	615	869	1,977	3,340	2,539	8,291	18,933
Nevada	1,042	330	25	799	56	211	3,655	6,118
New Hampshire	697	18,236	2,105	11	1,060	307	8,122	30,538
New Jersey	72,582	6,721	36,291	298	20,239	24,820	118,248	279,199
New Mexico	366	173	54	9,909	89	242	1,569	12,402
New York	250,253	62,385	122,937	3,600	145,202	130,803	542,321	1,257,501
North Carolina	179	498	103	19	191	352	2,865	4,207
North Dakota	15	1,684	309	108	1,766	576	6,024	10,482
Ohio	26,901	9,410	23,391	1,461	11,691	11,547	118,637	203,038
Oklahoma	424	596	285	1,419	601	676	2,945	6,946
Oregon	1,983	6,573	453	340	2,384	1,914	20,777	34,424
Pennsylvania	71,952	6,153	53,127	1,526	31,172	16,976	189,114	370,020
Rhode Island	11,924	11,745	3,335	10	1,793	715	23,048	52,570
South Carolina	70	180	106	10	199	199	1,424	2,188
South Dakota	59	452	139	94	873	935	4,848	7,400
Tennessee	1,132	393	344	52	541	553	2,122	5,137
Texas	3,345	1,768	1,162	183,758	1,507	3,757	18,601	213,898
Utah	984	603	39	796	78	863	7,124	10,487
Vermont	659	10,826	760	9	349	136	3,183	15,927
Virginia	771	855	405	37	1,027	884	6,114	10,093
Washington	3,982	17,019	1,296	425	3,222	3,025	52,667	81,636
West Virginia	5,284	430	2,679	210	1,405	479	13,175	23,662
Wisconsin	3,332	3,428	11,083	940	5,911	14,767	35,666	75,127
Wyoming	298	225	150	1,434	700	146	2,964	5,917
Alaska	52	479	31	17	147	116	2,563	3,405
Hawaii	34	295	45	23	123	98	90,829	91,447
Puerto Rico	90	29	12	87	14	43	14,579	14,854
Virgin Islands	2	5	5	2	2	10	3,827	3,853
American Samoa	0	1	0	0	0	7	97	105
Canadian commuters and visitors	19	2,108	20	18	31	5	461	2,662
Mexican commuters and visitors	6	7	2	1,242	3	4	82	1,346
Foreign address	2	16	0	12	0	0	32	62
Others and unknown	53	272	56	304	50	88	1,530	2,353

DISPLACED PERSONS IN THE UNITED STATES

During the war years there were references in the press to groups of displaced persons who reached the shores of this country. I have been unable to obtain sufficient information to make a complete report upon the subject of displaced persons who, to this date, have entered the United States. This should be the subject of careful inquiry upon consideration of any legislation upon the subject.

Life magazine at one time carried a picture of a refugee camp at Oswego, N. Y.

I am advised by the Attorney General that during the war there came into this country 953 persons without visas, and that approximately 200 of these have been returned to their native countries. The others were issued visas after reaching here and charged against the quotas of their respective countries.

I have received information that American vessels have been used, and are being used, for the transport of refugees from Bremerhaven and Mediterranean ports, and that such vessels are transporting 940 persons per vessel to this country. This situation should be made the subject of inquiry.

In addition, reports from the American zone in Germany indicate that large numbers of persons are infiltrating into that sector.

In view of the position taken by some to change our immigration policies and the observations of Mr. George Meader on the conduct and quality of displaced persons infiltrating into the American zones of occupation, I thought it advisable to obtain specific and detailed information concerning such persons both in this country and abroad. In particular I sought the following data: (1) Who are they? (2) Where are they? (3) How did they get where they are? (4) How many are coming to this country? (5) Under what authority are they here?

I asked the Department of Justice for the following information:

A. Total number of persons entering this country in 1938, the total broken down (1) according to countries from which immigrants came, (2) according to nationality, (3) according to race.

B. Same information for 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946.

C. How many displaced persons are there in this country?

D. Who are the displaced persons—the figures broken down (1) according to countries from which they came, (2) nationality, (3) race.

E. Where are they now?

F. How are displaced persons in this country being provided for and under what authority are they here?

G. Total number of legal entries into the United States under quotas for the years 1939 to 1946, the total being broken down (1) according to countries from which the immigrants came, (2) according to nationality, (3) according to race.

In answer to item A, the Department of Justice furnished me with the following statistical table set out on pages 28 and 29; and in answer to item B, the Department of Justice furnished me with the following statistical tables set out on pages 30 to 39, inclusive:

Immigrant aliens admitted, year ended June 30, 1939, by classes under the Immigration Act of 1924, races or peoples and sex

Race or people and sex	Number admitted	Quota immigrants	Husbands of citizens	Wives of citizens	Unmarried children of citizens	Infants (admitted as returning residents)	Natives of nonquota countries	Wives and children of natives of nonquota countries	Ministers and their wives and children	Professors and their wives and children	Women who had been citizens	Other classes
All races	82,998	62,402	1,088	3,759	2,196	71	12,119	104	705	447	88	19
Albanian	207	91		62	53					1		
Armenian	193	144	4	37			6		1	1		
Bohemian and Moravian	264	197	6	23	16	1	11		1	8	1	
Bulgarian, Serbian, and Montenegrin	397	326	4	36	12		2		17			
Chinese	124			112						12		
Croatian and Slovenian	457	341	17	46	41		5		6	1		
Cuban	558	2	2	7	2		545					
Dalmatian, Bosnian, and Hercegovinian	73	68		4						1		
Dutch and Flemish	758	562	34	17	3		136	1	3	1	1	
English	5,076	2,026	93	195	37	13	2,577	31	59	24	21	
Filipino	56	45		9	1		1					
Finnish	439	385	4	30	1	1	13		5			
French	2,214	609	18	63	32	3	1,463	2	3	15	5	1
German	5,524	4,463	148	217	104	16	424	4	47	24	7	
Greek	992	464	29	386	65		15		29	1	3	
Hebrew	43,450	41,439	159	451	287	2	545	8	315	213	31	
Irish	2,968	1,607	25	66	53	10	1,190	3	9	4	1	
Italian	6,708	3,940	275	1,193	1,108		132	18	29	11	2	
Japanese	57					3			51	3		
Lithuanian	131	95	4	16	4		10		1		1	
Magyar	614	475	14	57	18	1	24	1	5	18	1	
Negro	304	180	6	6	14		94		3		1	
Polish	868	513	28	159	83	1	68		13	3		
Portuguese	509	417	13	41	23	1	9		1	4		
Rumanian	98	60	1	16	1		11		7	2		
Russian	840	636	9	98	8		79	1	4	5		
Ruthenian (Russniak)	198	81	8	30	11		63		5			
Scandinavian	1,563	1,153	74	89	31	4	184	2	17	5	4	
Scotch	1,968	537	30	62	18	7	1,284	15	11	2	2	
Slovak	991	729	31	88	122	1	10		1	9		
Spanish	428	246	11	46	23		53	13	25	5		6
Spanish American	826	6	5	6	2	2	797	4	2		1	1
Syrian	282	171	8	41	11		40		9		1	1
Turkish	34	26		4	1				3			
Welsh	134	47	6	6	2	1	64	1	5		2	
West Indian	292	145	2	7	5	1	129					3
All other:												
Chiefly natives of Mexico	2,145	1	6	9		2	2,109		16	1	1	
Egyptians, Estonians, Latvians, etc	258	175	14	24	4	1	26		2	3	2	7
Sex:												
Male	39,423	31,699	1,088		1,236	39	4,633	18	441	259		10
Female	43,575	30,703		3,759	960	32	7,486	86	264	188	88	9

Immigrant aliens admitted, year ended June 30, 1940, by classes under the Immigration Act of 1924, and races or peoples

Race or people	Number admitted	Quota immigrants	Husbands of citizens	Wives of citizens	Children of citizens	Infants (admitted as returning residents)	Natives of nonquota countries	Wives and children of natives of nonquota countries	Ministers and their wives and children	Professors and their wives and children	Women who had been citizens	Other classes
All races	70,756	51,997	963	3,195	1,316	40	11,886	99	630	499	100	31
Armenian	181	132		32	1		9		6	1		
Bohemian and Moravian	188	133	3	17	7		14		6	8		
Bulgarian, Serbian, and Montenegrin	276	216	3	30	10		5		12			
Chinese	106			99					2	5		
Croatian and Slovenian	292	220	14	34	18		4	1	1			
Cuban	548	1		1	1		543	1				1
Dutch and Flemish	1,087	849	45	37	5		133	1	11	3	3	
English	4,889	1,948	78	220	39	10	2,484	28	44	20	18	

Immigrant aliens admitted, year ended June 30, 1940, by classes under the Immigration Act of 1924, and races or peoples—Continued

Race or people	Number admitted	Quota immigrants	Husbands of citizens	Wives of citizens	Children of citizens	Infants (admitted as returning residents)	Natives of non-quota countries	Wives and children of natives of non-quota countries	Ministers and their wives and children	Professors and their wives and children	Women who had been citizens	Other classes
Filipino	55	43	1	7	1				3			
Finnish	298	253	10	17	1		16		1			
French	2,363	630	8	78	30	4	1,582	5	5	15	6	
German	3,556	2,630	81	219	35	7	413	4	49	111	7	
Greek	1,049	554	14	352	73		24		32			
Hebrew	36,945	35,156	121	365	123	2	639	14	252	239	33	1
Irish	2,548	1,160	29	58	33	4	1,239	5	14	2	4	
Italian	5,512	3,491	323	846	676	1	130	9	20	15	1	
Japanese	48					2			44		2	
Lithuanian	99	57	3	29	1		6		3			
Magyar	561	393	21	66	39		22	1	3	16		
Negro	315	181	7	13	24		87		1		1	1
Polish	467	238	25	80	11		81		14	18		
Portuguese	516	433	9	46	12		16					
Rumanian	102	44	4	24	5		19		6			
Russian	671	513	3	85	5	1	43		15	6		
Ruthenian (Russniak)	118	30	8	11	7		60		1	1		
Scandinavian (Norwegians, Danes, and Swedes)	1,514	1,173	38	94	32	5	144		18	1	8	1
Scotch	1,946	515	19	89	7	2	1,282	11	10	5	6	
Slovak	349	216	32	34	51		6		2	7	1	
Spanish	435	226	26	57	27		35	12	24	19	1	8
Spanish American	922	23	13	13	4	1	865	2		1		
Syrian	193	85	2	22	3		72	5	3	1		
Turkish	18	12		4	2							
Welsh	105	44	4	4			49		3	1		
West Indian (except Cuban)	166	72	1	11	3		77		1		1	
All other:												
Chiefly natives of Mexico	1,801		6	31	2	1	1,747		9		5	
Albanians, Estonians, Dalmatians, Latvians, etc	517	326	12	70	28		40		15	4	3	19

Immigrant aliens admitted, year ended June 30, 1941, by classes under the Immigration Act of 1924, and races or peoples

Race or people	Number admitted	Quota immigrants	Husbands of citizens	Wives of citizens	Children of citizens	Infants (admitted as returning residents)	Natives of non-quota countries	Wives and children of natives of non-quota countries	Ministers and their wives and children	Professors and their wives and children	Women who had been citizens	Other classes
All races	51,776	36,220	368	1,543	211	23	12,501	85	404	245	168	8
Armenian	93	67		10			9		7			
Bohemian and Moravian	437	408	2	13	3		8		4	2		
Bulgarian, Serbian, and Montenegrin	56	48		6			2					
Chinese	73			66					6	1		
Croatian and Slovenian	81	53	8	10			8		1	1		
Cuban	596	2		1			591	1			1	
Dutch and Flemish	1,344	1,137	16	26	10	1	120	3	9	10	12	
English	6,115	3,016	48	218	33	3	2,640	23	44	12	78	
Filipino	56	45		10	1							
Finnish	366	309	3	28	1		23		2			
French	3,283	1,472	27	123	23		1,582	4	5	24	23	
German	2,154	1,642	24	84	17	1	316	2	32	30	6	
Greek	410	303	12	54	11		22		6	2		
Hebrew	23,737	22,378	73	290	28	4	703	13	123	114	11	
Irish	1,883	470	18	47	5		1,306	7	11	6	13	
Italian	696	530	16	35	5		105	1	3		1	
Japanese	30					7			23			
Lithuanian	121	87		22			5		5	1	1	
Magyar	279	209	3	37		1	21		4	3	1	
Negro	229	85	8	8	6		111	1	10			
Polish	686	476	13	49	6		122	2	7	9	2	
Portuguese	395	313	7	32	24		15	1		2	1	
Rumanian	90	43	5	9			24	1	7	1		
Russian	940	748	8	89			75	2	13	5		
Ruthenian (Russniak)	98	23	2	7			59		5	2		
Scandinavian (Norwegians, Danes, and Swedes)	1,351	1,095	27	38	9		156	1	11	8	6	
Scotch	1,865	510	15	83	4	3	1,221	5	14	2	8	
Slovak	163	142	4	8			8		1			
Spanish	443	270	13	47	17		52	11	26	7		
Spanish American	1,148	3	3	10	2		1,122	5	1	1	1	
Syrian	150	64		16		2	65		2	1		
Turkish	15	13		2								
Welsh	97	45		1			48		1		2	
West Indian (except Cuban)	152	64	2	7	2		77					
All other:												
Chiefly natives of Mexico	1,924	[illegible]	[illegible]	43			1,858	[illegible]	12	1	1	
Albanians, Estonians, Dalmatians, Latvians, etc	220	148	6	14	4	1	30		[illegible]			8

Immigrant aliens admitted, year ended June 30, 1942, by classes, under the Immigration Act of 1924, and races or peoples

Race or people	Number admitted	Quota immigrants	Husbands of citizens	Wives of citizens	Children of citizens	Natives of nonquota countries	Wives and children of natives of nonquota countries	Ministers and their wives and children	Professors and their wives and children	Women who had been citizens	Other classes
All races	28,781	14,597	223	904	135	12,554	42	136	54	80	56
Armenian	61	51		5		5					
Bohemian and Moravian	110	92	2	8		7		1			
Bulgarian, Serbian, and Montenegrin	23	18		2		3					
Chinese	13			10				1	2		
Croatian and Slovenian	37	21	4	5		7					
Cuban	551	1		1		547			1		1
Dutch and Flemish	386	239	5	19		117		3	1	1	1
English	3,802	1,001	46	161	19	2,485	20	32	4	33	1
Filipino	18	9	1	6		2					
Finnish	78	50	3	14		9		2			
French	2,363	555	11	57	13	1,685	1	9	18	14	
German	800	413	7	38	5	310		14	9	4	
Greek	263	219	5	20	2	17					
Hebrew	10,608	9,760	52	189	28	546	4	15	9	5	
Irish	1,707	249	11	33	5	1,381	4	16	2	6	
Italian	146	41	1	12		91	1				
Japanese	7							7			
Lithuanian	64	36	2	11		12		3			
Magyar	131	85	2	16	3	22		2	1		
Negro	171	60	2	8	11	89				1	
Polish	436	278	10	34	3	109		2			
Portugese	201	129	5	31	14	23					
Rumanian	84	51	1	7		21		4			
Russian	269	166	3	30	2	66			2		
Ruthenian (Russniak)	80	5	1	5		69					
Scandinavian (Norwegians, Danes, and Swedes)	594	348	18	35	6	175		10		2	
Scotch	1,649	285	8	48	4	1,279	3	11	2	9	
Slovak	102	73	5	9		14				1	
Spanish	292	167	9	42	14	52	5	1	2		
Spanish American	1,132	9	2	7		1,110	3			1	
Syrian	94	38	1	7		45		1		2	
Turkish	18	15	1	1		1					
Welsh	88	25	2	4		57					
West Indian (except Cuban)	127	40		5	6	76					
All other:											
Chiefly natives of Mexico	2,131	2	2	16		2,105	1	2	1	1	1
Albanians, Estonians, Latvians, Persians, etc	145	67	1	8		17					52

Immigrant aliens admitted, year ended June 30, 1943, by classes under the Immigration Act of 1924, and races or peoples

Race or people	Number admitted	Quota immigrants	Husbands of citizens	Wives of citizens	Children of citizens	Natives of nonquota countries	Wives and children of natives of nonquota countries	Ministers and their wives and children	Professors and their wives and children	Women who had been citizens	Other classes
All races	23,725	9,045	145	630	100	13,491	31	115	39	54	75
Armenian	52	41	1	5		5					
Bohemian and Moravian	88	77	1	3		7					
Bulgarian, Serbian, and Montenegrin	36	30		4		2					
Chinese	4							2	2		
Croatian and Slovenian	46	36	1	1		7	1				
Cuban	551	4		3		543					1
Dutch and Flemish	381	250	8	7	1	110	1	1	1	2	
English	3,629	1,132	17	146	14	2,247	10	34	7	21	1
Filipino	4	4									
Finnish	96	70	1	10		13	2				
French	1,763	296	2	30	7	1,416	1	7	1	3	
German	498	216		24		245	1	5	3	4	
Greek	378	346	2	6		24					
Hebrew	4,705	4,029	40	103	6	516	1	5	5		
Irish	1,511	299	5	26	1	1,142		23	8	7	
Italian	150	42	6	12		90					
Lithuanian	73	51		13		9					
Magyar	86	62	1	4	2	17					
Negro	198	86	4	12	1	90		4		1	
Polish	434	307	5	26	1	89	1	5			
Portuguese	312	252	5	26	22	7					
Rumanian	37	28		2		7					
Russian	211	90		15	2	102	2				
Ruthenian (Russniak)	57	18	2	3		34					
Scandinavian (Norwegians, Danes, and Swedes)	625	376	17	33	7	175	1	9		7	
Scotch	1,387	279	7	31	2	1,047	7	8	1	4	1
Slovak	129	105	1	8		15					
Spanish	404	264	9	35	22	68	1	2	3		
Spanish American	1,444	5	3	11	2	1,420	1		2		
Syrian	80	49	1			30					
Turkish	23	20		3							
Welsh	89	28		1		54		6			
West Indian (except Cuban)	186	80		14	10	79	1	2			
All other:											
Chiefly natives of Mexico	3,868		3	11		3,843		1	6	4	
Estonians, Latvians, Persians, etc	190	73	3	2		38		1		1	72

Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Philadelphia—Immigrant aliens admitted, years ended June 30, 1944–46, by countries as specified

[NOTE.—Column (a) covers country of birth and column (b) covers country of last permanent residence, the difference between the two indicating the number of immigrants who had left their native land to make their home in other foreign countries before coming to the United States for intended future permanent residence]

Country of birth or last residence	1944		1945		1946	
	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)
All countries	28,551	28,551	38,119	38,119	108,721	108,721
Europe	8,694	4,509	10,141	5,943	64,877	52,852
Albania	10	1	5	1	29	9
Belgium	135	126	92	71	1,770	1,718
Bulgaria	23	6	11	3	36	8
Czechoslovakia	341	136	289	64	1,075	267
Denmark	119	61	108	43	291	194
Estonia	28	26	19	16	136	9
Finland	72	29	58	29	197	29
France	232	387	207	201	5,000	5,708
Germany	1,360	238	1,260	172	4,010	2,598
Austria					989	
England	1,135	1,210	2,627	2,784	28,763	30,922
Scotland	357	96	515	192	2,472	1,586
Wales	47	15	100	53	1,495	1,044
Greece	292	226	235	176	578	367
Hungary	227	87	132	54	577	49
Ireland (Eire)	146	68	286	125	1,387	526
Italy	177	120	320	213	3,886	2,636
Latvia	66	24	50	16	206	29
Lithuania	105	37	86	19	244	14
Netherlands	217	71	111	50	610	355
Northern Ireland	92	44	340	302	1,584	1,290
Norway	195	127	114	61	379	248
Poland	1,420	292	1,222	195	4,806	335
Portugal	429	431	562	570	554	578
Rumania	249	70	234	77	425	19
Soviet Russia	433	41	399	18	1,110	72
Spain	291	271	238	156	402	227
Sweden	90	58	67	45	327	643
Switzerland	50	33	70	39	282	766
Yugoslavia	178	93	184	88	676	65
Other Europe	178	85	200	110	581	541
China	72	50	109	71	337	252
Japan	43	4	3	1	17	14
Palestine	35	45	52	133	193	483
Syria	42	8	61	18	143	90
Other Asia	157	120	335	219	938	794
Canada	7,023	9,821	8,866	11,079	17,586	20,434
Newfoundland	363	322	513	451	1,041	910
Mexico	6,399	6,598	6,455	6,702	6,805	7,146
West Indies	2,299	3,198	4,660	5,452	4,876	5,878
Central America	1,876	1,985	3,382	3,423	2,122	2,338
South America	899	1,160	1,326	1,609	1,755	2,633
Africa	75	112	267	406	1,098	1,516
Australia	428	461	1,179	1,261	4,869	5,111
New Zealand	105	116	356	364	877	898
Other countries	41	42	414	987	1,187	7,372

In answer to item C, the Department of Justice furnished me with the following statement (Note: It will be noted that the following statement does not fully answer the question in item C):

"Displaced persons: The President's directive of December 22, 1945, concerning immigration from the American occupation zones in Europe provided that 90 percent of the quotas for central and eastern Europe should be used for persons who could not or would not be returned to their prewar homes. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization was a member of the committee that went to Europe to survey the problem and set up a plan of operations. The plan effected was a joint one, in which a number of agencies cooperated. Military authorities determined that applicants for admission would not be detrimental to the security of the United States and also furnished transportation to the port of embarkation. The Public Health Service made physical examinations. Applicants for visas were examined and visas approved by consuls of the Foreign Service of the United States. UNRRA had the care and custody of refugees until they embarked, and the War Shipping Administration furnished the ships on which they traveled. All expenses, such as visa fees, transportation costs and head tax were privately paid by individuals or welfare agencies.

"Displaced persons were considered for admission in the following order: American citizens, orphaned children, close relatives of American citizens, then other refugees. Upon arrival at New York, officers of the Immigration and Naturalization Service made sure that all requirements of the immigration laws were met.

"Persons who qualified for admission as immigrants could be sponsored by an individual or by approved welfare organizations guaranteeing financial support. The first ship bringing displaced persons arrived May 20, 1946. From then until June 30, 1946, there were 2,534 such persons admitted as quota immigrants and 17 admitted nonquota. Almost half of those admitted—1,215—were charged to the quota of Poland; the next largest group—718—were charged to the German quota.

"The President specified that special attention be given to orphan children. By June 30, 1946, the United States Committee for the Care of European Children, Inc. (the only sponsoring agency authorized to be responsible for unaccompanied children) had received 122 children from Europe. Another group—190 Polish children who had been housed in Mexico—were admitted to the United States under the Polish quota. These children were assigned quota numbers in March, which was prior to the beginning of the displaced persons program in Europe.

"For a year or more, there had been some concern about approximately 1,000 refugees who were transported from the war zone of Italy and detained at Fort Ontario, Oswego, N. Y. This group of persons was granted the privilege of preexamination, and most of them were readmitted as quota immigrants."

In answer to item D, the Department of Justice furnished me with a copy of President Truman's plan for refugees taken from the January 1946 Monthly Review of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, as follows:

"On December 22, 1945, President Truman announced a far-reaching program to facilitate the admission into the United States, within the framework of existing immigration laws and regulations, of displaced persons and refugees from Europe. The President's plan encompasses two principal groups. The first of these is the group of refugees now in the relocation camp at Oswego, N. Y. Almost 1,000 persons were originally housed in this camp, after having been brought to the United States on an emergency basis by order of President Roosevelt. Some 900 refugees still at Oswego may now become permanent residents of the United States through appropriate statutory and administrative processes. Officers of the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service are presently processing the cases of those of the internees who desire to become permanent residents of the United States, and, if found eligible, they will be granted preexamination or other appropriate relief to enable them to establish legal residence.

"The major group affected by President Truman's directive of December 22, 1945, are displaced persons and refugees who are natives of central and eastern Europe and the Balkans. The annual immigration quotas for these countries total approximately 39,000. Statutory restrictions preclude the allocation of more than 10 percent of the annual quota in any single month. Consequently, no more

than 3,900 visas may be issued in any one month to natives of the affected countries.

"The President declared that 'common decency and the fundamental comradeship of all human beings require us to do what lies within our power to see that our established immigration quotas are used in order to reduce human suffering.' Therefore, he directed that the following procedure be followed 'to facilitate full immigration to the United States under existing quota laws':

"'The Secretary of State is directed to establish with the utmost dispatch consular facilities at or near displaced person and refugee assembly center areas in the American zones of occupation. It shall be the responsibility of these consular officers, in conjunction with the immigration inspectors, to determine as quickly as possible the eligibility of the applicants for visas and admission to the United States.

"'For this purpose the Secretary will, if necessary, divert the personnel and funds of his Department from other functions in order to insure the most expeditious handling of this operation.

"'Within the limits of administrative discretion, the officers of the Department of State assigned to this program shall make every effort to simplify and to hasten the process of issuing visas. If necessary, blocs of visa numbers may be assigned to each of the emergency consular establishments. Each such bloc may be used to meet the applications filed at the consular establishment to which the bloc is assigned. It is not intended, however, entirely to exclude the issuance of visas in other parts of the world.

"'Visas should be distributed fairly among persons of all faiths, creeds, and nationalities. I desire that special attention be devoted to orphaned children to whom it is hoped the majority of visas will be issued.

"'With respect to the requirement of law that visas may not be issued to applicants likely to become public charges after admission to the United States, the Secretary of State shall cooperate with the Immigration and Naturalization Service in perfecting appropriate arrangements with welfare organizations in the United States which may be prepared to guarantee financial support to successful applicants. This may be accomplished by corporate affidavit or by any means deemed appropriate and practicable.

"'The Secretary of war, subject to limitation imposed by the Congress on War Department appropriations, will give such help as is practicable in:

"'(A) Furnishing information to appropriate consular officers and immigrant inspectors to facilitate in the selection of applicants for visas; and

"'(B) Assisting until other facilities suffice in:

"'(1) Transporting immigrants to a European port;

"'(2) Feeding, housing and providing medical care to such immigrants until embarked; and

"'(C) Making available office facilities, billets, messes and transportation for Department of State, Department of Justice and United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration personnel connected with this work, where practicable and requiring no out-of-pocket expenditure by the War Department and when other suitable facilities are not available.

"'The Attorney General, through the Immigration and Naturalization Service, will assign personnel on duty in the American zones of operation to make the immigration inspections, to assist consular officers of the Department of State in connection with the issuance of visas and to take the necessary steps to settle the cases of those Allies presently interned at Oswego through appropriate statutory and administrative processes.

"'The administration of the War Shipping Administration will make the necessary arrangements for water transportation from the port of embarkation in Europe to the United States, subject to the provision that the movement of immigrants will in no way interfere with the scheduled return of service personnel and their spouses and children from the European theater.

"'The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service will assign to duty in the American zones of occupation the necessary personnel to conduct the mental and physical examinations of prospective immigrants prescribed in the immigration laws.'

"Ugo Carusi, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, was designated by the President to serve as chairman of an interdepartmental committee, which includes representatives of the Department of State, War, and Justice, the War Shipping Administration, and the Public Health Service, to supervise the execution of President Truman's directive. Commissioner Carusi, accompanied by Howard K. Travers, Chief of the Visa Division of the State Department, and Dr. Ralph C. Williams, Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, has left for Europe to make arrangements for the speedy inauguration of the President's program.

"It is anticipated that officers of the State Department, the Public Health Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service will be stationed in the American zone of occupation in Germany, to which immigration activities under the President's directive will be confined for the time being, in order to pass on the qualifications of prospective immigrants before they embark for the United States."

In connection with President Truman's plan for refugees, the Department of Justice furnished me with the following statistical table covering persons admitted under that plan:

TABLE 3.—*Displaced persons admitted to the United States under the President's directive of Dec. 22, 1945, by nationalities, April–October 1946*

Nationality:	
Albania	1
Austria	164
Belgium	2
Bulgaria	2
Czechoslovakia	174
Danzig	3
Estonia	34
Finland	3
France	1
Germany	1,450
Great Britain	1
Greece	2
Hungary	133
Latvia	113
Lithuania	134
Monaco	3
Netherlands	6
Norway	1
Poland	1,681
Rumania	27
Turkey	1
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	54
Yugoslavia	60
Stateless	642
Iran	6
Costa Rica	1
Venezuela	1
Total	4,700

TABLE 4.—*Displaced persons admitted by country of last permanent residence*

Country of last residence:	
Albania	1
Austria	216
Czechoslovakia	106
Danzig	1
Estonia	2
France	2
Germany	4,048
England	5
Ireland (Eire)	2
Northern Ireland	2
Hungary	7
Iceland	1
Italy	5
Latvia	12
Liechtenstein	1
Lithuania	6
Norway	1
Poland	259
Rumania	2
Russia	15
Sweden	1
Yugoslavia	2
Russian possessions in Asia	1
Unknown	1
Total	4,700

TABLE 5.—*Displaced persons admitted to the United States under the President's directive of Dec. 22, 1945, by nationalities, April–October 1946*

Nationality:	
African (black)	2
Albanian	1
Armenian	6
Bohemian	174
Bulgarian	32
Croatian	33
Dutch and Flemish	10
Estonian	32
Finnish	9
German	1,599
Greek	5
Irish	1
Italian	2
French	3
Lithuanian	133
Magyar	138
Latvian	114
White	46
Polish	2,054
Rumanian	40
Russian	154
Ruthenian	28
Scandinavian	2
Slovak	19
Syrian	1
Turkish	1
Other peoples	59
Unknown	2
Total	4,700

In answer to items E and F, the Department of Justice furnished me with no information.

The question asked under item E was: "Where are they now?" i. e., where are the displaced persons who entered this country illegally?

The question asked under item F was: "How are displaced persons in this country being provided for and under what authority are they here?"

In answer to item G, the Department of Justice furnished me with the following statistical table:

Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Philadelphia—Aliens admitted as quota immigrants under sec. 5 of the Immigration Act of 1924, in years ended June 30, 1938–46, by countries of last permanent residence

Last residence	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	1945	1946
Number admitted	42,494	62,402	51,997	36,220	14,597	9,045	9,394	11,623	29,095
Europe	35,590	56,500	45,554	25,206	10,640	4,561	4,146	5,203	14,338
Belgium	442	653	1,649	1,784	341	117	117	65	209
Bulgaria	108	116	76	126	15	2	6	2	3
Czechoslovakia	2,623	2,546	883	295	128	98	126	60	245
Denmark	328	285	223	233	73	98	55	37	176
Estonia	35	86	75	35	14	12	25	14	7
Finland	377	376	209	229	38	42	27	26	21
France	1,286	1,746	2,373	4,488	4,299	1,159	372	177	1,731
Germany	16,730	32,711	20,994	3,963	2,130	237	221	151	2,250
Great Britain:									
England	1,653	2,484	5,605	7,161	779	839	1,151	2,611	5,512
Scotland	275	216	224	275	43	59	27	124	39[illegible]
Wales	26	32	40	50	17	2	11	49	112
Greece	359	414	389	204	160	224	221	171	78
Hungary	844	1,164	1,654	291	172	75	81	52	30
Ireland (Eire)	801	1,034	708	202	64	108	56	105	299
Italy	3,152	3,968	3,412	409	98	36	103	172	10[illegible]
Latvia	106	152	264	86	24	18	23	12	24
Lithuania	255	255	228	197	47	40	32	18	11
Netherlands	665	1,207	1,997	777	131	73	68	46	92
Northern Ireland	127	68	67	55	13	31	37	235	345
Norway	476	424	406	341	62	60	114	53	178
Poland	1,859	2,535	568	391	305	361	272	174	280
Portugal	291	339	375	1,010	392	347	375	416	441
Rumania	230	291	251	104	59	43	68	71	7
Soviet Russia	46	35	23	35	47	29	37	11	61
Spain	221	153	144	226	184	209	232	125	153
Sweden	335	301	476	498	189	52	55	40	574
Switzerland	578	1,195	1,155	1,330	570	118	31	28	716
Yugoslavia	748	905	559	126	69	29	85	85	31
Other Europe	614	869	527	285	177	43	73	73	253
China	408	442	471	791	130	47	27	59	67
India	22	24	35	86	27	48	29	75	219
Japan	42	38	48	210	32	17	4	----------	7
Palestine	1,175	945	735	231	133	103	41	110	385
Syria	154	149	80	5	17	9	6	10	55
Other Asia	80	83	123	123	113	59	72	106	243
Africa	141	190	166	526	439	120	87	168	689
Australia	150	125	121	112	63	62	110	99	160
New Zealand	44	44	47	53	15	21	39	42	98
Philippine Islands	69	64	79	122	29	6	4	9	206
Other Pacific	15	8	19	56	37	40	31	24	34
America	4,604	3,790	4,519	8,699	2,922	3,452	4,798	5,718	12,595
Canada	2,631	1,736	1,796	2,292	1,565	2,071	2,563	2,006	2,961
Newfoundland	4	3	1	5	1	4	3	5	16
Mexico	385	295	308	662	133	131	152	172	776
British West Indies	437	337	327	305	114	359	766	1,655	1,512
Cuba	657	934	1,331	3,081	508	1,002	699	647	885
Dominican Republic	22	13	21	111	41	31	49	79	165
Other West Indies	31	16	53	126	42	43	63	147	271
Central America	86	81	194	587	79	49	129	137	302
South America	348	365	486	1,524	432	257	374	424	1,116
Other America	3	10	2	6	7	5	----------	446	4,589

In an effort to discover exactly what had been done under the President's directive of December 22, 1945, giving preference to displaced persons in immigration quotas, I asked the State Department to furnish me with a statistical table of immigration visas issued under the directive broken down according to the country of birth of the immigrant and his race.

I also asked the State Department to advise me concerning the scope and the operation of the program.

In reply I received a letter from Mr. G. J. Haering, Chief, Visa Division, under date of December 18, 1946, which letter is submitted herewith.

"MY DEAR SENATOR REVERCOMB: In reply to your request of December 12, 1946, for certain information on visa issuances to displaced persons, I take pleasure in transmitting the following information and accompanying statistics.

"1. Under date of December 22, 1945, the President issued a directive in regard to the immigration into the United States of displaced persons resident in the American zones of occupation in Germany and Austria. A copy of that directive with its covering press release is enclosed.

"There is also enclosed a copy of the President's communication of May 25, 1946, to the Secretary of State in regard to the extension of the program for the issuance of visas to displaced persons. The President's approval of October 31, 1946, of the prospective admission of a small group of Estonians who arrived in the United States during the current year in small boats may likewise be mentioned in this connection.

"2. Upon the issuance of the President's directive of December 22, 1945, the Department arranged for the establishing of emergency consular offices in the American zones of occupation in Germany to issue immigration visas to displaced persons in those zones. A committee consisting of representatives of the Department of State, War Department, Public Health Service, and Immigration and Naturalization Service proceeded to Germany and Austria in January to coordinate these consular facilities with arrangements by the Army, War Shipping Administration, and United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for assembling, screening, and the transportation of displaced persons. Arrangements were also made for the use of corporate affidavits of support of certain voluntary welfare agencies to meet the public charge provisions of the immigration laws and regulations in the cases of displaced persons. The President's directive of December 22, 1945, provided for the use of such corporate affidavits as were approved by the Attorney General.

"Actual visa issuances to displaced persons commenced in the American zones of occupation of Germany and Austria at the end of March. Owing to the necessity of dealing simultaneously with the repatriation of American citizens and as a consequence of other limitations, difficulties were encountered in maintaining consular staffs at sufficient strength to deal with visa activities. In the distribution of visas among displaced persons of the various faiths and creeds, as provided for in the President's directive, the consulates have been confronted by the following circumstances:

"(a) All displaced persons must be qualified for admission into the United States under the immigration laws and regulations, including the so-called public charge provisions of the law. The slowness of most non-Jewish welfare agencies in providing any considerable number of affidavits and of establishing adequate staffs of their representatives in the field to deal with cases requiring evidence to meet the provisions of the law naturally affected the number of non-Jewish cases which could qualify in early months of the distribution of visas to displaced persons. In contrast, Jewish organizations had large staffs and thousands of affidavits of support available at the very beginning of the program and they were therefore in a position to take up any balance of monthly quotas for which non-Jewish applicants were not available by virtue of a lack of adequate documentation concerning support.

"(b) A large proportion of some non-Jewish groups had a Volksdeutsch status under the Nazi regime and their Army security screening was thereby affected.

"(c) For obvious reasons, the majority of the persons qualifying under the German and Austrian quotas would be Jewish persecutees.

"In combination, these circumstances have resulted in creating a majority of Jewish immigrants among the displaced persons covered by consular reports on visas issued thus far. However, an increase in the volume of affidavits of support for non-Jewish immigrants is bringing about a continually rising percentage of visa issuances to displaced persons of non-Jewish faiths.

"3. The attached statistics are a summary of data contained in consular reports covering the issuance of immigration visas in 1946 through the month of October. Included in these figures are visa issuances to 504 persons in the Santa Rosa camp.

"It may be added by way of explanation that not more than 10 percent of the annual quota for a country may be issued monthly except in quotas of less than 300. The principal quotas involved have been those of Germany and Central European countries totaling approximately 39,000 numbers per fiscal year inclusive of the German quota of 25,957. The number of persons qualified for displaced persons status under the German quota has been far less than the supply of German quota number, and of course, this has resulted in a proportional reduction of the possible maximum of displaced persons who could receive quota visas under the President's directive. This maximum has been further reduced by the legal requirement that quota numbers must be allotted to aliens entitled to preference under section 6 of the act of 1924, as amended, regardless of whether they are displaced, and to aliens to whom the provisions of section 19 (c) of the 1917 act are applied.

"The quotas shown in the enclosed statistics represent the countries of birth of the aliens with few exceptions applicable chiefly to minor children accompanying their parents.

"I hope that the material contained in this letter and its enclosures will prove to be of service to you.

"Sincerely yours,

"G. J. HAERING,
"Chief, Visa Division."

The State Department has also provided me with a copy of Mr. Truman's letter to Mr. Byrnes, Secretary of State, under date of May 25, 1946, in regard to the extension of the program for the issuance of visas to displaced persons, which letter follows:

"MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been advised that the State Department has requested, and the Bureau of the Budget has approved for inclusion in the third deficiency appropriation bill, an item of approximately $1,600,000,000 for use in connection with immigration to the United States of displaced persons and refugees in Europe. I have approved the appropriation requested and trust that it will be enacted by the Congress.

"You will recall that on December 22, 1945, I issued a directive on the subject of immigration, in which I stated, among other things:

" 'The decision has been made, therefore, to concentrate our immediate efforts in the American zones of occupation in Europe. This is not intended, however, entirely to exclude issuance of visas in other parts of the world.

" 'In our zones in Europe there are citizens of every major European country. Visas issued to displaced persons and refugees will be charged, according to law, to the countries of their origin. They will be distributed fairly among persons of all faiths, creeds, and nationality.'

"I have been informed that 90 percent of the nonpreference quotas are now being allocated to displaced persons in American zones of occupation in Europe, which means that many persons in other countries are denied the opportunity to emigrate to the United States, even though eligible to enter.

"It is my view that the State Department should now give serious consideration to lessening the allocation to the American occupied zones, thus enabling displaced persons in other areas, as well as eligible persons residing in their native countries, to enter the United States under the nonpreference quotas.

"Very sincerely yours,

"HARRY TRUMAN."

The State Department likewise furnished me with the following statistical table concerning immigration visas issued to displaced persons through October 31, 1946, under the President's directive:

Immigration visas issued to displaced persons in 1946 through Oct. 31

(Based on consular reports received in the Department of State by Nov. 30, 1946)

Quotas:	
Albania	2
Australia	1
Austria	349
Belgium	20
Bulgaria	17
China	5
Chinese	1
Czechoslovakia	466
Danzig	31
Denmark	1
Egypt	1
Estonia	49
Finland	11
France	22
Germany	2,914
Great Britain	2
Greece	2
Hungary	226
Iran	8
Iraq	1
Ireland	2
Italy	7
Japan	5
Latvia	134
Lithuania	172
Luxemburg	1
Netherlands	16
Norway	3
Palestine	1
Poland	[1] 3,705
Rumania	87
Spain	1
Switzerland	4
Turkey	4
Union of S. S. R.	392
Yugoslavia	187
Nonquota	[2] 324
Total	9,174
Faiths:	
Catholics	1,669
Jews	6,032
Protestants	1,039
Others	434
Total	9,174

[1] Includes visas issued to Polish refugees in Santa Rosa.

[2] Covers wives and unmarried minor children of American citizens.

UNITED NATIONS' ACTION ON DISPLACED PERSONS

The United Nations Assembly at the recent meeting in New York adopted a resolution on December 15, 1946, to bring into being a constitution under which the International Refugee Organization is to be created to deal with displaced persons. The terms of the resolution provide that the organization is to become effective on signature by the delegates in the United Nations Assembly either with or without reservation as to subsequent legislative acceptance.

I am advised by Mr. Philip Burnett, of the Division of International Affairs of the State Department, that this constitution has been signed by the Honorable Warren R. Austin, our representative, with reservation as to subsequent legislative acceptance.

This means that the resolution will be submitted to the Congress of the United States for approval or rejection.

When the representatives of 15 member nations have signed the constitution it then becomes effective subject to its adoption by the governments of the respective countries.

The constitution creating this United Nations authority on displaced persons would empower that organization, in summary, to deal with displaced persons as to (1) feeding and clothing them; (2) repatriation, that is, return of them to their countries of origin; and (3) resettlement of them.

Resettlement means placing them in other lands. Therefore this question of settlement or entry into this country of displaced persons will be brought before the Congress whenever the plan is submitted for legislative acceptance.

Whether or not the United Nations (or its agent International Refugee Organization) will be given authority to override the immigration laws of this country will depend upon the authority granted the International Refugee Organization when the Congress acts upon the plan which must be submitted to it.

Mr. Burnett, of the Division of International Affairs of the State Department, advises me that it is the position of the State Department that there is not any provision in the United Nations' general constitutional powers that would permit that organization to override the immigration laws of this country without the specific authorization and consent of the Congress.

I am filing with the original copy of this report a copy of the resolution creating the International Refugee Organization and a copy of the Financial and Budgetary Questions Relating to the International Refugee Organization.

These two documents are too lengthy to write into this report with convenience.

Thus, we see that the United Nations Organization is proceeding to take over control of displaced persons. But the extent of its power to place and settle such persons in this country will depend upon the authority given it by Congress on the subject.

The policy upon immigration is still for the Congress.

AMERICAN LEGION'S POSITION

I am advised by the National Headquarters of the American Legion at Washington, D. C., that at its national convention this year that organization passed a resolution dealing with the subject of our immigration laws. The position taken in that resolution may be summarized as follows: The American Legion is opposed to any change in the quota as now provided under our immigration laws, and also opposes admitting persons of other countries under any unused quotas.

The American Legion is composed of veterans of the armed services who saw service in the First and Second World Wars and has a membership of approximately four million.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS POSITION

I am advised by the Washington Office of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that that organization passed a resolution at its national convention this year urging that all immigration into the United States for all quotas be stopped completely for a period of 10 years.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has a membership of approximately two million veterans.

SUMMARY

From the data contained herein the following summary facts appear:

1. In 1940 there were 5,009,857 registered aliens in this country, that is 5,009,857 persons who had not become citizens. Note: Under our present immigration laws 153,912 persons may legally enter the United States annually under complete filling of all quotas.

2. There are approximately 1,250,000 displaced persons including ex-enemies, but not German refugees, in the American, British, and French occupied zones in Europe.

3. The number of such persons in the Russian zone is not known.

4. It has long been State Department procedure to establish priorities for nonpreference immigrants on a first-come first-served basis.

On December 22, 1945, however, President Truman, by direction, abolished this procedure and gave priority of admittance to displaced persons in the American zones in Europe.

Under date of May 25, 1946, the President advised the Secretary of State that serious consideration should be given to lessening the allocation to American occupied zones, that displaced persons in other areas and eligible persons residing in their native countries could be taken into the United States under nonpreference quotas.

(NOTE.—The effect of the Presidential directive was, naturally, to cut off those on the waiting lists in their native countries from receiving visas, and also to cause a great rush into the American occupied zones of those who desired to come to America.)

Nine thousand one hundred and seventy-four visas were issued displaced persons in the American zones in Germany and Austria between January 1, 1946, and October 31, 1946.

The number of aliens admitted on visas from everywhere in 1946 to October 31 was 44,154, plus 4,903 under section 19 (c) of the 1917 act.

5. A number of persons who have reached this country illegally during the war have been admitted as quota immigrants, visas being issued to them after they entered here. This, of course, has excluded some who could have entered legally. Note: The number of these persons has not been furnished to date, although requested of the Department of Justice. This point should be made the subject of inquiry.

6. The United States Army has accepted into its occupied zones all persons who can present a plausible claim that they are persecuted for racial or religious reasons, or have political beliefs favorable to the allies.

7. Displaced persons are furnished a basic ration of 2,000 calories per day, and persecutees receive an extra 200 calories. By comparison the German population receives 1,550 calories daily. According to the Meader report all age groups in both sexes of displaced persons are overweight.

8. The United Nations has moved to take over the feeding, clothing, repatriation, and resettlement of all displaced persons. The representative of the United States, Hon. Warren A. Austin, has signed approval of such power subject to legislative action of his Government. Therefore, the Congress will determine to what extent the United Nations Organization known as International Refugee Organization may resettle displaced persons in this country.

CONCLUSION

The question squarely confronts this Government as to whether it will retain its present policy on the admission of persons to this country expressed in existing statutes, or whether it will change that policy so as to permit increased immigration or further restrict immigration.

This subject may come before the Congress upon a bill dealing directly with a change in the immigration laws or it may be presented when the Congress is asked to act upon the resolution of the United Nations Assembly setting up an organization to deal with displaced persons and to define the powers of that organization.

There are many phases to the problem.

During the war years none of the immigration quotas were filled. Some of those who advocate the entry of larger numbers of displaced persons suggest that we cumulate these past unused quotas and permit entry under them now. This would require a change in the present statutes under which quota entry is based upon yearly periods and even upon monthly limitations—as not more than 10 percent of the annual quota can be admitted in any 1 month.

It is doubtful that a number of countries will use their quotas for entry here this year and during subsequent years, notably the United Kingdom and some north European countries. It has been suggested that these current unused quotas be filled with displaced persons regardless of nationality. To follow such a suggestion would of course break down the whole quota system and completely do away with the present plan of allotments by countries and the policy of national origins. Any such plan would require amendment of the present law.

One of the most important considerations is that of economic result to this country. With today's starved market and need for replacements, there is full opportunity of employment. The time may come, however, when this market has been satisfied and production will be lessened and unemployment becomes a critical question. The addition to this population of any considerable number of persons would naturally add to the problem of unemployment whenever it may arise.

The political aspect of the situation cannot be overlooked. Many of those who seek entrance into this country have little concept of our form of government. Many of them come from lands where communism has had its first growth and dominates the political thought and philosophy of the people. Certainly it would be a tragic blunder to bring into our midst those imbued with a communistic line of thought when one of the most important tasks of this Government today is to combat and eradicate communism from this country.

The point of whether these displaced persons who are undesired in their own country, and who for some reason have made themselves undesirable, or who from their own choice are not willing to attempt to get along with their own governments, should be brought into this country to dwell among our people, is worthy of study.

Another point to be given consideration is whether we should accept people who are unwilling to accept the now dominant political policies of their own countries, and take the chance of dealing with them here among us. In other words, will we take the position that they should work out with their own peoples and their own governments their own situations in Europe until such time as they may come here under our present immigration laws, or shall we bring them here to work out their problems in this land.

We cannot ignore the distressing plight of many of these people who suffer as a result of the ravages of war. But, in helping them, should aid be given to them in Europe to reestablish themselves there, in or near to their native lands, or should we permit them to come into this country in large numbers and have our people assume the burden of caring for and directing them here?

No step should be taken at the price of probable economic or political turmoil in our own midst.

Our position should be taken squarely upon what is best for this country.

This does not mean that we ignore the plight of distressed people anywhere. Their needs should be met with great liberality. But it does mean that we cannot ignore our paramount duty to the people of this country to do what is best for them within the bounds of right and to keep secure the strength and progress of the Nation.

Respectfully submitted.

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB.

DECEMBER 30, 1946.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the patience of those who have heard me upon this subject. I feel that indeed at this time it was well to discuss and review the subject of immigration. I hope that the amendment which has been offered will be adopted, because I believe that it closes the door to any attempt to take from Congress its powers over the immigration laws. That is the purpose of it; that is the intent of it, and if it is made a part of this resolution I believe that then we may safely proceed knowing that any step taken must first receive the prior approval of the Congress of the United States.

I was glad indeed to hear the proponent of the resolution, the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] say that it was what he wanted, that he wanted this power left in the Congress.

I now ask that this amendment be adopted and made a part of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The question is upon agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] for himself and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Is an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Nevada in the nature of a substitute for the first committee amendment, on page 1, beginning in line 9.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I renew my parliamentary inquiry. Is an amendment to the Revercomb amendment in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that an amendment to other parts of the joint resolution would be in order, but not an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. DONNELL. May I inquire of the Chair if he is able to state at this time at what period in the proceedings such an amendment will be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As soon as the committee amendment is agreed to the joint resolution will be subject to further amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the committee amendment as amended is agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, the substitute which I offered on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and myself has been adopted and made a part of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know of any other committee amendments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there is one other committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 3, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State such sums as may be necessary.

And insert:

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State such sums not to exceed $75,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1947, as may be necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that amendments are now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so rules.

Mr. DONNELL. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It is an amendment to the amendment previously offered by the Senator from West Virginia, and I should like to be heard briefly upon it. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, of the Revercomb amendment, after the words "other person", it is proposed to insert "an acceptance of the constitution of the Organization by or on behalf of the Government of the United States shall not constitute or authorize action."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the amendment is not in order, unless it is an amendment directed to the joint resolution as it now stands amended.

Mr. DONNELL. I offer it in that form, Mr. President. May I address myself to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri is out of order. The only circumstances under which his amendment could be in order would be if the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] were voted down. The amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia was an amendment in the second degree.

Mr. DONNELL. Now that the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia has been adopted it becomes a part of the bill, does it not?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I think I may be able to help the Senator.

Mr. DONNELL. I am very happy to do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I correctly understand the amendment, I have no objection to it; and in order to facilitate action I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia be perfected by the acceptance of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] will be agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is perfected by the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

Mr. DONNELL. I very much appreciate the courtesy of the senior Senator from Michigan and that of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may we have a final vote on the joint resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The joint resolution, as passed, is as follows:

Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the International Refugee Organization (hereinafter referred to as the "Organization"), the constitution of which was approved in New York on December 15, 1946, by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and deposited in the archives of the United Nations: *Provided, however*, That this authority is granted and the approval of the Congress of the acceptance of membership of the United States in the International Refugee Organization is given upon condition and with the reservation that no agreement shall be concluded on behalf of the United States and no action shall be taken by any officer, agency, or any other person and acceptance of the constitution of the Organization by or on behalf of the Government of the United States shall not constitute or authorize action (1) whereby any person shall be admitted to or settled or resettled in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions without prior approval thereof by the Congress, and this joint resolution shall not be construed as such prior approval, or (2) which will have the effect of abrogating, suspending, modifying, adding to, or superseding any of the immigration laws or any other laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The President shall designate from time to time a representative of the United States and not to exceed two alternates to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the general council of the Organization. Whenever the United States is elected to membership on the executive committee, the President shall designate from time to time, either from among the aforesaid representative and alternates or otherwise, a representative of the United States and not to exceed one alternate to attend sessions of the executive committee. Such representative or representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum for such period or periods as the President may specify, except that no member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated as such a representative shall be entitled to receive such compensation.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State such sums not to exceed $75,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1947, as may be necessary—

(a) for the payment of United States contributions to the Organization (consisting of supplies, services, or funds and all necessary expenses related thereto) as determined in accordance with article 10 of the constitution of the Organization; and

(b) for additional expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including: (1) Salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates provided for in section 2 hereof, and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; (2) travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1933, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, sec. 73b), and, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, travel expenses of families and transportation of effects of United States representatives and other personnel in going to and returning from their post of duty; (3) allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, sec. 118a), and similar allowances for persons temporarily stationed abroad; (4) cost-of-living allowances under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, including allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; (5) services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; (6) official entertainment; (7) local transportation; and (8) printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 44, sec. 111), or section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 41, sec. 5).

SEC. 4. (a) Sums from the appropriations made pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 3 may be transferred to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government to carry out the purposes of such paragraph, and such sums shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the department, agency, independent establishment, or organizational unit thereof concerned, and without regard to sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529).

(b) Upon request of the Organization, any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government (upon receipt of advancements or reimbursements for the cost and necessary expenses) may furnish supplies, or if advancements are made may procure and furnish supplies, and may furnish or procure and furnish services, to the Organization. When reimbursement is made it shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Memorial 7

"Joint memorial to the Military Affairs Committees of the Congress of the United States of America urging the transfer of certain land and buildings on the Military Reservation of Fort Douglas, Utah, to the Federal Administrator of the Veterans' Administration

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

"Whereas the ending of hostilities has brought to an end the greatest war of all times and more than sixty-five thousand sons and daughters of the great State of Utah have returned to their loved ones and to take up their citizenry in this State; and

"Whereas these veteran citizens have, in their efforts to become rehabilitated and use the service of the Veterans' Administration, confronted many delays and much unnecessary travel to get the benefits to which they are entitled, because the regional Veterans' Administration offices are so isolated from the city and so separated as to cause much delay and hardships; and

"Whereas the present location of the regional manager's office of the Veterans' Administration is in temporary quarters, provided by semipermanent office buildings located some 6½ miles from the business section of Salt Lake City at the emergency war industry of Remington Small-Arms Ammunition Plant; and

"Whereas said buildings, facilities, communications and transportation are insufficient and inadequate to provide proper service to our veterans, and the structures do not have sufficient space to provide for present requirements, are not properly arranged for economic or efficient operation, are not of permanent construction, are not safe from fire hazards, and are too far isolated from other related operating agencies of both Federal and State units; and

"Whereas the cost to rearrange space, construct required addition, furnish necessary facilities and correct fire hazards and to provide permanent quarters is not within economic justification; and

"Whereas the present arrangement of splitting the administration's personnel, having four sections in the business section of Salt Lake City, with approximately 150 employees of the training division separated from the chief of the division and managers of other various departments, places a great burden of delay and confusion upon the many functions of the administrative and operating units of the managers' responsibilities; and

"Whereas the manner of conducting the affairs of the many units by present communication system and transportation is entirely unsatisfactory, and the handling of mail, communications, and files between these units results in serious delay to final action and service to our veterans; and

"Whereas the inadequacies of the present arrangements seriously impair the operations, supervision, and training of personnel required of the regional manager and further deprives the veterans of services they expect and are entitled to; and

"Whereas the United States Army military post at Fort Douglas, Utah, provides sufficient space for all present forces and for any reasonable expansion; building and facilities are much more adequate and suitable and may be rearranged to provide satisfactory facilities for all the manager's personnel at a minimum cost; the communications trunk system is of sufficient capacity to provide suitable services; there is ample building space available to furnish suitable offices for other State and Federal agencies having relations with the Veterans' Administration that could be moved to this location and further the economic operation of such agencies; and

"Whereas the post is now operated on a standby status and the military personnel assigned there is not of a number to economically justify the use of the many buildings, quarters, and other facilities at their disposal; and

"Whereas a plot of ground in the southwest corner of said reservation has been transferred to the Veterans' Administration and there will be constructed thereon a 500-bed veterans' hospital during the year 1947; and

"Whereas having this hospital on said reservation will further enhance the value and economy of having the Veterans' Administration administrative and operating units consolidated in one area; and

"Whereas the present veterans' hospital has always had and does now have a waiting list of general medical and surgical cases and this unsatisfactory condition could be alleviated by the use of the present Fort Douglas post hospital and facilities not now being used; and

"Whereas it is most desirable to bring all medical activities as near the Utah State Medical School as possible, to assure that the best talent is accessible and available for our disabled veterans. This could be accomplished if the Veterans' Administration was permitted to occupy the post hospital facilities previously requested from the War Department: Be it therefore

"Resolved by the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the State of Utah in session assembled, being fully mindful of the manifold problems confronting your honorable body, That necessary action will be taken immediately to transfer from the jurisdiction and custody of the United States Army to the jurisdiction and custody of the United States Veterans' Administration agency, administrator of all the property, land, and buildings, with their operating equipment, all situated within the boundaries of the United States military reservation known as Fort Douglas, Utah, as set forth in the Veterans' Administration request to the War Department Commanding General of the Sixth Army at Presidio, Calif., dated approximately August 1, 1946; Be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Utah forward copies of this memorial to the congressional delegation from the State of Utah, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to members of the Military Affairs Committee of the United States Congress."

By Mr. MURRAY:

A joint memorial of the legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting legislation to grant certain servicemen and veterans who have been prisoners of war the benefits of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"Whereas section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code exempts military personnel who served in possessions of the United States from payment of income tax; and

"Whereas no exemption is made in the case of military personnel who were made prisoners of war while in a possession of the United States and who were removed therefrom by the enemy;

"Now, therefore, we petition you, that legislation be enacted such as H. R. 6541 and S. 1958 of the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, or other legislation, making section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code applicable to servicemen and veterans who were made prisoners of war while in a possession of the United States and who were removed therefrom by the enemy.

"It is hereby directed that copies of this joint memorial be sent to the Honorable Harry Truman, President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives from Montana."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the legislature of the State of Montana, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A joint memorial of the legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 10

"Joint memorial of the Senate and the House of Representatives, of the State of Montana, to the Congress of the United States, requesting the continuation of the present Commodity Credit Corporation wool-purchase program and requesting price support for wool

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"Whereas the State Department is now giving consideration to a further reduction of duties on apparel wool; and

"Whereas probably no agricultural commodity has been so adversely affected by war as the domestic wool-growing industry; and

"Whereas there was a carry-over of apparel wool in this country on January 1, 1947, of about a billion pounds regardless of the fact that consumption of wool in the United States during the past 5 years has been maintained on a plane about 35 percent greater than prewar averages; and

"Whereas about 75 percent of all apparel wool consumed in the United States in 1945 and 1946 was of foreign origin; and

"Whereas the operation of present duties and national administration policy has resulted in every apparel-wool-producing country of the world using our markets as a dumping ground; and

"Whereas this national policy will, if continued, inevitably liquidate the domestic wool-growing industry as evidenced by the 33-percent loss in sheep numbers nationally and the over 50-percent loss in sheep numbers in Montana in the last 5 years: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Thirtieth Session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate and house of representatives concurring), that Congress request the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the continuation of the present Commodity Credit Corporation wool-purchase program for the 1947 wool clip on the basis of not less than 90 percent of comparable price of January 15, 1947.

"That, pending an increase in tariff, enactment of legislation to establish a comparable price for wool and lambs, to declare wool a Steagall commodity for price support of not less than 90 percent of the comparable price, for 2 years following January 1, 1947; and

"That, Congress grant permission to the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell domestic wool under their jurisdiction at a price competitive with foreign duty-paid wool; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Secretary of State, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Joint Memorial 11

"Joint memorial addressed to each member of the Montana delegation in Congress of the United States and to the Honorable J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, relating to predatory animals and urging that the Federal Government allocate more money to assist in bringing said predatory animals under control

"Whereas in the State of Montana there is approximately 35 percent of our land area which is held by the Federal Government in proprietary or trustee capacity for Indian reservations, forest reserves, wild animal refuges, grazing lands, military reservations, and for other governmental purposes and objects; and

"Whereas the livestock industry of the State of Montana is suffering large losses each year because of the large number of predatory animals which attack and kill livestock upon the public ranges in the State; and

"Whereas the numbers of said predatory animals have increased to a considerable extent in recent years, due partially to the fact that said animals are protected in national parks and in game refuges, and that by reason thereof said livestock growers are facing a serious situation; and

"Whereas the State, counties, grazing organizations and stockmen of the State of Montana are spending between $200,000 and $300,000 annually for the purpose of bringing said predatory animals under control, and the Federal Government expends or contributes approximately $40,000 annually to assist in the control of said predatory animals: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the senate concurring)*, That we respectfully urge that the Department of the Interior increase the allocation of moneys to be expended for the control of predatory animals in the State of Montana to the sum of $100,000 per annum, and that the necessary steps be taken to decrease the number of predatory animals in the national parks and the game refuges where said predatory animals are now protected; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from the State of Montana, and to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Congressman from the First Congressional District, and to the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, Congressman from the Second Congressional District, and to the Honorable J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior of the United States of America, with the urgent request that each use every effort to accomplish the object and purpose herein set forth."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 12

"Joint Memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting the appropriation of funds for the completion of construction of that portion of the Broadus-Crow Agency Highway known as State Route No. 8, lying within the northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation between Ashland and Lame Deer, Mont.

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"Whereas the Broadus-Crow Agency Highway running from Broadus, Powder River County, Mont., to Crow Agency, Big Horn County, Mont., known as State Route No. 8, was long ago accepted by the Montana State Highway Commission and the United States Department of Agriculture as a part of the 7 percent Federal highway system; and

"Whereas this highway runs approximately 88 miles through Federal lands, namely: the northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation, the Crow Indian Reservation and the Custer National Forest and the remainder of 22 miles is Federal-aid highway outside of any reservation; and

"Whereas, the Indian Department and the United States Forestry Service have asked for the construction of the highway as a necessity for the proper administration of their work and the development of the Indian lands and the preservation of the forests; and

"Whereas, this highway will open up and cause to be developed a large territory of rich agricultural, stock-raising, lumber, and mineral lands which has remained largely dormant because of inadequate transportation facilities, and thus will add much to the State's wealth, and help the Indians of this section to be more nearly self-supporting; and

"Whereas the territory to be traversed is of wonderful natural scenic beauty, and historical interest and especially attractive to tourists; and

"Whereas this highway shortens the distance from the Black Hills and the central West to our National Parks by more than 100 miles and will prove a great feeder highway, bringing in tourists in great numbers to our State; and

"Whereas said highway has not been constructed except about 20 miles between Ashland and Lame Deer, Mont., which stretch of proposed highway lies within the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation and for which no money has as yet been appropriated by the United States; and

"Whereas the portion of this highway already constructed will have been hard-surfaced when contracts already let or about to be let have been completed, leaving only the 20 miles above described as yet unbuilt and unfit for travel; and

"Whereas said highway is considered by the State of Montana to be of such importance that the Montana Highway Commission has spent $100,000 thereon which is unmatched by Federal funds; and

"Whereas the unconstructed portion makes the use of the entire highway difficult or impossible; therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be requested to appropriate funds for the construction of the portion of the Broadus-Crow Agency highway, known as State Route No. 8, lying between Ashland and Lame Deer, Mont., within the Northern Cheyenne Indian Reservation; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this Memorial be forwarded to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from Montana in the Congress, to Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner, United States Bureau of Public Roads, and to the State Highway Commission of the State of Montana and that all of them be hereby requested to use their best efforts to obtain the necessary funds to complete said highway in the manner aforesaid."

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 9

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States of America and to the Interstate Commerce Commission, requesting an investigation of the railroad boxcar shortage, appropriate legislation to relieve such shortage and appropriate action by the Interstate Commerce Commission to correct the present inequitable distribution of cars.

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled and to the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States:*

"Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States, Senate Resolution No. 47, introduced by Senator REED, providing that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee or any duly constituted subcommittee thereof, of the United States Senate be authorized and directed to make an early and thorough investigation on the following points and to make prompt report to the Senate together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable:

"A. Whether the boxcar supply of the railroads has been and is now adequate;

"B. Whether there has been an avoidable failure to make necessary material available for the building of new cars;

"C. Whether material for building of freight cars for export from the United States of America has been provided and such cars exported to the detriment of business in this country;

"D. Whether the Interstate Commerce Commission has fully carried out the duties and obligations imposed upon that agency of the Congress by the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the control of the freight-car supply of the country and the prevention and correction of dislocation as among railroads and as among sections of the country; and

"Whereas, there has been and now is a shortage of boxcars in the State of Montana and it appears that the present holdings of cars by Eastern roads are in many cases considerably in excess of the holdings of cars by Western roads, proportionately, as is evidenced by the on-line ratio of cars as currently published: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, in regular session, respectfully urges the Congress of the United States, or the appropriate committees thereof, to conduct an early and thorough investigation of the boxcar shortage pursuant to S. 47 introduced by Senator REED and to enact such legislation as may be deemed necessary as a result of such investigation to relieve the present boxcar shortage; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana respectfully urge the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States to take whatever action may be necessary to correct any inequities now existing in the distribution of boxcars, to the end

that on-line car ratio of Western roads serving Montana be increased to and maintained at an amount equal to the on-line car ratio of the principal Eastern roads; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be sent to each of the following: To the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, United States Senators from Montana; to the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Congressmen from Montana; to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and to the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States."

"Senate Joint Memorial 11

"Joint memorial requesting the United States Civil Aeronautics Board to give early consideration to providing that northern area of the United States as the crow flies from Duluth, Minn., to Seattle, Wash., with regular air transportation serving Chicago via the Twin Cities and Duluth and the intermediate points of Grand Forks, Devils Lake, Minot, Williston, Wolf Point, Glasgow, Malta, Havre, Great Falls, Shelby, Cut Bank, Kalispell, and Spokane

"*To the Honorable United States Civil Aeronautics Board:*

"Whereas there is no transcontinental air service between Lake Superior and Seattle along the northern part of the United States; and

"Whereas said territory can well support such service and is in fact operating one of the most successful railroad operations in the Nation; and

"Whereas applications are pending on the part of air-transport companies for such authority; and

"Whereas all of the cities and trade areas affected are desirous of having such service; and

"Whereas said service appears to be both economically feasible and necessary in the best interests of the country; and

"Whereas no through service is available from the intermediate territory to important commercial and industrial centers of the country East or West: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the house of representatives concurring therein)*, That the Members of Congress from this State be requested to lend every effort toward the establishment of such service by presenting this memorial to the Civil Aeronautics Board and in person reporting to said Board the lack of transportation by air above set forth; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent by the secretary of state to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, Members of the United States Senate, and to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, Members of the United States House of Representatives from Montana.

"Approved March 3, 1947.

"SAM C. FORD,
"*Governor.*"

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 10

"Joint memorial to the Secretary of Interior of the United States, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of War of the United States, Hon. James E. Murray, Senator from Montana; Hon. Zales N. Ecton, Senator from Montana; Hon. Mike Mansfield, Representative from Montana; and Hon. Wesley A. D'Ewart, Representative from Montana, requesting that funds be made available from Federal public-land funds, Indian Department funds, and War Department funds for assisting in the location and construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Poplar and Brockton, Mont.

"Whereas the State Highway Commission of the State of Montana at the direction of the Twenty-ninth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana has made an examination and survey preliminary to the location for the construction of highway bridges over the Missouri River in the State of Montana; and

"Whereas the State Highway Commission of the State of Montana reports a favorable location for a bridge over the Missouri River near Brockton, Mont.; and

"Whereas the people in Richland County, Mont., south of the towns of Brockton and Poplar are now forced to travel a great distance to market by reason of a lack of a bridge over the river, and because of the impossibility of maintaining a ferry crossing over the Missouri River due to the great and continuing fluctuation of the water level in the Missouri River resulting from the opening and closing of the head gates at Fort Peck Dam; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation plans the construction of the Charlie Creek and Redwater irrigation pumping units in Richland County, and a bridge over the Missouri River would substantially decrease transportation costs during construction of these irrigation projects and would serve the projects after completion; and

"Whereas if a bridge were constructed across the Missouri River between Poplar and Brockton, Mont., approximately 500,000 bushels of wheat and 1,000 head of cattle would annually be hauled over the bridge to market resulting in a higher price for the weight of cattle because of decreased transportation and freight rates to market; and

"Whereas a very large area of the State of Montana which now depends upon ferry crossings and rowboats for postal service would receive far better service over a bridge than having to depend upon ferries and rowboats; and

"Whereas the north end of the bridge would be located on tribal lands of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation; and

"Whereas it would be an unreasonable burden upon the State of Montana and the Public Roads Administration for them to pay the entire cost of such a bridge when the bridge would be serving the Indian Department of the United States, the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States, and the War Department of the United States; and

"Whereas funds from Federal public lands, the Indian Department of the United States, and the War Department of the United States are available but not allocated for assisting in the construction of such a bridge: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Thirtieth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, the senate concurring, does hereby respectfully request the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Secretary of War of the United States to make funds available to assist the State of Montana and the Public Roads Administration of the United States in the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Poplar and Brockton, Mont.; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Secretary of War of the United States, and also to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from Montana; and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana."

"Senate Joint Memorial 16

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting allocation of funds for construction and maintenance of farm-to-market roads by States and political subdivisions thereof

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress:*

"Whereas we acknowledge that America needs thousands of miles of farm-to-market roads at a cost that will enable the American taxpayers to finance the construction of the necessary farm-to-market roads; and

"Whereas good practical farm-to-market roads can in many areas be designed and constructed by State local political subdivisions at a cost of a few hundred dollars per mile as against the present cost of several thousands of dollars per mile for farm-to-market roads; and

"Whereas the State and the local political subdivisions are in the best position to design and construct farm-to-market roads at the lowest cost: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Montana (the house of representatives concurring)*, That we do hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to pass necessary legislation to provide adequate funds to build and maintain farm-to-market roads, and to allocate such funds directly to such States, counties, and other political subdivisions thereof, that are qualified to receive them, for the purpose of building and maintaining farm-to-market roads in their respective areas; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of the memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to the Senators and Representaives in Congress from the State of Montana, and to the Montana Highway Commission.

"Approved March 7, 1947.

"SAM C. FORD,
"*Governor.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the enactment of legislation authorizing the State of Montana to lease State lands for the production of oil, gas and other hydrocarbons for such periods of time and on such terms and conditions as may be provided by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(See joint memorial printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore on March 24, 1947, p. 2426, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, requesting Congress to make funds available for the immediate construction of an electrical transmission line from Kerr Dam to Hungry Horse and to appropriate funds for the prompt construction of Hungry Horse Dam in northwestern Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint memorial printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore on March 24, 1947, p. 2426, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the enactment of legislation to reimburse wheat growers who sold their 1945 wheat early and were deprived of the benefit of advance in price; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See joint memorial printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore on March 24, 1947, p. 2426, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for and to expedite the rural electrification program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint memorial printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore on March 24, 1947, p. 2425, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the annual payment of rents by the Government to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of the several counties of that State in lieu of taxes on land owned by the Government in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(See joint memorial printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore on March 24, 1947, p. 2426, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 931. A bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 74).

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 516. A bill to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 75).

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted a report (No. 73) to accompany the bill (H. R. 2535) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act reported by that committee on March 21, 1947.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. REED:

S. 976. A bill for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife; Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually; the estate of Ora H. Hatfield; and Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 977. A bill to prescribe certain dates for the purposes of determining eligibility of veterans for vocational rehabilitation, education, and training, and for guaranty of loans and readjusting allowances under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; and

S. 978. A bill relating to the exercise by the Public Health Service of certain wartime authority; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. ECTON (for himself, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma) introduced Senate bill 979, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 980. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution designating April 5, 1947, as Booker T. Washington Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 93, favoring the establishment of a relief and rehabilitation fund for Greece to be administered through the United Nations Organization, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

STRIKING OF MEDALS IN LIEU OF COINS FOR COMMEMORATIVE PURPOSES—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 865) to provide for the striking of medals, in lieu of coins, for commemorative purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

AID TO GREECE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of aid to Greece, delivered by him on March 23, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF RAILROADS—STATEMENT BY WILLIS J. BALLINGER

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement in opposition to Senate bill 110, made by Willis J. Ballinger, economic adviser to the National Federation of Small Business, on behalf of the Federation, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEFENSE AGAINST RED FASCISM—ADDRESS BY DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning before the Maryland Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution on March 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PORTAL PAY BILLS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Portal Pay Bills," from the New York Herald Tribune of March 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—EDITORIAL BY JOHN S. KNIGHT

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on aid to Greece and Turkey, by John S. Knight, from the Miami Herald of March 23, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

ADMINISTRATION OF GRECIAN RELIEF FUND BY UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HICKENLOOPER obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For what purpose?

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to introduce a joint resolution and make a statement of about 10 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Florida for that purpose.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] and myself I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, to introduce a joint resolution. The joint resolution relates to the extension of aid to Greece, but the proposals it contains differ in four vital particulars from the administrative proposals pending in the Congress at the present time.

They are as follows: (a) Relief is provided to Greece and Turkey is excluded; (b) the relief is administered by the United Nations; (c) military supplies and aid are excluded; (d) a full-scale investigation of the whole Near East and Middle East problem by the General Assembly is called for.

Since the Greek situation is inextricably bound up with the political and economic crisis in the Near East and Middle East, the United States representatives to the United Nations are directed to initiate a request for an emergency meeting of the United Nations General Assembly to consider and take action on the peace-threatening situations in that area, with a view to resolving not only the Greek crisis but the problems of Palestine, Dardanelles, and Middle East oil.

The joint resolution provides that United States representatives at the United Nations shall initiate proposals for the establishment of an international fund for the relief and rehabilitation of Greece. Contributions by member nations will be voluntary, but the United Nations may recommend equitable quotas. A United States contribution of $250,000,000 is authorized. The international fund will be subject to the following conditions: (a) United Nations control; (b) relief to the civilian economy only; (c) the Greek Government must give assurances that supplies will be distributed without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; (d) United Nations observers and representatives of press and radio of countries contributing to the fund must have full access to observe and report on the distribution of supplies; (e) the Greek Government must furnish pertinent information promptly; (f) the United Nations must make quarterly reports on the administration of the fund.

Pending the establishment of the international fund, the joint resolution provides for an immediate advance of $100,000,000 by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the relief and rehabilitation of Greece, under the control and administration of the United Nations.

Mr. President, there are no people in the world whom the people of the United States are more anxious to help in their distress than the heroic people of Greece. But there is no reason why, in order to help the Greek people, we have to destroy the United Nations—for the United Nations is the only hope mankind has

against the unspeakable destruction of World War III.

The United Nations, if we lend it our full support, can do every appropriate thing we propose to do to help Greece. But it is said the United Nations has no relief organization. It had the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, but we killed it, effective March 31 of this year. The United Nations tried to set up an international relief fund at its last assembly meeting, after former Mayor LaGuardia, as head of UNRRA, had personally appealed to Generalissimo Stalin and had gotten his agreement that Russia would participate in that international fund. But we prevented that.

But we can now by congressional resolution authorize the President to make available to the United Nations, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, funds up to, say, $100,000,000 to be expended through a United Nations Commission, on which we shall be prominently represented, along with other nations. We are sure many other nations will add their contributions to that fund, according to their ability. The United Nations would not have to recruit new personnel for the task, for it has the veteran personnel of UNRRA which is on the ground in Greece, which knows the problem, and which could be absorbed into the United Nations relief program. That trained UNRRA personnel could effectively do the work under direction of the United Nations.

Meanwhile we can secure by our request, in about 45 days, a special meeting of the United Nations General Assembly. The United Nations would then take up immediately the Greece-Turkey situation and the whole question of relief and security for the nations and the peoples in that area.

The Food and Agricultural Organization, through a mission which was in Greece for months, has just recommended a $100,000,000 loan for Greece from the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Upon the basis of the FAO report, the Greek Government could, in a matter of days, file an application for this $100,000,000 loan for building railroads, bridges, power plants, hydroelectric dams, docks, highways, and for purchase of railroad rolling stock and the like. We, being the principal stockholder in the World Bank, and having the President of the bank, could get this loan approved in short order after its filing. The United Nations could and would, we are sure, work out with our help an adequate relief program for Greece, short-term and long-term.

A United Nations mission is already in Greece, investigating alleged aid to Greek insurgents from outside sources. The Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, has testified that that problem was being handled by the United Nations, and certainly there has been no failure on the part of the United Nations yet to handle it satisfactorily.

If the security of Greece or Turkey is impaired by threatened aggression from a foreign power, is it the duty of the United States to try to stop it without consulting with a single other member of the United Nations, and without calling on the United Nations to tackle the task?

Yet Mr. Acheson testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that before this proposal was made by the President to provide economic aid to Greece and to put $150,000,000 into the training and maintaining of a Greek Army and another $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 into the support of the Turkish Army, we had not consulted with a single other nation, and had not taken the matter up with the United Nations.

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

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. While the Senator is referring to the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, I wish to ask whether it would be fair to say that the Assistant Secretary of State did testify before the committee to the effect that until this Government by its own constitutional processes—that is, by action of Congress giving the necessary authority—had a definite proposal to make to the United Nations, there was no proposal to be made; but that when those constitutional processes had been followed, it was the intention to take it up with the United Nations, when we knew definitely what this country could be authorized to do.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his comment, but I may say that the entire purport and character of the proposal indicates that it was contemplated as unilateral action on the part of our country.

The failure to which I have referred is all the more regrettable in view of the fact that in the only two cases of armed intervention brought to the attention of the Security Council, namely Iran and Syria and Lebanon, the Security Council secured a successful peaceful disposition of the dispute, a result which greatly heartened the people of the world and increased their confidence in the United Nations. It should be noted that the United Nations achieved that result without our having to furnish armies in any of those countries. Yet we now propose to send military missions to Greece and Turkey, the limit of which the resolution does not prescribe. Our Government has not, in the past, had authority to send military missions outside the Western Hemisphere. Here, too, is a departure from our traditions of the past.

The truth—which the State Department has not been willing fully to disclose to the Congress and the country—is that we and the British are engaging in a power struggle in the Balkans, in Turkey, and in the Middle East against the Russians and against communism. We are told that the Communists will come to dominate the Government of Greece if we do not put up the money to prevent it.

We are told that if Greece goes communistic she will undermine Turkey, which might also become communistic. In addition, we are told that the Turks cannot maintain their present Army of nearly a million if we do not bear a part of the cost, and that an exceptionally large Army is said to be necessary against Russia, which might use force to back up her demand for a larger voice in the control of the Dardanelles. As against these "iffy" contingencies, we do know definitely that in both Greece and Turkey there are governments strongly opposed by many of their own people, who allege that they are being ruthlessly deprived of their democratic rights. In the case of Greece, the Government of a discredited and Fascist-minded King leads a pitiful persecution of the republican elements in the population. And we should know that in Greece our money will be used, as our surplus war goods have been used, to kill off a large number, if not all, of these people, whose only offense is that they have the classic Greek passion for democracy, the ancient Greek hatred for tyranny. We should know this, because our State Department has some pretty good figures showing how many Greek democrats have been assassinated, exiled, and imprisoned.

We do know that Turkey, with all her excellent progress toward democracy, was allied with Germany in World War I, and that she gave some assistance to Germany in World War II. She did not declare herself on the Allied side until the end of the war.

The $300,000,000 we are to put up to maintain the Turkish and Greek Armies will last only until June 30, 1948. That $300,000,000 will be spent to maintain foreign armies to fight for a discredited imperialism, or as part of global policy of power politics. Are we hiring foreign soldiers to fight our battles?

The British have poured hundreds of millions into the maintenance of armed forces in Greece. Now they are getting out and we are getting in. Are we trying to bolster up a collapsing empire or laying the foundations of a new? For more than half of the money going into Greece and all of the money going into Turkey is to maintain armed forces.

Boiled down to the dregs, the President's proposal is this. American corporations have big oil interests in Saudi Arabia in the Middle East. The British have oil interests and other interests in many Middle Eastern countries; and the British life line, so-called, leads through the Mediterranean and the Suez Canal on toward India and other British possessions in the Far East. The British for centuries have been fighting to keep the Russians out of the Dardanelles and out of influence in the Eastern Mediterranean, Greece, Turkey, and the Middle East. The British are still carrying on that fight, but they are so embarrassed financially that they are having to retreat. They put it up to us to take over their load in this battle. We have stepped in and now we are going to defend, as strategic areas, Greece, Turkey, the Dardanelles and the Middle East, not only against possible Russian aggression, but against becoming communistic in their domestic politics. So we support the Greek and Turkish armies; we maintain a fleet in the Mediterranean; we put up enough money to keep the present Government headed by King George, in power in Greece by enabling it to kill off its opposition by the gun and the bomb; we make it clear that we are committed to the same policy at least in every area of the world which we deem to be of strategic significance. By this logic, to-

morrow it may be France or Italy or Iran or India or China, and we know not where else.

We may have to come to such a decision, but let us know it will be the most momentous decision we have ever made. It means, first, incalculable cost to this country; it means the death of the United Nations; and it means that this power struggle between us and Russia is rendered hopeless of peaceful solution, and commits us both to a conflict which will engulf all mankind.

Mr. President, we humbly submit that we do not have to commit ourselves to such a dangerous doctrine. We can help Greece through the United Nations in every humanitarian and appropriate way. We are trying to provide such help through the proposed resolution. If the integrity of Turkey is in danger, the way to meet that is through the United Nations as we met the danger to the integrity of Iran and Syria and Lebanon. If forces are needed, let us put up our share through the United Nations.

Mr. President, when those forces go forth, let it be said they have the United States on the one side and the United Nations on the other side, and that they fight with the other forces of the world trying to maintain democracy, and they shall not be suspected as being but the emissaries of a new imperialism raising its head above the nations and the peoples of the earth.

If we follow this course of international cooperation, we will get the material and moral help of many other nations. If the United States takes a strong leadership in meeting this crisis through the organization of the United Nations, we will strengthen, instead of weakening, the United Nations to meet future crises. We must not sacrifice the United Nations upon the altar of haste and condemn it to death for inaction before we give it a chance to act.

The handling of this crucial matter through the United Nations is, therefore, of the sternest necessity to the future of the United Nations and the peace of the United States and the world.

For that reason, the Senator from Idaho and I have felt it necessary to introduce this joint resolution, which will provide effective peaceful aid to Greece through the United Nations. Thus, not only will Greece be safe, but the fair escutcheon of American democracy will be saved from the taint of imperialism and power politics.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 93) favoring the establishment of a relief and rehabilitation fund for Greece to be administered through the United Nations Organization, introduced by Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. J. Res. 93) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the postwar adjustment in the Near East and Middle East areas has given rise to a number of interrelated situations which endanger the peace and foster suspicion and distrust among members of the United Nations, including armed conflicts in Greece and Palestine, disputes over the control of the Dardanelles, and problems of access by the various nations of the world to the critical oil resources of these areas on an equitable basis; and

Whereas the people of the United States have renounced war and the use of armed force in the solution of international disputes and have joined with other peace-loving nations in the United Nations in order to promote and secure the peace through international cooperation; and

Whereas there is and will be hunger, privation, and suffering in Greece if assistance is not promptly provided, and the Government of the United States desires to assist in the furnishing of such assistance to Greece for humanitarian reasons and in order to promote international well-being; and

Whereas administration of such assistance by the United Nations will promote international confidence and minimize suspicion and conflict among the nations, and will foster that spirit of unity of the great powers that brought us victory in war and laid the foundations of a United Nations Organization to preserve the peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it is the sense of Congress that (a) the United States shall initiate a request for an emergency meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations to consider, investigate, and take appropriate action looking toward the resolution of those situations in the Near East and Middle East areas which are endangering the peace, and (b) United States representatives at the several constituent organizations of the United Nations now in session request such organizations as have jurisdiction over any of the aforesaid situations to expedite consideration and action upon such situations pending the convening of the emergency meeting of the General Assembly.

SEC. 2. The United States representatives at the appropriate constituent organizations of the United Nations are hereby authorized and directed to initiate proposals looking toward the establishment of a fund for the relief and rehabilitation of Greece in accordance with the following terms and provisions:

(a) The said fund shall be subscribed by voluntary contributions of the member nations (but the United Nations may recommend to the member nations quotas based on equitable considerations).

(b) The said fund shall be controlled and administered by appropriate organizations and officials of the United Nations.

(c) The said fund shall be used only for the provision of supplies for the relief and rehabilitation of the civilian economy of Greece (including incidental administrative, transportation, technical, and other necessary services); but no part of said fund shall be used for the provision of military material, supplies, or services.

(d) No assistance shall be provided through this fund unless the Greek Government has given assurance satisfactory to the Secretary-General of the United Nations that: (1) the supplies made available under this fund as well as similar supplies made available locally will be distributed among the people of Greece without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; (2) representatives of the United Nations and of the governments which have contributed to the said fund and representatives of the press and radio of the countries which have contributed to said fund will be permitted to observe freely and report fully regarding the distribution and use of said supplies; and (3) upon request of the Secretary-General of the United Nations the Greek Government will furnish promptly information concerning the production, distribution, importation, and exportation of any supplies which affect the relief and rehabilitation needs of Greece.

(e) The Secretary-General of the United Nations or the appropriate organizations of the United Nations shall submit quarterly to the nations contributing to the said fund reports of expenditures and activities pursuant to said fund.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President upon the establishment of the fund described in section 2, a sum of not exceeding $250,000,000 to provide the United States contribution to such fund. Any advances made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to section 4 shall be charged against any appropriation made under this authorization and shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SEC. 4. Pending the establishment of the fund described in section 2, and notwithstanding the provision of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed until such time as an appropriation is made pursuant to section 3 to make an advance of $100,000,000 to the President for the purpose of providing supplies for the relief and rehabilitation of Greece. The administration of such relief and rehabilitation shall be carried out by appropriate organizations of the United Nations. For this purpose the President shall transfer the aforesaid advance to the Secretary-General of the United Nations or to such constituent organizations as the Secretary-General may direct, in such amounts as the President shall determine to be appropriate, upon the receipt of assurance satisfactory to the President that the terms and conditions specified in subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 2 will be complied with.

SEC. 5. The authority of the President under sections 3 and 4 may, to the extent the President so directs, be exercised by the Secretary of State.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have listened to the words of the Senator from Florida with a great deal of disappointment and regret that the Senator from Florida should lend his brilliant talents to a cause which I feel should not be permitted to control the action of the Senate.

I have not had opportunity to study the resolution introduced by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Idaho, but I shall take pleasure in doing so in a little while. However, from the remarks of the Senator from Florida, I assume that he is now approaching the subject of relief to Greece and Turkey from the standpoint that it should be administered by the United Nations, and not by ourselves. May I inquire if I am accurate in that assumption?

Mr. PEPPER. With our participation, of course, as a leading member of the United Nations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will permit, I think he was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Florida took the floor, and perhaps should understand just what the proposal of the Senator from Florida is. As I heard it read, it was that we should authorize the payment of $250,000,000 to the United Nations, to be used for relief purposes. Other nations might voluntarily contribute if they so desired. We would also authorize the

payment of $100,000,000 directly, or through the World Bank. How was that payment to be made?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me, the gist of it is that the Congress by resolution should authorize the President to make $100,000,000 of RFC funds immediately available to the United Nations Organization, to be used by that organization through an appropriate committee in meeting the distress current at the present time in Greece. It contemplates that the UN would call upon other member States to contribute according to their ability, or all they would contribute, along with the funds we made available for the initial emergency program. Furthermore, it suggests that the personnel of UNRRA which is already in Greece and is now functioning there could be immediately availed of by the parent organization, the United Nations, in the carrying out of the program. That would be the temporary program for relief only for Greece.

There would be initiated by the United States representative a request for a special session of the Assembly, which I contemplate could be achieved in 45 days. Within about 45 days after the initial request, it would be possible to have a special meeting of the UN Assembly. Then at that time the resolution contemplates that the UN shall take up the problem in Greece, and proceed toward a solution of it through the agencies and through the ordinary processes of the UN. The resolution contemplates that we shall, of course, take a leading part in not only helping to formulate the program that the UN might devise, but that we shall, of course, have a leading part in carrying it out, and that we shall be a prominent part of the committee that will be charged with the execution of the program. Then, the resolution contemplates that there shall be——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit——

Mr. PEPPER. Just 1 minute, and I will finish.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I have a moment, please?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think I have yielded a great deal of time in the Lilienthal matter.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has been more than courteous, Mr. President.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I desire to say, Mr. President, that I wish to be entirely courteous, but, having the floor to discuss the Lilienthal matter, I cannot yield in my time for an extended discussion of a matter which will be fully explored on this floor at a later date. I still want to be courteous to the Senator from Texas and to the Senator from Florida, but I feel that it is an imposition—I do not use the word in any harsh way, but it is an imposition on the business before the Senate to go over the details of the program of the Senator from Florida, or to discuss the Greek loan at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I did not intend to trespass upon his time. I shall immediately desist; but I hope he will allow the Senator from Texas to make any comment he desires.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yielded to the Senator from Texas for that purpose, but I did not want a round-robin discussion to ensue.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida proposes a very unique approach to this problem. From the explanation I have had, I assume that he wants the United States to furnish the money, but to let somebody else handle it and spend it.

Those who suggest that this is a problem of the United Nations must not have read the Charter of the United Nations. I challenge them to put a finger on any clause in the Charter which authorizes that organization to do the things relative to Greece and Turkey that are proposed in the joint resolution.

In the first place, UN has no funds. In the second place, if it had funds, it has no authority to loan them. It has no authority to make grants of public funds to which we are contributors.

We hear discussion of the troubles of Greece and Turkey. If there are troubles there of military nature, the United Nations does not have one dime of funds with which to meet such expenses, and no military forces, not one soldier, can it summon. It is well known that the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations has for more than a year undertaken to formulate plans for the allocation of quotas to the various member nations as to the troops which they will supply and place at the command of the United Nations, to resist or to prevent aggression; but, Mr. President, they have never agreed, and, if they did agree, they would then have to submit the agreements to all the participating nations, numbering, as I recall, 51, at the present time. Such agreements would have to be ratified as treaties are ratified. That process would require so much time that it would not be of material benefit to Greece or Turkey to meet the existing emergency. The situation in Greece particularly is of a desperately emergent character; so that what we do we must do quickly and well.

What is the objection to the United States handling this matter directly? We handled the British loan directly, and there was no fervent elocutionary appeal that it should be handled by the United Nations. We made a loan to Italy in her distress. No one asked that it be done through the United Nations. We made a loan to France. Nobody complained that that ought to come under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. Implicit in every one of those loans was the motivating thought which is embodied in the loan resolution now pending, that by reason of the war and chaos and confusion which were created in Italy, for instance, unless we went to her economic relief she would be submerged by communism. We all know that. It was not written into the bill, but we all know that that was one of the motivating causes for extending aid to Italy. The same thing was true of France; we did not want communism to grow any more rapidly than it was already growing in France, and we made a generous loan to that Nation. We did not call on the United Nations to perform that task.

Even in the case of Great Britain, when we loaned her three and three-quarter billion dollars, as I remember the amount, we were concerned with her economic condition. We did not want Great Britain to be thrust into chaos and confusion as an aftermath of the dislocations of the war, because we did not desire that staid old England, which for a thousand years has stood as the exemplar of democracy and free government, should become engulfed by the sweeping surges of communism, which might overcome, to a limited extent, at least, her ancient democratic government.

Mr. President, suppose this matter were sent to the United Nations. What has happened to the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations? It has been delayed and practically vetoed because there are on the Security Council representatives who do not view these questions as we do. Suppose the Senate listened to the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Idaho and sent this case to the United Nations; it would go to the Security Council, would it not? The Senators know who sits in the Security Council. They know who in the recent past has, not merely once, not twice, not thrice, but 10 times registered a veto of the solemn decisions and actions of the Security Council.

If it be true—and the Senator from Florida says it is true—that the proposal to provide relief for Greece and Turkey is designed to resist the efforts of Russia—I dislike to use the term, but in order to be frank and honest, I am compelled to use it, and my excuse is that the Senator from Florida used it; for he says that the proposal is designed to resist the encroachments of Russia—if that be true, does anyone suppose that Russia as a member of the Security Council would hestitate to veto the proposal?

No, Mr. President; we are seeking, it is true, to arrest the ravages of communism which might submerge Greece and destroy a civilization which had its roots in antiquity.

Mr. President, Greece, among the ancient nations, was foremost in the practice of democracy. The annals of the classical days of Greece, and the glorious days of her greatest orators, are filled with stories of democracy and free government. That ancient land has at the present moment, by reason of the ravages of war, become devastated, its industries have been destroyed, its railways and communications have been almost obliterated. With cruel savagery the war swept over that country and killed thousands upon thousands of Greek citizens. I would recall to the Senator from Florida that in the early days of the war, when Italy invaded Greece, the Greeks stood with heroic valor and attracted the admiration of the world as they resisted the invaders of Greek soil and sought to maintain the integrity of their nation. The measure now pending providing relief for Greece is designed to maintain the integrity of the Greek Government. It is designed

to give assistance to Greece. It is not an aggressive measure. Even the military aid proposed is limited, as Senators will find if they read the measure, to a small group which shall act in advisory capacities only. The word "only" is used in it. We are not proposing to send a combat force to Greece. We are proposing to send a small military group to aid the Greeks in utilizing and learning the use of the military weapons which we shall furnish them in order to reequip their army, not for aggressive purposes, but to restore order in their own territory, to maintain the functions of democracy, and to resist, if need be, the invasions from foreign lands on the north.

Mr. President, everyone knows that in large part the troubles of Greece grew out of conditions on her northern border. She is bordered on the north by Albania, by Yugoslavia, by Bulgaria. Everyone who is at all familiar with the situation in Europe knows under what influences those three countries operate. He knows what the influences are which dominate and motivate them.

If they can smother Greece, if they can muzzle her activities, if they can override her Government by the substitution of a communistic government, their purposes will be served according to the voice and the command of their commander in chief.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up more of the Senate's time. The Senator from Iowa has been very generous. But I should like to say to the Senate that the proposal to hand over the matter of aid to Greece to the United Nations in the first place is a delaying movement. It is a flanking movement. It is not a frontal attack. It is not resistance in the open, but is an effort to create in the minds of the people of the United States the idea that we have bungled this matter and that we ought to entrust it to the United Nations.

Mr. President, if it were a problem that the United Nations was authorized to handle under its charter I would say yes. If the situation were not emergent and did not demand quick action, yes, perhaps. But, Mr. President, one cannot go to a well and draw water when there is no water in it. The United Nations could not have done anything in the world about this matter if it wanted to. Everyone knows that under its charter—and that is all the authority it has—the United Nations could do neither of the things proposed in the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Florida. The United Nations can neither make a loan, because it does not have any money to loan, nor can it make a grant or a gift, because it has no funds with which to make a grant or a gift. It cannot afford military advice and direction, because it does not have a single soldier, not a single one. The reason why it does not have a single soldier is known to all who keep informed of current events.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator says the United Nations is utterly helpless to provide relief, how does the Senator account for UNRRA? Was not UNRRA set up for the United Nations, and was not UNRRA given a grant of funds, and not a loan of funds?

Mr. CONNALLY. That was done by special act of Congress providing the funds.

Mr. PEPPER. All we did was to participate in the organization that was proposed by the United Nations.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true. Mr. President, UNRRA is going out of business quite shortly, and the only reason it had existence was that Congress by a separate act specifically provided the authority and the funds. UNRRA was not created under the general charter of the United Nations. I challenge the Senator to find anything in the charter of the United Nations that gives it primary authority to do the things that UNRRA did. UNRRA received a grant of funds through an act of the Congress.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. PEPPER. My information is that at the last meeting of the assembly in New York it was proposed formally that there be set up an international relief fund. Ex-Mayor LaGuardia, former head of UNRRA, made the proposal, and my information also is that the United States took the lead in preventing the establishment of that fund, and no one raised the question that the United Nations did not have authority, if its member states subscribed, to set up an international relief fund.

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot go into all the details because I do not know what was done at that particular meeting. The Senator says that the creation of a relief fund was proposed in the UNO, but the fund was not established, it was not created. What does that prove except that it proves that UNO was not very greatly interested in this proposition even if it had the authority to do it, which it does not have.

Mr. President, there are many terms, many ideals, many concepts of fancy, but we are faced here with realities, not with dreams. Our old friend Greece, with whom we have maintained cordial relations for more than 100 years since she threw off the Turkish yoke and achieved her independence along in the 1820's—Greece is in dire distress. Her industries are destroyed. Her people are in want. She is threatened with communism internally, inspired, we think, from abroad. It is necessary that we do one of two things—either grant this relief as provided in the joint resolution heretofore introduced or refuse it. I shall not refuse it by my vote. I want to see preserved the free governments of the world, the free democracies of the world. I want to see their independence maintained.

In the UNO we profess to adopt the principle of the equal sovereignty of all nations, great and small, and the small nations have an equal vote, except on the Security Council. In the United Nations the smallest republic, the smallest nation on earth, has the same vote as the great ones. Greece is a small country, but she has a glorious past. She has contributed perhaps more than any other nation of ancient times to the culture and to the advancement of civilization. Her history is a glorious one, filled with examples of all the arts, many of the sciences, literature, and oratory.

Mr. President, I want Greece to be able to stand before the world in her own dignity, in her own integrity, in her own freedom, and in her own independence, and if the greatest and most powerful Republic on the globe cannot render this slight service to one of the smallest republics on the globe, then all of our Fourth of July speeches during which we beat our breasts and talk about democracy and freedom go for little

Mr. President, we face a reality. Shall we face it with courage, with patience, with determination, or shall we face it by beginning to trim and hedge and say, "Oh, no; wait a minute, this is not our obligation. This is the obligation of the UNO." The UNO what? [Laughter.]

How can it be said that it is the obligation of an organization which knows it cannot perform it, which we know cannot perform it, which Greece knows cannot perform it, which Russia knows cannot perform it, which Great Britain knows cannot perform it? But, thank God, we propose to do that which no nation except ourselves can do. We can do it. Standing on our own dignity, with our own resources, with courage and with a high conception of preserving the peace of the world, we propose to take this step in aid to Greece. I believe our aid will contribute to the preservation of the peace of the world. We propose to aid this free government, this great republic in the ancient world, to maintain her dignity. We are taking this course not because someone tells us to but we are taking it because of our own strength, our own resources, and our own courage.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For what purpose?

Mr. ECTON. For the purpose of introducing a bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ECTON. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, in view of what has transpired in world affairs during the past couple of weeks I think it is safe to state that we are facing some of the most serious questions which this Nation has ever confronted. President Truman called the two Houses of Congress together in joint session and asked that we support a measure which would provide a loan of $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey. In connection with that request he also asked that he be permitted to send civilian and military personnel. It has made some of us wonder just how far our national policy is to be extended by our State Department. We necessarily must trust the State Department, and especially General Marshall, who is to direct the future of that great Department and our foreign policy. Many of us have felt that perhaps a

little more than American dollars would be required to stop the totalitarianism against which we have been waging a world war, and especially to uproot totalitarianism in Europe as we find it today.

We think that General Marshall's hand should be strengthened in other ways than merely putting up American dollars. I do not know whether or not this is the psychological time for this country to extend the Monroe Doctrine, as it applies to this hemisphere, literally to the entire world. Perhaps it is. However, it seems that that is what we are doing, when the President asks us to make a loan to Greece and Turkey.

Possibly other countries may respect us for what we have done or tried to do for human liberty in the world; but I for one suspect that some of the nations in the world respect this country of ours because we hold the atomic bomb.

Therefore, Mr. President, a few of us believe that we can strengthen General Marshall's hand, and that of our State Department, by introducing a bill proposing an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which was passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

On behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and myself, I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, to introduce a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. With the indulgence of the able Senator from Iowa, I should like to read the first paragraph as an explanation. It reads as follows:

(1) There is hereby established an Atomic Energy Control Board (herein called the Board), which shall be composed of the Secretary of State, who shall be Chairman of the Board, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and two additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In submitting the nomination of any appointive member to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and the qualifications of the nominee. Three members shall constitute a quorum of the Board.

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

Mr. ECTON. I yield with the consent of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. PEPPER. I wish merely to get the purport of the bill. Is it proposed to displace the present Atomic Energy Commission, and to establish instead a board consisting of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. ECTON. That is correct. The board would consist of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and two members appointed by the President.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, to introduce the bill and have it appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 979) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, introduced by Mr. ECTON (for himself, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For what purpose?

Mr. MALONE. For the purpose of commenting on the bill just introduced.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I hope the comment will not be extensive.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator. I shall be brief.

Mr. President, times have changed since the enactment of the 1946 Atomic Energy Act. Times have changed since Mr. Lilienthal and other members of a committee recommended that the atomic energy secret be shared with all other countries, including Russia, without adequate inspection for security.

The President of the United States has sounded the warning note. He has said that the time has come for a show-down.

It is well known that there are two great world powers in the world today—not five—and they are Russia and the United States.

The other three—England, France, and China—we are simply leading by the hand. They have neither the money nor the national stamina successfully to oppose the continuous unrelenting pressure of communism.

Mr. President, our own President of the United States has made this decision—we here have only the right to accept or reject.

Our own generation has experienced two devastating world wars. Our people were never properly informed of the approach of either of them, or of the great principle and policy upon which the decision to enter them was made.

This time they have a right to know. They have a right to be fully and completely informed of not only the great over-all plan of which our entry into Greece and Turkey is a part, but they have a right to know what the alternative to such a plan might be, what would be the consequences of our refusal to enter into the European and Asiatic internal conflicts which have continued periodically throughout all recorded history.

According to the President of the United States this is clearly a conflict between two philosophies of government—an attempt to establish spheres of influence.

Communism is a religion as well as a socioeconomic system. For this reason the spreading of it around the world is a holy purpose to the Russians. This explains why they can be expected to die for it right here in this country and to deny, when confronted by the evidence, that they are members. This also explains why we have not been able to reach them with any argument to stop the expansion of their doctrine by subterfuge, trick, deceit, propaganda, and every other means.

This has led to the "containment" plan which brought out the Greece-Turkey military-economic backing program now under consideration. The immediate proposal is to give $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey to organize their armed services and to vitalize their industries in defense against the totalitarians.

It has already been announced that Korea will be the next country to be helped in the same way. It is understood China will follow Korea, and that we intend to build a great naval base at Singapore, probably also at other points along the China coast or the Asiatic waterfront.

The plan of containment also includes dominance in Iran, Arabia, Italy, Syria, and to attain as much control in Europe at key points as is essential for the purpose.

Last week we made a treaty with the Philippines which gives us the right to build harbors, military bases, air bases, fortifications, and many other kinds of offensive and defensive works in all parts of the islands in approximately 20 areas. By the terms of the treaty we may put in the installations under our own laws in our own way virtually without any control by the Philippine Government. About half of these installations whose building has begun are in absolutely new locations.

The theory involved in this containment program includes the purpose of establishing industries wherever we come to the aid of a country. Even Germany, it is hoped, may be launched on a light industrial-production program. This, obviously, will be done with our money collected from our own taxpayers, and will be guided by our technicians, business executives, trained administrators, and financiers.

All these countries have an extremely low living standard. It is obvious that the plan has been launched to make this country the principal market for their products. This part of the program, if successful, will tend to lower our wage living standards when dumping begins.

The problem involved in this entire program is whether our 140,000,000 people and their equipment, military forces, and resources—which are not illimitable—can be scattered around the globe to contain and control 2,000,000,000 people—which is roughly estimated to be the populations who might eventually follow totalitarian leadership.

It also is wise to emphasize that, while the President through his Cabinet members is continually emphasizing that our resources are running short, and that through their preachments of becoming a have-not nation and current operating policies, they have practically stopped the investment of venture development capital in our mines, forests, and fuels.

An argument used against the containment program is that it will drain us of human resources, mental energies, and most of our physical resources of mine, forest and field, and that we are playing into the hands of the Russians by exhausting ourselves. When a certain point of exhaustion is reached, not only our physical resources will be depleted but we will be so terribly taxed that people will reach the discouraged conclusion, "what is the use to work purely for the tax collector who gathers in his money to support Government's enterprises?"

The theory on which this program as well as others are based is that Russia is

weak and still unorganized and poorly equipped and therefore is not able at the present to fight. The thought seems to be that she can get ready within 5 or 10 years, the military here says 5 years, and the people abroad say 10 years.

Those who have faith in the containment program think Russia can be so well bottled up within 5 years that she will not want to fight. The practical immediate effect of the program obviously means the expenditure of billions of dollars which must come from our people.

It will, and is already, recreating a war economy.

The foreign demand will take United States goods abroad which we need at home. Replenishment industrially and by the consumer inevitably will be delayed. Machinery and materials we need here for our capital plant and equipment will go into foreign countries.

Britain already has restored practically all its wartime controls. It is inevitable that we will restore wartime controls with a war economy. It is immediately apparent that we must have controls under this program to speed production of goods needed abroad.

That the Government must have controls to make the necessary allocations between foreign and domestic needs and the Government must place controls on prices, marketing, storage and transportation. It is inevitable that the armed services will buy enormous quantities of many materials and equipment. This means new United States industrial mobilization.

What are alternatives to this program?

Some people are very candid who hate the thought of war and who have confronted the present situation with Russia in bewilderment, have reached the conclusion since some form of war is apparently inevitable that now is the time to deliberately offer Russia the alternative of fighting, or confining her communistic activities to their own sphere of influence as layed down by your plan of occupation.

These thoughts are somewhat like the philosophy of the surgeon, but it is the surgeon's philosophy in reverse. The surgeon tries to operate while the patient is still strong. In this case we would operate while the patient is still weak. The springboard for this particular trend of thought is downright realism without any of the higher or spiritual phases of life.

Another alternative that is often discussed is that we shall keep out of the rest of the world—draw our people back wherever they are and devote ourselves to making ourselves completely ready in our own hemisphere. This would include integration into the hemispheric plan of everything from Baffin Bay to the Straits of Magellan. It would involve the English-speaking, Spanish-speaking, and Portuguese-speaking people of the Western Hemisphere. It would also involve the possibility sometime in the future that we would be attacked by the totalitarians on our own hemisphere. They would be under the necessity of bringing troops many thousands of miles over practically all the oceans of the world. The same of course is true of our problem if we seek to join the issues with them in Asia and Europe. And all military thought still holds that masses of infantry are the deciding weight that wins and occupies countries.

Another alternative that should have some force and which probably appeals to the greatest number of Americans, Although they cannot see how it can be accomplished, is what you might call the spiritual phase or program.

This is not a religious feeling. It is a feeling that there must be some better way to decide issues than by conflicts that destroy civilization. There is not the remotest doubt that the next conflict will leave most of the globe in ruins. It is impossible to imagine what will be the state of this world when the next conflict has been terminated and only one social and political form is left sitting on top of the world on a heap of skulls as it were. No thinking man or woman can imagine that the next war will leave anything but vast, monstrous, demolition and annihilation.

We want peace and we are ready to sacrifice for peace. The trouble seems to be that the Russians, truly Asiatics, are fired with a fanatic zealousness for communism which to them is religion. They think it is their destiny to convert the future world to the system of cooperative living and eliminate competition. We do not appear to have that same spiritual conviction that possesses those people.

If we had some tremendous and inspiring conviction it is possible that with our will to peace and our conviction we might be able to sell the Russians the idea that the globe is big enough for their system and for the nontotalitarian system, and that it is perfectly feasible for both systems to compete for the good will and following of the peoples of the globe in peace rather than in an annihilating conflict.

There is no reason why such an appeal might not register. The trouble is, apparently we on our side of the fence have inadequate leadership and are still riddled with too obvious selfishness.

Bear in mind that in the minds of practically every mother and father and in those of us who have had to do with the last two World Wars will be the desperate question, Why cannot they do something about avoiding war? And that particularly is the problem of the people in the Congress. It is up to them some way to find the method by which the Russians can be stopped and contained without recourse to those processes which will destroy the globe.

Now, Mr. President, since it is well understood that the atomic energy is purely a national security asset and that it will have no civilian application for a considerable time, it seems the sensible thing to place the control where it is so obviously needed.

This morning's papers carry headlines announcing the Korean emergency, estimating the cost at $600,000,000. This, together with the crisis in Greece and Turkey, adds up to $1,000,000,000 with more to come.

The purpose, then, of introducing the amendment to the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 at this time is to put into the hands of the one man holding the absolute confidence of the American people at this time, the greatest national security and peace-enforcement weapon of all time. That man is Hon. George C. Marshall, Secretary of State.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE AND RINDERPEST

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] wants to ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, for the consideration of a bill referring to the prevention, control, and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 154, Calendar No. 63.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 154) making an appropriation for expenses incident to the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Iowa for his courtesy in permitting me to have the joint resolution considered at this time. I know how he feels; for at one time when I had the floor, for 45 minutes continuously I was kept from saying a word because of the interruptions of other Senators.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have been pleased to yield to the Senator from Kansas. He is a delightful gentleman from the Midwest, and I am glad he has been able to secure action on the measure so quickly.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have just one or two other things to say in order to complete the statement I wish to make at this point. I have referred to the qualifications of Mr. Lilienthal and the reasons why I have decided to vote for the confirmation of his nomination. I referred briefly, yesterday, to Mr. Lewis L. Strauss and his background as a layman in science.

At this time I desire to refer briefly, for the information of the Senate, to Mr. Robert F. Bacher, another proposed member of the Commission. I call attention to the fact that Dr. Bacher is a nuclear scientist of highest degree. He is the one scientific, professional man

nominated to be a member of this Commission. He has had extensive experience in the Manhattan project. He began in 1941, with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in radar work; and in the spring of 1943 he went to the Los Alamos Laboratory, as head of the experimental physics division. Later he was head of the bomb physics division of the Los Alamos Laboratory, which is the laboratory of the Manhattan District which put the bomb together in its final stages.

Again I call attention to the fact that in the printed hearings we find, prior to the testimony of each of the nominees, a résumé of his experience.

One of the other gentlemen nominated to be a member of the Commission is Mr. Sumner T. Pike, of Maine. He has had broad governmental and business experience. It will be found, from reading the references to his background and experience, as shown in the hearings, that he has had military service in the past; he has been purchasing agent and assistant manager of an electric company in Texas; he was vice president of the Service Station Equipment Co., in Texas; he was assistant to the president of G. Ansinck & Co., of New York, a firm in the general South American import and export business. He was later a member of the financial department and financial secretary for the Continental Insurance Co. and affiliated companies; and he has been vice president and director of Case Pomeroy & Co., a firm engaged in mining exploration and investment and also in oil production and exploration. He was later business adviser to the Secretary of Commerce and a member of the Temporary National Economic Committee for the Department of Commerce. Thereafter he was a member of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission. He has been a Director of Fuel Prices, in the Office of Price Administration; and now he has been nominated for appointment as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The other gentleman nominated to be a member of the Commission is Mr. William W. Waymack. His home is in Des Moines, Iowa, and he would come to the Atomic Energy Commission from the position of editor of the Des Moines Register. To indicate Mr. Waymack's background, I suggest that Senators read in the hearings the résumé of his experience. He has had world-wide experience during the past 20 or 30 years. He has had unusual opportunity to learn about the rest of the world. He is a Pulitzer prize winner as an editor. He has received many honors for the excellence and high quality of his editorial ability. I have know Mr. Waymack personally for a great many years. He is an intensive worker, a man with a highly qualified mind, and one who, as a layman, in my judgment cannot only secure a completely adequate grasp of his duties in this field, but also will bring to it a zeal and an integrity which will be of great benefit to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I wish to ask a question about Mr. Waymack.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I simply wish to say that I judge that the Senator from Iowa is a little more enthusiastic about Mr. Waymack than he has been about some of the other gentlemen he has described; is he not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I did not intend to be, Mr. President. I merely felt that because I have known Mr. Waymack for some years, perhaps I might enlarge a little upon the statement of his qualifications.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that when the Senator from Iowa knows a man and has known him for years, he is correct in enlarging a little on his qualifications. I can excuse the Senator for not doing so as to others. Probably he does not know Mr. Lilienthal as well as I do and is not as well acquainted with him as I am. I have known Mr. Lilienthal for 16 years, and I can understand very well why the Senator from Iowa would be a little reticent in speaking in detail about him.

So I am glad to see that when the Senator from Iowa does know a man like Mr. Waymack, he enthuses over him a little more.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I may say that while the acquaintance of the Senator from New Hampshire with Mr. Lilienthal has actually extended over 16 years, I will bet him a new hat that the 16 years have not seemed as long to him as the 6 weeks I have known him have seemed to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, let me say a word about the nominee for General Manager of the Commission, who, under the law, must be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The President appointed Carroll L. Wilson to be General Manager of the Commission, after recommendation by the Commission. Mr. Wilson is a young man, 36 years old, I believe. However, the record shows, as do the recommendations of those who know him, that during that time he has reached an enviable standing in scientific-production fields. He bears the unqualified and enthusiastic endorsement of such men as Dr. Vannevar Bush, to whom he was assistant at one time; Dr. Karl Compton; and a number of other scientific men who know well the atomic-energy field, and who not only speak of him in the highest terms, but were instrumental in recommending him to the Commission and to the President for appointment as General Manager of the Commission.

Now, Mr. President, I have concluded what I wanted to say, at least in a preliminary way.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator does not think that as General Manager Wilson would be of much account with Lilienthal as Chairman, does he?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; I think he would be.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why does the Senator think that the General Manager would have much to say with Mr. Lilienthal as Chairman?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator is suggesting that Mr. Lilienthal overrides the provinces of employees or those under him, I do not believe Mr. Lilienthal is of that disposition. I think Mr. Lilienthal is a forceful executive; I do not think anyone can deny that he is a successful executive. But I believe that, as a successful administrator, he will cooperate with his associates on the Commission, and will certainly confine his activities to the establishment of a general policy, and that the General Manager will be fully authorized and permitted to perform his functions as such.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator said yesterday that Mr. Lilienthal is impatient of legislative processes. Of course, that is how all dictators start; they begin to oppose or become impatient with legislative processes. So they take the law into their own hands. That is how Hitler started; that is how Mussolini started; that is the way many men in countries overseas started to become dictators.

If Mr. Lilienthal has that characteristic—and the Senator from Iowa said yesterday he has—if he is impatient with legislative processes of the Congress, which created his Commission—and the Senator from Iowa said yesterday that he is—it is reasonable to suppose that he would be intolerant of a manager who exercised any of the real duties of management, particularly when the manager is a subordinate? In other words, instead of being a resolute executive, as the Senator indicates, would it not be better to say that he is a ruthless executive, who demands complete obedience from his subordinates, and will brook no interference?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, when I said yesterday, in effect, that he may be a man who is restless at certain legislative restraints or legislative procedure, I was speaking, perhaps, forensically, or admitting forensically, for the sake of the argument, taking the assumption that he might be. I am not in a position to say that he is not. There are those who accuse him of being restless, and, as I have said, he may be; I do not know. I have not any evidence that he wishes to override legislative authority. If he does accentuate that feeling, if he is strongly of the opinion that he wants to disregard all legislative restraints upon a public body, I would say he probably would be ruthless, but I am not convinced that he is that kind of a man.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask the Senator from Iowa if it is not a fact that all the witnesses who appeared and testified about Lilienthal—that is, all those who were asked about this specific point and this charge—united in their expression? I can refer the Senator from New Hampshire to the record, and I would ask him to read the testimony of Mr. Charles A. Thomas, the vice president of the Monsanto Chemical Co., in charge of the gas-diffusion project at Oak Ridge.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Just a moment, please. He was one of the collaborators and one of the writers and signers of the Acheson-Lilienthal report. I would ask

the Senator from New Hampshire to read the testimony of Harry A. Winne, of Mr. Chester I. Barnard, and of Lilienthal's other associates. Every one of them made the point that he knew how to cooperate, that he listened carefully to the suggestions which were made by them, was quite willing to compromise and to adjust his viewpoint if he believed intellectually that that was the thing to do.

I must say to the Senator that the picture contained in the thousand or twelve hundred pages of testimony does not convey to me, or to any one else who will read the record, I believe, the kind of a picture the Senator is attempting to draw of this man. I think it is a figment of the Senator's own imagination, based upon the fact that Mr. Lilienthal has committed the terrible crime of making the TVA project a success.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Connecticut knows that is not true.

Mr. McMAHON. If I knew it was not true, I would not say it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why did the Senator not mention Dr. Arthur Morgan? There is a man who knows Lilienthal better than the Senator from Connecticut does, or perhaps I know him better than the Senator does. So why quote the heads of great corporations who have projects that may come under Mr. Lilienthal, who do not dare to say anything else?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for an answer.

Mr. McMAHON. I propose to discuss Dr. Arthur E. Morgan at some length. I propose at the proper time in the debate to read the characterization of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan by the senior Senator from Tennessee. I read one of the characterizations of Dr. Morgan yesterday. I have three or four more, in which the Senator described Dr. Morgan back in 1935.

I listened to Dr. Morgan, as did the other members of the committee, for, I believe, 2 days. I think that all the members of the committee—well, shall I reserve one?—were of the opinion that the doctor completely and entirely failed to make out his case, as he did when previously a joint committee took 6,158 pages of testimony, wrote a report of 275 pages, and denominated every charge which was made by Dr. Morgan, every charge, incidentally, remade in this hearing, as entirely unsubstantiated and without merit.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to make a slight contribution to the statements which are now being made with reference to Mr. Lilienthal. I should like to quote from Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, testifying before the committee, who stated, speaking of Mr. Lilienthal, as appears on page 100:

> He is a man of prodigious energy, of driving force. I think sometimes that in his conception of his duty he drives exceedingly hard; and sometimes perhaps makes enemies or creates misunderstandings.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. It is significant that the Senator stopped at just that point in the record. Mr. Baruch proceeded to say:

> He never had any with me, but I understand, that at some time or other, he has had some with my good friend, Senator McKELLAR—whom I have known for 31 years, and for whom my affection and admiration have grown each year in the time that I have known him, since the great days of Woodrow Wilson, when he was particularly active and up until now.
>
> Those differences I have never discussed with either one of them. I have had a closer and more affectionate relationship with Mr. McKELLAR than I have with Mr. Lilienthal. But Mr. Lilienthal is thoroughly qualified, a good manager—knows his subject.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. How does that detract from or add to the information I conveyed to the Senate, when Mr. Baruch stated, along the line the Senator from Iowa was discussing, that Mr. Lilienthal "is a man of prodigious energy and of driving force"? That is the point I wanted to bring out:

> I think sometimes that in his conception of his duty perhaps he drives exceedingly hard, sometimes perhaps makes enemies or creates misunderstandings.

There is no necessity for my proceeding to read the eulogy he pronounced on my good friend, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. The Senator from Tennessee needs no eulogy from anyone on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am trying to yield the floor, but I will yield to the Senator from Connecticut, if he wants to make a comment.

Mr. McMAHON. I think it is only fair to say that the Senator from Connecticut completed the reading, because he did not want the inference to be in the RECORD that Mr. Baruch had done anything else but completely and finally and totally endorse this nominee. "He is a man of driving force." What were the adjectives? "A man of prodigious energy." That he is a man of "prodigious energy" and of "driving force" makes him, to me, very much the man for the job. That is what we need.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I want to ask the Senator from Connecticut whether Mr. Baruch said that Mr. Lilienthal was the best qualified man in the United States. Did he make that statement?

Mr. McMAHON. I do not know that he was asked that question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did he make that statement?

Mr. McMAHON. No, as I remember, he did not make that statement. But Mr. Baruch is not the President of the United States; Mr. Truman is the President of the United States. He sent the nomination of this man to the Senate for our consent and advice as to whether we should confirm him.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator think that we should get the best man in the United States for such an important office as this?

Mr. McMAHON. I certainly do. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I believe after listening to the hearings and after giving the matter considerable thought and reflection, that is exactly what we have done. I stand on that.

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely want to say to the Senator from Connecticut, in that connection, that he and all others who agreed with him that Lilienthal is the best man in the United States will have my deepest sympathy in the years to come. I have nothing but sympathy for the Senator, because I believe he is certainly terribly misled.

Mr. McMAHON. I accept the Senator's expression of sympathy, and at the same time I congratulate the President and the people of the United States, and the Senate, which will have a chance to confirm the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. For my own information, and for the RECORD, I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa a few questions. Is it true that on January 7, 1946, the then Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, appointed a committee on atomic energy, of which Mr. Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, was chairman, and on which committee were the following members:

Mr. Vannevar Bush, who has been head of the OSRD;

Mr. James B. Conant, who was president of Harvard University;

Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, United States Army, who was in charge of the Manhattan project, as I understand it; and

Mr. John J. McCloy, who has recently been appointed President of the International Bank.

Is it also a fact, if I may ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa, that that committee set up a board of consultants, in order to make the study they had been asked to make by the Secretary of State, and on that board were the following gentlemen:

Mr. David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority;

Mr. Chester I. Barnard, president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., who, I am glad to interject, is a warm personal friend of mine, one of my constituents, and he is also one of the leading businessmen in my State;

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, of California Institute of Technology, and the University of California;

Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, vice president and technical director, Monsanto Chemical Co.; and

Mr. Harry A. Winne, vice president in charge of engineering policy, General Electric Co.

Is it not true that that group, working with the Acheson committee, prepared what was called the Acheson-Lilienthal report, which was released to the press, as I understand, on the 16th day of March 1946?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am unable, without the book or the records, to verify the dates the Senator has mentioned, but with reference to the committee to which the Senator has referred, which was appointed, with the personnel he has stated, there was the main committee, the Secretary of State's committee, I believe, and the other committee, headed by Mr. Lilienthal, was a panel or group to do, I think, the detailed work in the preparation of a report.

Mr. SMITH. Is it a fact also, I will ask the Senator, that these gentlemen, other than Mr. Lilienthal, worked with Mr. Lilienthal during the period of time in which this report was made; and also, that they were in consultation with Mr. Baruch, at the time of the preparation of the material that Mr. Baruch used in preparing our case before the United Nations? Is it not also true that the gentlemen whose names I have read testified at the hearings conducted by the Senator's committee, and certified to the ability of Mr. Lilienthal to carry on this job?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, generally speaking, the Senator is correct. I think he has asked a three-barreled question.

Mr. SMITH. I merely recited for the RECORD this material from the report of the committee, which gave the names of both the original committee appointed by the Secretary of State and also the Board of Consultants.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Secretary of State's committee was appointed, as the Senator has stated, and that committee in turn appointed a panel headed by Mr. Lilienthal to make a survey of the subject and help with the report. The panel, headed by Mr. Lilienthal, as I understand, made two or three reports to the main committee, headed by the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of State's committee, and after several meetings, and after canvassing the situation, a report was adopted for the international control of atomic energy, or a recommendation, called the Acheson-Lilienthal Report.

In our hearings Mr. Bernard, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. Winne testified for Mr. Lilienthal. Dr. Oppenheimer did not appear. Mr. Acheson, Under Secretary of State, Vannevar Bush, and Dr. Conant appeared. I cannot recall at the moment whether Mr. John J. McCloy appeared or not. I am informed that he did not. Does that answer the question?

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Replying to another part of the Senator's question, as to whether or not they were in consultation with Mr. Baruch, when he became our representative to the United Nations for the composition of the Atomic Energy International Control Plan, I think there was a consultation by Mr. Baruch and his assistants with this group, all of them, or some of them at least, and that some of the details of the so-called Acheson-Lilienthal Report were used as a basis for certain proposals on the international control of atomic energy. I think it was helpful in that way.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. I simply wanted to get the relationship of this work with which Mr. Lilienthal was connected to our program before the United Nations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It was interrelated.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey did not ask the Senator whether or not he knew if Mr. Lilienthal requested any of these gentlemen to appear and to testify personally, did he?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; as a matter of fact, I do not know whether he requested them; but if I had been in Mr. Lilienthal's place, in one way or another, I might have tried to see whether they would testify in my behalf, or against me.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator from New Jersey also ask the Senator why, before they prepared this report and turned it over to Mr. Baruch, they left out one very fundamental thing—the safeguards to the United States of America on the disposal of the atomic bomb; why this commission, which endorsed Mr. Lilienthal, in preparing this report, forgot that very fundamental phase, which is of interest to some 140,000,000 people in this country.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I take a much different view of that report than the connotation raised by the Senator from New Hampshire. The so-called Acheson-Lilienthal report, as I read it—and I have read it a number of times, and I can take no other interpretation from it—only consisted of the broadest generalization of principles.

The Baruch report, which went further, specified in more meticulous detail the step-by-step proposals under which we would turn over the last secrets of atomic energy. The Acheson-Lilienthal report never intended and did not in fact give the details of the implementation of the plan. It consisted of broad generalities. That is the only interpretation I could make of it. I know there is some disagreement on that point, but I think that a reading of the plan fairly discloses that fact.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator answers my question, and the answer is "Yes," that they did forget to include any safeguards for the United States of America in the disposal of the atomic bomb.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In answer to my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, to the question he now asks, I propounded to the Under Secretary of State during the hearings on Monday, February 10, as appears on page 287, the very same question the Senator raises. Mr. Acheson said this in reply:

That is correct.

In other words, that the veto had not been gone into.

Now, what I have said several times is that the Attorney General's committee—

Which was a misstatement. He meant the Secretary of State's committee—

and the Board of Consultants undertook to limit what they were doing. In my judgment it is a wise court that limits its own jurisdiction. We undertook to deal with the basic physical problems; what had to be done if you are going to control it. We did not undertake to go into the questions of international law, international finance, the use of international armaments to repress aggression.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I think it would be well to place in the RECORD at this point the very eloquent statement which was made by the distinguished President pro tempore, the senior Senator from Michigan, and comment which he made, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to make a brief observation at this point, to help clear the record. I happened to have been with the Secretary of State "at the front and in the trenches" at the particular time this commission (the Board of Consultants) was launched. We had been rather glibly discussing international inspection and control, with the constant question in the back of our heads as to: Just how do you do it when you get around to it? And it is my opinion that the Commission to which you refer was created for the specific purpose, and the purpose only, of answering the physical question: "How do you do this thing if you get a chance to do it?"

It did not occur to me, I must say, that the absence of a discussion of the veto in your particular report—

Referring to the Lilienthal-Acheson report—

was any reflection on the report. I quite agree with Senator KNOWLAND, as I know you do, that in the final showdown the veto becomes perhaps exhibit A in connection with the entire affair. But I think I would have to testify from my own association with the development of the enterprise that the problem presented you was purely an answer to the question: "Can you physically, factually, mechanically, actually control atomic energy?"

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator from Iowa yield for one more question, please?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did Mr. Lilienthal ever explain to the chairman or his committee why he was reluctant or why he refused to allow the military to participate in the work of the Commission? This question has been raised here very definitely, and I say it is a very interesting coincidence. It is peculiarly significant that we laid down the broad basic principles on atomic energy, but we forgot one which I thought paramount to all, the safeguarding of our Nation and her 140,000,000 people in what is probably their most vital possession, the atomic bomb. I am just wondering if it is true, as the hearings indicate, that Mr. Lilienthal refused to have the military participate in the discussions of this committee after he took over, and, if so, if that is significant to the Senator?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in the first place, the Senator assumes that Mr. Lilienthal has refused to let the military participate. That assumption is not correct. In the second place the protection of the atomic bomb is completely assured under the law. The law created a military liaison committee to be appointed by the Secretaries of War and Navy, six men. That committee has the right to be informed as to whatever goes on in the atomic energy field that has anything whatsoever to do with the military applications. That committee has the right if it feels that anything the Commission is doing or is not doing is inimical to the security of this country, to appeal to the Secretaries of War and Navy, who, if they think or if they agree that there is a serious question involved, can carry the matter to the President, who has the authority, and the duty, and the right, and the responsibility to order the Commission either to do or to refrain from doing that which is going on which is considered to be inimical to the safety of the United States. And in the Commission itself there is a department of military application which is devoted to the military application of atomic energy. I think the question of the security of our military application is safeguarded.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is it not true that Mr. Lilienthal testified that he had not from the time that the Commission took over the project conferred with General Groves, who had previously headed it, until the time the hearings began?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would prefer, Mr. President, to quote that testimony accurately, and I cannot do it from memory. I will give the Senator my best judgment respecting what was said. On the first or second or third day of the hearing—perhaps a few days later, I do not recall—a question was asked Mr. Lilienthal as to whether or not he had consulted with General Groves. I think he said that he had seen him a time or two. I think a day or so later he came back with a list of specific dates upon which he had consulted General Groves and had talked with him about this matter. It was a much more extensive list, I will say, of dates and times, than I had been led to believe from his first statement. I cannot be more specific.

Mr. BRICKER. I think his first testimony was that he had not conferred with General Groves, and then a couple of days later he came back and said he had.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator may have the exact pages of the record at which the testimony occurred. I do not have the time now to leaf through the hearings.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was impressed by the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire that Mr. Lilienthal had shown a reluctance to consult with or utilize the military in connection with atomic energy. I do not know whether that is true or not. I know nothing about Mr. Lilienthal. But I recall quite well that millions of people in the United States were terribly afraid that atomic energy would fall into the exclusive control of the military, and that this great force would be used only for destruction and not for any constructive purpose. I remember that when the bill creating the Atomic Energy Commission was first presented on the floor of the Senate I and other Senators raised the question whether the measure should go to the Military Affairs Committee because many of us were reluctant to turn this vast force over to the military. As a result of the objections and of the fears that some of us entertained, a special committee was established, headed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMahon]. I do not think it is a just criticism of Mr. Lilienthal to say that he hesitated to turn this force over to the military.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have before me at least a portion of the record referred to by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Bricker] a moment ago, on the point as to whether or not there had been consultation between Mr. Lilienthal and General Groves.

Mr. McKELLAR. What page?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Page 11 of the record of the hearings.

The first question was asked by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Vandenberg], as follows:

Senator Vandenberg. Has your Commission ever consulted with General Groves since the Commission was organized?

Mr. Lilienthal. Yes; that was one of the very first things we did, and all during this period we have had the benefit of a good many consultations with General Groves and some of his associates on a great variety of matters. And Colonel Nichols, his deputy, has been of invaluable service to the Commission, as well.

Senator Vandenberg. You did consult with General Groves? Your answer was "yes"?

Mr. Lilienthal. Yes. On many occasions; yes, sir. And on many subjects.

Senator Knowland. Was that individually, or did the Commission call General Groves in?

Mr. Lilienthal. It was chiefly between the Commission and General Groves, although I perhaps did see the general at times in addition to that.

Senator Johnson. Was that since December 31 at midnight, or prior to December at midnight?

I interpolate that the Commission took over complete control of all phases of the Manhattan project at midnight on the 31st of December.

Mr. Lilienthal. Most of the consultations were prior to that. I am not sure whether there have been consultations with General Groves since the transfer or not.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Just a moment. I continue to read from the record.

Senator Johnson. You have not had any since December 31 at midnight with General Groves, have you?

Mr. Lilienthal. I don't recall that there have been any; I think perhaps not.

The testimony continues on the question of the military.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Iowa has, I think, very fairly revealed the record; and it proves the point that since David Lilienthal came into control at midnight on December 31, 1946, when the military relinquished control and he took over, he has not consulted General Groves. Of course, he probably consulted him while General Groves was in charge. That would be very natural. But since he assumed the supreme power, since he became our atomic dictator, he has not consulted General Groves. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his contribution to the cause, which clearly demonstrates that my point was correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that it is my recollection—although I cannot find it in the record at this time—that Mr. Lilienthal later brought in a memorandum of dates and times when he had in fact later consulted with General Groves, after the 31st of December.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On that point I think an explanation of Mr. Lilienthal's position is appropriate. I quote from page 16 of the record, in his answer to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Millikin], a member of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Mr. Lilienthal. We had a great many before the take-over, and I may be in error about after that date. It is quite possible I am. But as problems arise in which we feel the need for General Groves' judgment—when we get to those problems, and his experience becomes relevant, then either he or his aides have been consulted. As an example, I might cite this change in operation, which I referred to hypothetically, which actually took place. There, Colonel Nichols, General Groves' deputy in charge of that sort of thing, was the man who presented the matter to the Commission; very ably, giving us the whole background. In that sort of situation, of course, General Groves and his aides' experience will be invaluable.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. There is nothing in that statement by Mr. Lilienthal to the effect that he had conferred with General Groves at any time after taking over control. If the Senator will read carefully, he will note that there is no positive statement to that effect. The statement by Mr. Lilienthal was in reply to a question by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Millikin], who said:

Well, it continues to seem strange to me. Here is the most valuable single source of information in this whole business; and from the time you took over, you have not had a single consultation with him.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In reply to the point raised by the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio, in the first place, the testimony being given by Mr. Lilienthal before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was given on the 27th day of January. Mr. Lilienthal, the designated chairman of the Commission, had testified that there had been many consultations. The point at

issue was whether there had been any consultations from midnight on the 31st of December until the 27th day of January, when he appeared before the committee The testimony shows—and I think there is no dispute about it—that he had testified to the effect that there had been many consultations prior to that time. The Commission had been busy getting itself established under the law, which it was required to do; and as matters came up affecting the military applications of this subject there had been consultations with Colonel Nichols, an able soldier, the righthand man of General Groves, and the man who was primarily responsible for the Manhattan project at the Oak Ridge plant.

Mr. BRICKER. But the fact stands out that before the Commission took over on the 31st of December, they were in touch with the organization of the military, which was then in control of the project; and during the time when they ought to have been organized, and after they got started and should have been in touch with the military organization, they were talking to subordinates and not to the man who was best informed.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether General Groves was summoned to appear before the committee and testify on this point or any other point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He was not.

Mr. OVERTON. Why not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. General Groves is a major general and a Regular Army officer. So far as I am concerned, the summoning of Regular Army or Navy personnel in a matter of this kind by the committee is an ineffectual medium of testimony, because I have the feeling that military personnel are bound to express only the administrative policy of the Government, and are not free to express their own opinions. I say that with no discredit to anyone. It follows from the nature of the service in the Regular Establishment. I will say to the Senator that if an officer or official of the Government volunteers to testify under circumstances when opinions and policies are involved, that is a different matter. In this case the committee did not feel that it was justified, by subpena or otherwise, in compelling the attendance of a member of the Regular Establishment in either the Army or Navy, unless the testimony arose naturally in connection with some specialized field. This was a matter of policy, a matter of Presidential discretion. General Groves was not summoned, and he did not volunteer to testify.

Mr. OVERTON. I take occasion to differ with the able Senator as to his duties as chairman of the committee. I think it is very proper to summon an officer of the Government, whether he be a civilian officer or a military officer. I have had occasion to summon them before committees of which I have been in charge and have them testify. I have requested them to be present, and they have come and have testified. They did not volunteer to testify, and at times they did not care to testify. But we are searching for the truth in these investigations. We want to know the facts. Certainly General Groves would have been in a position to testify exactly what contact, if any, Lilienthal had had with him. I think General Groves would have given a very accurate statement in that respect.

I attended the first session and one or two other sessions of the committee at the time when Lilienthal was under examination, and the impression created on my mind was that in his early testimony, in response to questions by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], Mr. Lilienthal indicated that he was not desirous of having any contact with the military liaison at the meetings of the Atomic Energy Commission; and it was only after it was evident that the Senator from California and the Senators from Colorado did not agree with him that, later on in his testimony, he changed his attitude in that regard and stated something to the effect that he would welcome such conferences. But in the beginning he stated very clearly, I think, to the contrary.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator will have to make his own interpretation of the evidence. The testimony on one day and the testimony on the second day, at least in my mind, made it clear that there was a willingness on the part of the Commission and on the part of Mr. Lilienthal to meet with and work with the military.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator will pardon me, and he is always courteous in yielding to others, let me say that the testimony to which I have reference is found on pages 13, 14, and 15 of the hearings. I do not care to take up the time of the Senate in reading it, especially in the Senator's own time. But there is the testimony in which Lilienthal clearly indicated, and I heard him say so, that he did not want any interference from the military and that they would not be present at the meetings of the Commission.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I want to make a very brief observation. As I recollect, after the first of the year, immediately after the Commission took over, General Groves went to Florida for a very well-earned rest, and until about 10 days ago, I think he was at the old Miami-Biltmore Hotel, which had been turned into a Government hospital. He has now returned and is on the military liaison committee. General Brereton has been appointed the head of that committee. There has been no complaint of any kind whatever from the military about noncooperation; in fact, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have given their approval to these nominations.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. When the Senator from Connecticut says there has been no complaint from the military, that is a broad statement; is it not? Members of the military have complained to me. I shall not elaborate on what they have said or mention their names at this time. But when the Senator from Connecticut says that no one in the military has complained about this matter, that is a broad statement. The Senator certainly has not consulted the military list extensively. He knows only that one has complained to him, does he not? He can speak only for himself.

Mr. McMAHON. I think that if the Senator has any observations to make regarding any specific complaints made by any responsible member of the military it is a proper subject to place in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. BRIDGES. The military men I have talked with are opposed to Mr. Lilienthal. Of course, the President has nominated Mr. Lilienthal, and the fact that the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy could mean their careers would be prejudiced by taking a public position in opposition to the President. Therefore, I do not blame them for being silent. But if the Senator will talk with some of the military or naval men with whom I know the Senator is acquainted, because I have seen him from time to time hobnobbing with some of them, and if he will lend his ear, I am sure they will give him information about Mr. Lilienthal which could, if the Senator's mind is open, cause him to change his mind.

Mr. McMAHON. All I can say is that during whatever hobnobbing I have done with them they have never let out a peep.

Mr. BRIDGES. Perhaps they thought the Senator was too far committed, and they did not want to waste their time and energy in that respect.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire or any other Senator why these military officers who were so brave on the field of battle are now such cowards that they cannot open their mouths to a Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky, that he knows how long a Navy or Army officer would last if he publicly took a position against the President of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY No; I do not know how long he would last, but I think it is due the Senate and the country, when Senators are constantly referring to some secret, private conversation, some whispering into the ear of a Senator by a high ranking military officer, to let it be known who the officer is and what is behind it all.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator from Kentucky might well recall the very distinguished case in which a very high-ranking officer of our Navy did take issue with the President of the United States, and consequently was demoted from the very exalted position he held. That was the case of Admiral Richardson, a case which was fully explored in the Pearl Harbor investigation, and concerning which there was no doubt that Admiral

Richardson was removed from his position of power and prestige because he dared to put his considered military and naval judgment against that of the President.

So I think we have very definite evidence of what happens, or certainly of what happened under a previous administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was not a case were Admiral Richardson or any other naval officer whispered into the ear of a Senator his private views in regard to something which was a matter of disagreement, between the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and the high-ranking officer, over naval policy as to which the Commander in Chief had the responsibility of making the decision. Admiral Richardson told the President very frankly that if there was a disagreement between them in regard to the policy at Pearl Harbor, the President should appoint someone who was in sympathy with his own views.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is not my recollection of Admiral Richardson's statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will recall that Admiral Richardson specifically stated before the Pearl Harbor Committee that his transfer from the command at Pearl Harbor to a position in the Navy Department in Washington, D. C., was within the rights of the President. He made no complaint against it; and he took the position that the President, in the exercise of his own judgment and discretion, was not to be criticized for it.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is quite correct; but it is quite different from the Senator's earlier statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator can make any point out of it that he wishes to make.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is quite true that Admiral Richardson made exactly the statement which the Senator has now given, and it certainly reflected great credit on his concept of obedience.

But here we have an exactly parallel case in which the President of the United States has the responsibility of naming these officials, and he has exercised it. It might well be presumptuous for Army officers who may be familiar with this matter to express their private opinions—certainly in the light of the existing executive prohibition forbidding any Army or Navy officer to say anything inconsistent with the policies of the President. That is covered by a written Executive order which is now in effect, and certainly it suffices to explain the difficulty to which the Senator from New Hampshire has referred.

Mr. BARKLEY. All this is probably beside the point, but I think that if we are to give credence to confidential, secret conversations held by Army or Navy officers with Senators, the Senate ought to have the advantage of their names and the circumstances under which they complained, if they have complained, so that we might pass judgment upon it and weigh the testimony, if it is testimony, according to its own merits.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have confidence that if an officer whom the Senator from Kentucky liked and respected, say, a colonel or a general in the Army, should come to the Senator from Kentucky and say, "ALBEN——

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator make it "Dear ALBEN"? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes—"Dear ALBEN, I have lived my life in Kentucky. I am an old neighbor of yours, and I feel that I could tell you something that you should know"—I think the Senator, no matter what his position was on the floor, would not betray the confidence of that old friend. I have too much faith in the Senator from Kentucky to think that he would. I really think he would respect and honor that confidence.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for the compliment, and I hope I deserve it. But if some such person were to come to me and tell me that he had information in regard to a Presidential appointment which a congressional committee should know or which the Senate should know or the country should know, I feel that I would urge him to make the information available to the committee; and if he declined to do so, I might, of course, inquire—and I would have a right to do so—as to his motive in coming to me, no matter how friendly he might be in urging the rejection, for instance, of a nomination made by the President. I think, in fairness and truth, I would feel disposed to ask him why he was coming to me personally and confidentially, and why he was unwilling to make the information available to the committee, if it was worthy of consideration by the committee.

There come times, I think, in the life of a military or naval officer, just as they come to Members of the Senate, when the interest of the country is more valuable than confidential information.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree.

Mr. BARKLEY. And where men have to take the chance of losing something which they regard as a temporal advantage, if they can serve their country by so doing.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; I agree. But if that old friend who had come to the Senator from Kentucky and had called him "Dear ALBEN," as the Senator desires, and had approached the Senator from Kentucky in that way, had also said "I tell you that it will mean my career—my career probably will be shattered; and I will be on my way to Timbuktu, or somewhere in the Pacific; but I am telling you this because I believe that in your great power as minority leader of the Senate you can utilize this information for the best interests of our country," I have every confidence that the Senator from Kentucky then would say, "Of course."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I tell the Senator that I would not reveal a confidential conversation; but I would not let it outsway testimony or facts brought publicly to a committee as to the qualifications bearing on a nomination.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that so far as I can remember, not one Army officer, not one naval officer, not one air officer, not one Marine Corps officer, came before the committee. Am I mistaken about that, or is my statement correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I felt sure it was correct. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in answer to the query of the Senator from Kentucky, who asked me why men who have been so brave on the field of battle fear to come before the committee, I might suggest that on the battlefield they have some fighting chance for their lives, and they are brave men because they have that fighting chance; but I am afraid that if they were thus to risk their political careers, they would have no chance whatever for their political lives.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with that. But is a committee or is the Senate to be swayed by reason of a prejudice against a nomination with which they had nothing to do, simply because that person did not take that chance and appear before the committee either for or against the nominee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I say to the Senator that in my argument I have not alleged that any Army or Navy officers have whispered anything to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So I am out of this argument. It is academic so far as I am concerned.

Mr. President, I merely wish to make one other statement; namely, there are a number of incidental matters which I think undoubtedly will come up during the debate. They are incidental in connection with the hearings, because in my judgment those matters go to administrative detail, not to the fundamental question of confirmation of the nomination. Therefore, I shall not take the time of the Senate to discuss matters which I believe go to administrative detail. As to some of them I disagree; but none of them go to the fundamentals of the question of confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry that I have not had an opportunity to hear all the Senator's discussion of this important subject since he has had the floor. However, judging from the newspaper reports, I am certain that the question of communism will be raised during this debate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It was raised yesterday.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Iowa is about the best-qualified member of the committee to answer the question I am about to ask; namely, Is it a fact that all members of the committee which reported the nomination concluded that Mr. Lilienthal was not a Communist and was not sympathetic to communism?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I can only answer that question by saying—and I should like to have each member of the committee make his own statement on this matter if he believes

my statement to be incorrect—that it is my opinion that each member of the committee came substantially and soundly to that conclusion.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was my understanding.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Cecil Wayne Gray, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MEMBERSHIP OF NATIONAL ARCHIVES TRUST FUND BOARD

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to make the following statement: The act of July 9, 1941, establishing the National Archives Trust Fund Board, provides that the Board shall be composed of the Archivist of the United States, as chairman, the chairman of the House Committee on the Library, and the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Library. In view of the reorganization of the committee system of Congress and the disappearance of the House and Senate Committees on the Library, the Archivist, Mr. Solon J. Buck, states that he is at a loss to know who the other members of the Board now are. He asks for instructions and authority from the Senate.

In the opinion of the President pro tempore, in view of the fact that the Committee on Civil Service has taken over the functions of the Committee on the Library, insofar as they relate to the National Archives, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is the duly qualified member of the National Archives Trust Fund Board; and, without objection, this announcement will stand as being made with authority.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR CONTROLS

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 58, relating to the extension of sugar controls.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. J. Res. 58) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from California for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to address a question to the majority leader. My question is this: In view of the fact that we have before us these very important nominations to the Atomic Energy Commission, and in view of the further fact that, as was pointed out the other day, the United States probably has lost about 18 months in the development of nuclear power, and also in view of the other important legislative matters requiring early action by us—including the one which now is the unfinished business, following adoption of the motion by the Senator from New Hampshire—is it not necessary that we recognize the importance of such matters and the deadline of March 31 which we face, and is it not, therefore, possible to have evening sessions, so that we may be able to take care of these urgent matters and at the same time not unnecessarily delay confirmation or rejection of the nominations of members of the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, of course if it is the desire of the Senate we can hold evening sessions, I shall take the matter up with the members of the policy committee to determine whether at this time we should again undertake to hold evening sessions. Our two experiences up to date have not been particularly helpful. But if Senators want evening sessions they can readily be provided, and I shall discuss the matter with the policy committee.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think the statement should constantly be repeated, unchallenged, that we have lost 18 months in nuclear power. I understand that, according to many Members of the Senate, we now have a very competent man directing this field. While he may feel the sword of Damocles suspended over his head, I presume he is proceeding under the responsibility and power that are clearly his. During the preceding period, when the President failed to make the appointments to the Commission, I assume the President felt it was in the competent hands of the military and of General Groves. I am at a loss to understand why we hear constantly reiterated the statement of 18 months being lost.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator from California that the urgency of the sugar situation must be apparent to him as it is to all of us. Controls on sugar will expire next Monday. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, after weeks of deliberation, reported Senate Joint Resolution 58, and submitted a written report, and unless we act on the joint resolution by tomorrow, it will be too late, because it must go to conference after we get through with it. I realize the urgency of the situation regarding Mr. Lilienthal.

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

Mr. TOBEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not think that in my statement I disputed the urgency of action on the measure taken up on motion of the Senator from New Hampshire; in fact, I acknowledged it. I merely pointed out that, due to the fact that there are two urgent matters before the Senate, it seems to me the Senate could well meet in evening sessions and expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. I am glad the Senator corrected me. In the confusion I did not catch his point.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the sessions of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and until Thursday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

MEETING OF COMMITTEES ON BANKING AND CURRENCY AND FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency may sit while the Senate is in session on Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

And, without objection, the Committee on Foreign Relations is given authority to sit tomorrow afternoon.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan has the floor. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 26, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 25 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Cecil Wayne Gray, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In this sacred stillness, Heavenly Father, we would lift our eyes unto Thee. Thou hast set Thy glory above the heavens, and all Thy works shall praise Thy name in earth and sky and sea. We beseech Thee to pour into our

lives a high and holy meaning, renewing and refreshing them. We praise Thee for the assurance that Thy mercy strengthens, Thy heart forgives, and Thy wisdom guides us aright. Even in the dark hours when reason and experience fail, we pray for Thy comforting signals. Send forth Thy light, which strikes a crimson pathway through the ages, and bless us with that spirit of brotherhood which breathes from the Saviour of men. In the name of our Lord and Master. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 214. An act to change the name of the Lugert-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project;

S. 547. An act to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers;

S. 736. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947;

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

S. 875. An act to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites;

S. 918. An act to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the selective service records, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service.

REDUCING INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX PAYMENTS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 161, Rept. No. 181), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income tax payments, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 6 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to the said bill except the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now in the bill and such amendment shall be in order any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding but shall not be subject to any amendment except such amendments as may be offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal.

COMMUNIST PARTY VIOLATES CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, last December the Committee To Investigate the Conduct of Elections, pursuant to the authority of this House, laid before Attorney General Tom Clark the facts in connection with the failure of the Communist Party to file a report under the Corrupt Practices Act.

The Communist Party actively engaged in the election of Representatives and Senators in several States in the 1946 election. The Republican Party and the Democratc Party are compelled to file reports of their receipts and expenditures under the law. Why should not the Communist Party also comply with the law?

Our committee went into this and made a full report of the facts to the Attorney General so that he might bring prosecution.

As a humble citizen, I am tired of the political outward anti-Communist drive of the administration while, at the same time, it fosters and protects Communists who violate the law. The Attorney General should proceed forthwith with this prosecution.

A TAXI DRIVER'S VIEW ON COMMUNISM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, last night when I left the House Office Building I grabbed the first taxicab available, and I asked the taxi driver what he thought of President Truman's plan to combat communism in Greece, Turkey, and other places, and he said, "I think he better start combating it right here, and the conditions which give rise to communism. I am living with my wife and two daughters in a house with only one bedroom, because we cannot get any other place. We ought to take care of Americans first. I do not think," he said, "that these people will ever pay the money back; they will not think any more of us for having given it to them, and they are not going to take care of me and my family when we are in trouble. It might be well," this taxi driver said, "to let them have communism to get their fill of it, see how bad it is, and then maybe they will not like it or keep it."

Mr. Speaker, I give you these not as my own opinions but the answers as I get them.

THE CONSUMER IS THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR IN ANY FOOD PROBLEM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress the House passed what promised to be a very important bill. It was the Hope bill dealing with food, the manufacture, preparation, and scientific development of food from various angles. It was so popular that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, stated that that legislation was the most important legislation passed in the history of the country as far as agriculture was concerned. However, the Department of Agriculture is refusing to put that law into effect.

I have been granted permission to address the House this afternoon on this subject, but in view of the fact that it will be very late before I can be recognized for that purpose, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that instead of taking that time I may be permitted to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD, and in my extension I shall deal at length with the subject to which I have just referred.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement and certain excerpts.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of March 1 entitled "The Russians Made It Hard To Aid Them."

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article by Dorothy Thompson, and further to

extend his remarks and include a resolution and memorandum with regard to naval shipyards.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Pandit Nehru on Indian aims.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by W. Craven-Ellis, former Member of the British Parliament, on the subject The Truth About British Housing Construction. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $165.67, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

ACQUISITION FROM BRITAIN OF A 99-YEAR LEASE OF THE ISLAND OF CYPRUS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Navy has announced that a task force to be led by the 27,000-ton aircraft carrier *Leyte*, will soon visit the Dardanelles Strait in Turkey. This aircraft carrier will proceed to the Mediterranean to join with the cruisers *Dayton* and *Providence*, and the destroyers *Bristol*, *H. R. Dickson*, and *Purdy*, presently in the Malta area; the cruiser *Portsmouth* and destroyer *Compton* now at Trieste; the destroyer *Calnard* at Pola, now on the Istrian Peninsula below Trieste; and the destroyer *Hyman* at Naples. These warships will undoubtedly call at Piraeus, Greece, which is the port of Athens, and will visit the Suda Bay in Crete, as well as Gibraltar, Naples, Istanbul, and Alexandria.

The United States has no naval base in the Mediterranean area. It has no facilities of its own for the berthing, refueling, repairing, and dry docking of its vessels. In addition, it obtains vast supplies of fuel from the Palestinan and Saudi Arabian areas in the eastern Mediterranean Basin.

The new "Truman doctrine" will undoubtedly require from now on, the presence of our naval forces in the Mediterranean. The acquisition of a 99-year lease from Great Britain of the Island of Cyprus, would greatly bolster this new "Truman doctrine."

We cannot rely in times of peril and emergency, upon the services for our ships, to be obtained at Malta, Gibraltar, Italian Naples, French Marseilles, Spanish Tangiers, or any of the ports of the Moslem areas of Tunisia, Algeria, or Morocco. From now on we are on our own. We need a naval base to implement the interest we are now taking in the Middle East.

Great Britain, I am quite certain, would willingly grant this base. She has everything to gain thereby, and nothing to lose. The maintenance of this base would be one of the greatest factors in the maintenance of the peace in the Middle East.

THOMAS LYNCH

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1946, in the Seventy-ninth Congress, I introduced the bill (H. R. 6512) for the relief of the legal guardian of Thomas Lynch, a minor. This is a private tort claim against the Government. The bill died in the Claims Committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Certain files which are now in the House file room and the property of the claimant are necessary to enable the claimant to prosecute this claim in the district court. I ask unanimous consent that these papers and files may be removed from the House file room so that they may be turned over to me for return to the claimant.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNISTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday papers we saw big headlines stating "Truman orders check of all Federal workers to determine loyalty." We have been working on that ever since we established the Dies committee years ago. The people of this country, and especially the President, knew what the Dies committee and the Committee on Un-American Activities have been telling him and the country about communism in this country. They only wake up to this fact when they want to do something to try to drive communism out of countries way over in Europe. That is all right, but we want to get communism out of this country first. Clean our own house before you start on another. I am glad he issued this order, but I do not want this order now to be construed by the public all over the land as meaning that it is time for us to spend billions and billions and billions of the dollars of the American taxpayers trying to drive communism out of other countries, until we first drive it away from our own shores.

Oh, this propaganda to bring the issues is so apparent. But we must be so very careful in what course we take in obligating our country to do what the United Nations should do and do now.

We must not take on the responsibility of being godfather to Greece, to Turkey, and to dozens of other nations. Involving us in war, involving us to look after these countries of Europe, Asia and Africa. We are not now responsible to help Great Britain in pulling her chestnuts out of the fire. We have done that long enough. Time to stop before we wreck ourselves. I am for America first, last, and all the time.

LEGISLATIVE LARCENY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday my good friend, my distinguished colleague from Nebraska, Dr. MILLER, made a feeble attempt to explain away his participation in what has become public property, of a piece of legislative larceny committed during last week. At the time I was not on the floor and I was not given an opportunity to read his remarks until this morning. Therefore, I am taking this opportunity to suggest that those who are interested in keeping the record straight and in keeping the Congress intellectually honest read the extension of my remarks in reference to what he had to say.

I am seriously considering writing a book about the whole business which I shall entitle "Ali Baba and the Forty Republicans—More or Less."

I assure you it will be interesting reading when the facts are all brought out in the open.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some editorial comments.

LET US NOT GIVE AWAY OUR WEAPON SECRETS TO THE NAZIS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it comes as a shock to most Americans to learn that our War and Navy Departments have actually imported Nazi scientists to work on the development of secret weapons. Anyone familiar with the Nazi mentality should know that they consider a war that is lost, merely a battle that is lost, and they immediately lay plans to correct their mistakes so that they will win the next, and final one.

Nazi scientists are entirely unscrupulous. While we have brought them here to assist us, we must not lose sight of the fact that they will help themselves to our military secrets which they may turn against us some day. And with their cynicism, you may depend upon them to get the best of the exchange.

On the one hand we are striving with might and main to perfect a plan for international control of the atom bomb, while, on the other hand, we invite Nazi scientists who were recently working to destroy us to share in our ordnance secrets. This is an impossible situation.

In the interests of genuine security, I propose that we prohibit the use by

the United States of Nazi scientists and other Nazi experts.

Under the bill which I offer, all those now working for our Government shall be discharged and no agency of the executive branch shall be permitted to bring any more to this country for the performance of any task which permits them to gain access to information of such a secret character that it is being withheld from the American people.

This would apply only to those aliens who were at any time members of the German National Socialist Party, or who were employed at any time between March 23, 1933, and May 9, 1945, by the German Government.

Hard-headed realism, won at such a fearful price, should warn us to be on our guard. Once a Nazi, always a Nazi. Do not let them get near any of our military or naval secrets lest we be called upon again to pay dearly for our awakening.

Or perhaps wake up too late.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the script of a broadcast given last night over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the subject Should Special Restraints Be Placed Upon the Communist Party?

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

There was no objection.

ADMITTING FERRY *CROSLINE* TO AMERICAN REGISTRY

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1344) to admit the American-owned ferry *Crosline* to American registry and to permit its use in coastwise trade.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was reported out unanimously by the committee. The reason it is being brought up at this time is that the present war powers which would make it possible to extend the operation of this vessel will expire on March 31 and thereby the ferry service in that particular area will be interrupted.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, nothwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 883), the ferry *Crosline*, owned by the State of Washington, shall be admitted to American registry, and shall be entitled to engage in the coastwise trade and to transport passengers and merchandise between points in the United States, including districts, Territories, and possessions thereof embraced within the coastwise laws.

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

SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, agreeable to the majority and minority leadership, I am instructed by unanimous vote of the Committee on Armed Services to ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill S. 918, an act to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the selective-service records, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question about the personnel now employed in the Selective Service. What will it do with the personnel now being employed under the Selective Service Act?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The great majority of the personnel will be dismissed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will that keep intact the personnel and overloaded staffs that are now in every State capital handling the selective-service records?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No; it will not.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will it reduce them?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It will greatly reduce them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. By how much.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I cannot tell you exactly.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would like to know; otherwise, I am going to have to object because this is an important bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. There is a time limit on this bill, and this bill must go through today.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman should not bring such an important bill up without having the bill or report before us. I insist on seeing the bill and the report.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withhold his objection for just a moment, I will explain the report to him. This establishes an office of selective-service records and transfers to this office all of the property records, personnel, and unexpended balances of the appropriations of the Selective Service System.

The continuance of the confidential nature of selective-service records with a provision for penalties for violations of these confidences.

I may say that these records go back to the States and then to the county agents and are left there. Many of the States have set up a system of bonus for the men who served overseas. Unless this is done, there is no authentic way in which the matter can be carried on after next Monday.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Did not the President of the United States request that they be sent to the central office in the State capitals?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. He did; but the Senate, wisely, I think, adopted a further amendment to put them down in the counties and leave them there, where they would be available for the communities.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Can the gentleman give us any information as to how much the present personnel may be reduced in the handling of these selective-service records?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The expenses for operating the present local board organization to June 30, 1947, is estimated at $4,500,000. The cost of liquidating the Selective Service System is estimated at $11,150,000, and the cost of establishing and maintaining the Federal-record depots in States from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948, is estimated at $4,500,000. Thus it will be seen that if the Federal-record depots in States were established at once, $4,500,000 of this expense would be eliminated; but there would be $5,000,000 of office equipment and an unestimated amount of leases that would be lost by the immediate liquidation of local offices.

Most of the office equipment and material of that is, under this act, transferred to the National Guard Associations of the several States and the Reserve Officer Associations at their request.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. How long do the records stay in the position they are under the proposed resolution?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It runs until July 1, 1948.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have been one of those who have felt that the selective service, since the war is over, should be folded up. The President suggested that these records be sent to the State capitals, and I am under the impression that is where they belong. It seems to me that this bill will continue selective service, with their large personnel, until 1948.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It will not. I might add further that there are 44,000,000 records included in this provision. They are of much value to the several governmental and State agencies who have a legal right to this information. State-bonus acts are in operation in some States and contemplated in others. As a result, there have been over 1,000,000 inquiries from veterans and governmental agencies, outside of the selective-service inquiries, during the last 6 months. These will undoubtedly continue at a heavy rate for some months to come. For convenience and speed in handling these inquiries, it has been deemed advisable to maintain these records at the presently organized local selective-service offices until the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1947.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object to the consideration of this bill until we have more information on it.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

DOMESTIC RUBBER-PRODUCING INDUSTRY

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 118, a joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Crude" and insert "Natural."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Crude" and insert "Natural."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "crude" and insert "natural."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "crude" and insert "natural."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "crude" and insert "natural."

Page 2, line 23, strike out "crude" and insert "natural."

Page 3, line 1, strike out "rapid" and insert "rapidly."

Page 3, line 16, strike out "crude" where it appears the first time and insert "natural."

Page 3, line 16, strike out "crude" where it appears the second time and insert "natural."

Page 3, line 23, strike out all after "Notwithstanding" over to and including "continue", in line 1, page 4, and insert "the provisions of title XV of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, title III of such act and the amendments to existing law made by such title, shall remain."

Page 4, line 6, strike out "crude" and insert "natural."

Page 4, line 6, strike out "crude-" and insert "natural-."

Page 4, line 7, strike out "except" and insert "including import control of synthetic rubber and natural- and synthetic-rubber products, but excluding."

Page 4, line 7, strike out "crude" and insert "natural."

Page 4, line 8, after "that", insert ", to the extent necessary to accomplish the purposes of this joint resolution."

Page 4, line 12, strike out "crude" where it appears the first time and insert "natural."

Page 4, line 12, strike out "crude" where it appears the second time and insert "natural-."

Page 4, line 13, after "products", insert "and import control of synthetic rubber and natural- and synthetic-rubber products."

Page 4, line 14, strike out "act" and insert "joint resolution."

Page 4, line 15, strike out "crude" and insert "natural."

Page 4, strike out all after line 15 over to and including line 2 on page 5 and insert:

"(b) The powers, functions, duties, and authority of the United States to manufacture (including the conduct of research essential to the development of the synthetic-rubber industry) and sell synthetic rubber shall continue in force until the effective date of permanent legislation enacted to accomplish the policy set forth in section 1 (b) hereof, but in no event beyond March 31, 1948. There shall not be declared as surplus nor shall War Assets Administration dispose of any synthetic-rubber plant and facilities costing the Government in excess of $5,000,000, until the effective date of permanent legislation enacted to accomplish the policy set forth in section 1 (b) hereof: *Provided*, That there shall be exempt from such disposal limitations the neoprene plant, styrene plants, the petroleum-butadiene plant located at Toledo, Ohio, not to exceed two alcohol butadiene plants, and butadiene-styrene-type copolymer plants to the extent that the aggregate actual capacity of such copolymer plants remaining in Government ownership shall not be less than 600,000 long tons per year. It is hereby directed that the aforesaid powers, functions, duties, and authority of the United States to so manufacture and sell synthetic rubber shall be exercised and performed by Reconstruction Finance Corporation while that Corporation has succession and thereafter by such officer, agency, or instrumentality of the United States as the President may designate: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed as precluding any other agency of Government from engaging in research authorized by law."

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish the gentleman from Michigan would explain the amendments to the House and tell us whether they make any material change in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. SHAFER. In answer to the gentleman from North Carolina I might say that the Senate made very few material changes in the bill. They made such changes as inserting the word "natural" in place of the word "crude" when speaking of rubber.

The one change that probably should be explained is that beginning on line 16, section (b), an amendment suggested by the RFC better to control the synthetic-rubber industry. I think it is a good amendment. No doubt we would have adopted it in our committee had we received the amendment in time.

Mr. DURHAM. There is no material change in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. SHAFER. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any other special orders heretofore entered for the day.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from Ernest T. Weir on the Greek deal.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in regard to House Resolution 38, which he introduced today.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1½ hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2700, the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, 1948, with Mr. HOPE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] yield time now in view of the fact that our side closed the matter yesterday.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes. I think we shall not have any difficulty with regard to it. We will see that the gentleman has the opportunity to close the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the dissolution of an entire service to labor and industry is a matter for grave consideration. Therefore, I would like to analyze the result of action by the House Committee on Appropriations which voted to dissolve the Division of Labor Standards in the Department of Labor and decided to transfer a few of its functions to other agencies.

The Division of Labor Standards is a highly specialized agency and the smallest agency in the Labor Department. It is therefore vulnerable to attack. But size is no indication of worth.

The Division of Labor Standards was established within the Labor Department to represent all of the people in the effort to standardize labor legislation and practices. All of our 48 States have autonomy in such fields as workmen's compensation, industrial safety and health and a good many other fields affecting the relationship between management and labor. Is it not the responsibility of the Federal Government to be

at least aware of the legislative action of its 48 parts? I believe it is. No single State will assemble material on what all the others are doing in the field of labor legislation. No other agency in the Labor Department is concerned with assembling State labor legislation.

This is a proper function for the Federal Government—to have a Division of Labor Standards in which information on labor-management legislation is accumulated and which works to encourage the States to raise their standards.

This year 44 State legislatures will be in session. Every 2 weeks the Division of Labor Standards assembles digests of State labor bills. This is not a statistical job; it is a frank effort on the part of the National Government to encourage the passage of better labor laws.

That is the function of the Division of Labor Standards—a clearinghouse for information and promotion of higher standards.

For example, there is much to be done to reduce industrial-accident rates. This is a job being performed by the Division of Labor Standards. But it will not be done if the Appropriations Committee report is approved.

Last year about 16,000 men and women were killed in industrial accidents. Last year about 2,000,000 workers were injured on the job. Has the Federal Government no responsibility to reduce the cost of these deaths and accidents? The cost to American wage earners of industrial accidents last year was $1,500,000,000. The cost to industry was $1,800,000,000. Experts say 90 percent of this gigantic waste was preventable.

Can the people in California be responsible for industrial deaths in New Jersey? Can the States themselves reduce this frightful accident record? Whether they can or not, the facts prove that they have not reduced accidents as much as they should be reduced. The States need help, and the Division of Labor Standards has been providing them with help. Through the services of its Federal safety engineers, working in cooperation with the States, the accident rate in the last 3 years—years of the most intense industrial activity in our history—has come down. But 70 percent of the accidents occur in plants which have not yet been approached by safety experts.

It is obvious that the States need help. The very fact that there are only 500 safety inspectors in the States for 40,000,000 workers in industry is proof of that. The fact that the States have indicated their desire for the maintenance of this Federal-State cooperation is further proof.

Because the Bureau of Labor Statistics is an agency which studies objectively the results of labor-management relationship, it cannot be expected to alter the results. That is the job of the Division of Labor Standards and the service should be maintained.

Just as no other agency in the Labor Department is equipped for this Federal-State cooperative effort in the field of safety and health and in the field of workmen's-compensation and child-labor laws, so no other agency can rightfully assume the labor-education job of the Division of Labor Standards.

The House Appropriations Committee has admitted that the workers of this country should be educated for union responsibility. It has admitted that the Federal Government should help public and private agencies to educate the workers in such things as collective bargaining and labor legislation.

The committee admitted this by recommending $63,000 for the continuation of the labor-education program of the Division of Labor Standards—but by transferring that service to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

This shows a fundamental misconception of the functions of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. That Bureau gathers information and adds up the figures and announces the result—without consideration for the effect of those totals. If the cost of living rises, it says so. But by no stretch of the imagination does it attempt to educate labor or industry on laws or practices. It is a research agency.

But the field of labor education is entirely different than that. The universities throughout the country which are only just now starting classes for the study of industrial-relations problems are not interested in just figures. They want basic texts in collective bargaining. They want the advice of experts in this relatively new field of labor education. In short, they want to raise the level of practices in this field. That is what the Division of Labor Standards was created to do, that is what it has been doing, and that is what it should continue to do.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, in 1943 and again in 1945 and again in 1947, I introduced a bill for the prevention or purge of subversives in our Government employ. It is now H. R. 1103. The enactment of such a bill is the way in which employment only of the loyal may be assured. Such legislation is within the constitutional power of Congress.

The token payment on our debt to decency proposed in the pending bill, H. R. 2700, is unconstitutional at least in that it would invade the province of the Executive, and even if it were constitutional, it would be a piecemeal, haphazard, inadequate procedure. The Humphreys case, the Meyers case, and other cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States have condemned that kind of practice, not that this does not avoid some of the manifest characteristics of a bill of attainder so recently condemned. This may escape condemnation as a bill of attainder, and is better than those preceding appropriation bills that carried similar provisions that were condemned by the Supreme Court. However, I wish to read from the decision in the Humphreys case:

> The sound application of a principle that makes one master in his own house precludes him from imposing his control in the house of another who is master there. James Wilson, one of the framers of the Constitution and a former Justice of this Court, said that the independence of each department required that its proceedings "should be free from the remotest influence, direct or indirect, of either of the other two powers."

We should just as fiercely repel a threatened invasion of the executive province by the legislative as we would resent an intrusion by the executive branch of our Government into the legislative.

It has been suggested that the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor was not created by Congress. That is all the more reason that we should stop, look, and listen before we intrude upon the clearly defined prerogatives, privileges, and province of the executive department.

I will take second place to no man in fighting intrusion on the part of the executive or the judiciary into our province. What I am voicing again today is a warning, with the utmost friendliness for the objective sought, that we should respect our oaths of office, the traditions of our Government, and the doctrine implicit throughout our Constitution, observed in our legislation, and commended by our courts, of separation of the powers of Government into three coordinate, independent, free branches.

It may be argued with a smile that this is not an intrusion because we are "firing" no one. But if the result be the same that argument is facetious, specious, and untenable.

So I am pleading again, as I have in the past, let us do this job in the way which is within our province, let us exercise our own power and adopt the bill H. R. 1103 or some similar measure, and with the utmost care and propriety let us implement the message of the President of the United States exercising his Executive functions, as he should, by suitable punishment to be inflicted upon subversives, as well as upon their employers, and so keep every single one of them out of every branch of the Government, or drive out those who got in. Otherwise, there is no security, nor possibility of national perpetuity.

Boll weevils can destroy the whole cotton crop. Termites can ruin the finest homes. We must accomplish this purpose if the Government is to endure. My plea is, please do it in the sphere in which we are authorized by the Constitution of the United States to operate. There never has been one syllable of power conferred on Congress to hire or fire executive employees. We can destroy beyond question the whole Department of Labor by denying appropriations. The life we gave, we may take. If that be a desirable end, then let it be done. That is within our power, but let us not stoop to an invasion of the sphere of authority of another independent, coordinate branch of our Government through a back door or side door and thus seek to curtail the functions implicitly and explicitly committed by the Constitution to another branch of the Government.

Let us protect the principle of the separation of powers. Let us protect, as we would be protected against any invasion of any one of our powers. If we revere the Constitution, let us observe it.

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

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy, always, to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. What assurance would we have that Mr. Warren would be separated from the Federal Service in the event that the legislation as reported was not amended?

Mr. HOBBS. Only the assurance in debate given us by the distinguished, able, perfectly honest chairman of the subcommittee presenting this bill, and others who have assured us that will be the result.

Mr. WALTER. There would be nothing to prevent the transfer of this man from his present position to another position in the same department.

Mr. HOBBS. That is true, but that must come, sir, and I repeat, at the instance and request and under the order of the executive branch and not the legislative branch of our Government. We are not pleading to save any man. We are not pleading here to prevent the Congress from wreaking its vengeance or working its will in any respect in which it is authorized so to do. But we are pleading that it perform its own functions and not those of another branch of the Government.

Before you vote, please read these authorities, directly in point:

Humphrey's Executor v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602); *Meyers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52); *Morgan* v. *T. V. A.* (115 Fed. 2d 990, certiorari denied 61 Sup. Ct. Rep. 806); Opinion of Attorney General Mitchell (37 Opinions of Atty. Gen. 56, 61).

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in ordinary circumstances, I certainly would not trespass the proprieties by speaking out of order in connection with general debate on an appropriation bill. I do so only because right soon a bill now in preparation in the Committee on Deficiency Appropriations with an estimate of $350,000,000 will come to this House which is designed to provide for foreign relief. In the not distant future there will probably be on the floor of this House a bill dealing with relief for Greece and Turkey. It is only in the interest of emphasizing the attention these problems must necessarily receive that I do trespass upon your time this morning.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—A NEW FOREIGN POLICY

We are confronted with a new foreign policy.

It is embodied in 28 words.

It is the essence of the President's message.

Most of the message deals with the Greek request for aid, the reasons for the request, what might happen if aid is denied, and, finally, the kind of assistance to be rendered.

But it is the three-line statement of policy which is the nub of the President's message.

It states in brief that:

> I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

At once certain questions arise: What peoples? How many? What will it cost? What is included in the term "attempted subjugation"? What is meant by outside pressures? Where does this policy take us? Is it realistic? Will there be firm adherence to it if it is carried into action? How will other nations react? What about Russia?

These are but some of the questions which immediately spring to mind.

APPLICATION OF THE POLICY

Obviously, the President refers to the militant Communist minority in Greece.

But there are also armed minorities in Korea, China, Iran, and elsewhere. The President's reference to "outside pressures" must mean Soviet needling and economic pressures on small nations in the Soviet orbit.

It embraces what might be called psychological aggression.

At the San Francisco Conference in 1945 former President Hoover suggested that the United Nations take account of psychological aggression. It was then waved aside. Now it is on our doorstep and precipitates a crisis.

In general, this new policy would apply to Communist expansion in small nations too weak and unequipped to successfully resist.

To these, in all parts of the world, the President now offers assistance in behalf of the people of the United States.

AREA OF AGREEMENT

In general our people will applaud a spirited resistance to communism.

It is the avowed enemy of our free system.

Lenin and Stalin have made it abundantly clear that the two systems cannot live together in the same world.

They regard us as imperialistic.

American policy must necessarily take account of this sharp conflict.

But all this must be considered against the background of recent history.

SOME BACKGROUND

Not so long ago this Nation was assisting communism.

Eleven billions of lend-lease supplies went to the Soviet Union.

Yugoslavia received thirty-two million and Greece seventy-one million.

A misguided UNRRA program, badly administered, directly aided and strengthened communism.

Of the $2,700,000,000 of UNRRA aid provided by the taxpayers of this Nation, four hundred and eighty-five million went to China, four hundred and forty million to Poland, three hundred and ninety million to Yugoslavia, three hundred and eighty-five million to Italy, three hundred and thirty million to Greece, two hundred and fifty million to Czechoslovakia, two hundred and thirty million to Byelo-Russia and the Ukraine, one hundred and ten million to Austria, and twenty-five million to Albania.

Since VJ-day, lend-lease aid on a long-term, reimbursable basis has been made available. France received three hundred and ninety-two million and Russia two hundred and thirty-nine million. In addition, substantial loans have been made by the Export-Import Bank.

How fantastic it all appears now as I look back upon the action taken in July 1945 on the bill to expand the capital of the Export-Import Bank. At that time I offered an amendment which read as follows:

> *Provided*, That none of the powers granted herein may be exercised with respect to any country (including political subdivisions, persons, organizations, and business firms, corporate or otherwise, owing allegiance thereto) unless such country has adhered and continues to adhere to and is faithfully observing the first three principles of the joint declaration of the President of the United States and the British Prime Minister, otherwise known as the Atlantic Charter, as set forth in the message of the President of the United States to the Congress of the United States under date of August 21, 1941: *Provided further*, That, if any such country is in the enjoyment of any aggrandizement obtained subsequent to its adherence to the said Atlantic Charter and contrary to the principles thereof, such country may qualify for benefits hereunder by divesting itself of such aggrandizement: *Provided further*, That the certificate of the President of the United States that such country meets the requirements hereof shall be conclusive.

In brief, that amendment would prohibit loans to any nation, which did not faithfully adhere to the freedoms which were assured in the Atlantic Charter.

It would have denied loans to any country which had violated the principle of self-determination set forth in the Atlantic Charter and was designed to protect small nations against aggression.

It was a modest effort to prevent American dollars from undoing the work of dead American GI's, but singularly enough it failed.

All of our previous policies in terms of money have served to strengthen and entrench communism.

The latest available report from Communist Party headquarters in London indicates that in Italy the party has 2,000,000 members, 108 seats in Parliament, and 4 memberships in the Cabinet. In Austria the party has 150,000 members, 4 seats in Parliament, 1 member in the Cabinet. In Bulgaria the party had 450,000 members and 278 seats in Parliament. In Czechoslovakia it boasts 1,000,000 members and 115 seats in Parliament. In Hungary it has 650,000 members and 70 seats in Parliament. In Rumania it claims 500,000 members, 68 seats in Parliament, and 4 memberships in the Cabinet. In Poland it claims 600,000 members and scored more than 9,000,000 votes in the recent election. In Yugoslavia it boasts 100,000 members and gained 6,725,000 votes in the last election. It is in complete control. In Albania it also has complete control.

Here are the beneficiaries of American aid. In many cases they have established complete total government and are directly allied with the Soviet Union.

Our reproof of Bulgaria for holding an undemocratic election was little more than a light tap on the wrist.

Our note to Poland in protest of an unfree election marked by Communist

terrorism was nothing more than a mild note.

Yalta and Potsdam made concessions to communism.

Releasing the secrets of atomic energy to the Communists was seriously considered by the administration.

There has been appeasement at every turn.

Now we are confronted with a sudden show of resistance.

What shall we believe? What shall the people believe? Will this be a sincere and genuine effort or is it political in character?

THE SITUATION AT HOME

Until this good hour, the present administration has shown but a mild interest in eradicating communism at home.

Sincere and genuine resistance to Red fascism, like charity, must begin at home.

The record reveals no such effort.

There are Communists in Government today.

The Personnel Division of the Treasury Department testified before the Appropriations Committee that charges were made against 352 persons in that Department—page 268 of the hearings—but only one hearing was held on such charges.

There are Communists in certain labor organizations today.

The Communist Party has actively supported the Democratic administration.

Only a single day before the President's message did a responsible administration official speak on the subject.

Secretary Schwellenbach called for the outlawry of the Communist Party.

Even that suggestion was so timed to tinge it with political suspicion.

Anticommunism was the greatest single force in the elections of November 1946.

Its implications were not lost on the administration. If the administration means business, why are vigorous anti-Communist measures so long in coming?

This ideological malady cannot be successfully resisted abroad until we are completely cured at home. The President's first Loyalty Commission has had 4 months to do something. Little has been done. On Saturday last, there has come a new Executive order and a new Board. Will it achieve more substantial results or must it be done by legislative flat?

WHAT LIES AHEAD

Appeasement of communism at home and abroad has shaken confidence in the administration.

It now proposes an about-face.

But, is it real? The Congress and the country want definite assurances on that point. The record of the past is too revealing.

If succor for free peoples against armed minorities and outside pressures shall be our policy, there must be some evidence of good faith before the Congress and the country embrace such a policy.

Some pertinent questions suggest themselves.

Who will be selected to administer this aid? To place food and supplies, valued at hundreds of millions of dollars, purchased with funds from the pockets of American taxpayers, at the disposal of intellectual pinks and misguided liberals will mean that communism will be strengthened, not stopped. This Nation is interested in firm and long range results and wants no more experiences like that of Yugoslovia where more than $400,000,000 worth of United States aid has assisted Tito in maintaining a huge army with which to provoke the very problem in Greece to which the President now directs attention in his message.

Do we propose to meekly submit to Soviet falsehoods in the press and over the radio or do we speak our minds?

How shall this new policy be translated into action? Does it call for a broad delegation of power to be used by certain persons as they think best, no matter what the views of the Congress and the country may be, or shall the policy be reduced to writing and then adhered to as an assurance to those who pay for this policy and this assistance, that it is being carried out?

Does this become another costly goodwill binge without tangible benefits, or do we at long last become realistic and in return for this aid request certain concessions such as naval bases, air rights, travel privileges, the elimination of trade and exchange controls? Communism is not resisted for a day or a week or a month. We are embarking on a long range policy which may lead us into strange and devious paths and it must be implemented in realistic fashion.

What have we to show for more than $350,000,000 of lend-lease and UNRRA aid to Greece? The very request which is the basis for the present so-called crisis indicates an impoverished, unstable country swept by inflation and powerless to deal with an armed minority estimated at 400,000 Communists. To add additional hundreds of millions would be like bailing out the ocean unless there is an immediate reordering of exchange and the stabilization of currency so that a thin crust at the top does not become the principal beneficiary of our largess.

How many persons is it proposed to send and who are they? Shall we have another experience like UNRRA when mental misfits, indolent adventurers, and hypersensitive pinks squandered billions of American funds?

How carefully has this estimate of Greek and Turkish needs been considered, or does it contain jokers? The people would not like it if, for example, certain quantities of powdered milk at an estimated cost of 23 cents per pound was considered for shipment to these countries when it might be purchased for half that amount.

These are but some of the questions for which there must be adequate answers and they at once suggest a course of action. Once before the Congress delegated broad lend-lease powers to a President which developed many strange and unanticipated results and which will cost this Nation billions of dollars with little to show for it.

Yes, there was a victory, but the President's own message now makes it appear that while we have dispatched a black dictator, we have nurtured a red one. Otherwise, why this message and this crisis?

A COURSE OF ACTION

Resisting communism at home or abroad is no child's play. It requires strong, purposeful, and coordinated action. The following suggestions should be considered for incorporation in any proposal to authorize the expenditure of funds of United States taxpayers for this purpose:

First. The amount authorized should be determined after a most careful and critical examination of the needs and purposes to be served. Waste has become a settled habit in the field of international relief and must be halted. Our own survival in a desperate world is a matter of primary consideration, and we cannot continue forever dissipating the assets and resources of this country. Wherever possible, war surplus supplies, material, commodities, and equipment should be utilized to reduce the cash outlay that might be involved.

Second. There should be a proviso that all goods and commodities for relief shipment should be purchased in the United States.

Third. A commission should be created to administer this aid composed of men experienced in the field of business, economics, and finance and the members thereof should be confirmed by the Senate.

Fourth. There should be a requirement that no aid shall be furnished until a clear and reasonable detailed statement of what is proposed to be done and how it is to be done shall have been prepared in writing and submitted to the Congress for information and study. Congress should seriously consider the creation of a Congressional Advisory Committee to provide constant and sustained oversight of this policy.

Fifth. There should be a requirement that all goods be shipped in American vessels.

Sixth. There should be a requirement that negotiations be instituted with Greek and Turkish authorities for long-term air rights, naval bases, trade concessions, and travel privileges. Is this asking too much? What would Britain or Russia do under similar circumstances?

Seventh. There should be a proviso placing a definite limit on the number of persons to be sent to Greece and Turkey for the administration of this aid, and each person so designated should be required to submit to a loyalty test.

Eighth. Insofar as United States assistance might be regarded as relieving Great Britain of any responsibilities there should be a requirement that all Greek and Turkish credits and balances in London should be freed from all exchange restrictions so that these countries might convert sterling balances into dollars for the purchase of American goods. In the case of Turkey, there should be a reexamination of her assets to determine whether aid from the International Bank might be utilized.

Ninth. There should be a requirement for commitments of adequate newspaper space and radio time with which the United States might tell its story to the people of Greece and Turkey.

Tenth. Revamping of the currency systems of these two countries should be one of the conditions of the loan and should be attended by a vigorous stamping out of black markets under heavy penalties.

It is common knowledge that large quantities of UNRRA funds and commodities went into the black market for the enrichment of speculators.

Eleventh. Consideration should be given to the adoption by the beneficiary countries of a repayment tax. Corollary thereto there should be a definite understanding with respect to any outstanding loans against the Greek Government, in the nature of a moratorium, so that her economy will not be too heavily burdened by repayments on those obligations.

IN CONCLUSION

There should be an evidence of complete good faith in respect of this new policy by an immediate vigorous all-out drive on communism at home.

What shall it profit us to resist communism abroad and lose freedom at home?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, there are many who think the task of a member of the Committee on Appropriations is very easy. It is in fact one of the most difficult, as all who have served in that capacity will have to admit. It is extremely difficult at this time, more so, perhaps, than it has been for the past 14 years, because we have been engaged in an ever-expanding system of spending, deficit spending, reckless spending, spending to get into and out of the depression, spending to get into and out of a war, spending to get into a peacetime program.

Let us just consider for a moment whether or not we are willing to approach this proposition from the standpoint that the people of this country are demanding that we approach it, from a realistic standpoint. Let us see what has happened all during these years with reference to these various items that are covered by this bill. Let me give you a few figures in order that we may be realistic. Every bureau, every agency that appears before the committee considers that it and its functions and services are the most important of any connected with the Federal Government. They are indispensable, according to these bureaucrats, and they want even more money. They have grown like Topsy, just grown up until they have mushroomed beyond the realization of the people. Let us see for a moment what these figurers have been doing.

Take the office of Secretary of Labor and the salaries of that office. In 1938 the salaries for that office were $323,500; in 1947, $1,083,686. We have allowed in this bill $819,500, almost three times as much as the salary item for 1938.

Then take salaries and expenses. For the office of Secretary of Labor in 1941 they were $78,940, and last year, 1947 fiscal, $1,075,775. The item provided in our bill is $755,300. Then let us look at the next item in the bill, contingent expenses. In 1938 that item was appropriated for at the amount of $115,000. In 1947 it had grown to $681,316. Our bill provides for $468,400. Traveling expenses in the office of Secretary of Labor were $680,800 in 1938, and in 1947 they had mushroomed and grown to $3,017,757. That item in our bill is fixed at $2,112,400. Take printing and binding in that same office, the office of Secretary of Labor. In 1938 it was $253,560. In 1947 it was more than double that amount, $518,388. Our bill provides for that item at $414,700. Penalty mail in 1945 was $107,763. In 1947 it was five times that amount, $551,925. Our bill is fixed at $119,700.

So we go on. Then we have the Conciliation Service about which there has been so much talk. In 1938 that item of appropriation was $275,000. In 1947 they had $2,583,976. We have heard much talk about the appropriation for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in the office of Secretary of Labor. I invite your attention to the fact that in 1938 the appriation for that year, for this function, was $784,000, but in 1947 it was $5,517,465. We fix the figure in the bill at $3,373,400.

I could go on indefinitely and show that there is no end, apparently, to what will be asked. I invite your attention to some wise sayings, or sayings of wisdom, by the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, in an address he delivered some months ago to the chamber of commerce at Asheville, N. C. Listen to what Mr. Warren said:

> The States are now, for the most part, in excellent financial condition. Their budgets, unlike that of the Federal Government, are in balance, and most of them have comfortable reserves. If the States will assert their leadership in their proper sphere, there will be less incentive for further expansion of Federal power.

But the weaning time has come, and it is a difficult task to wean the bureaucrats.

Here is another statement made by Mr. Warren:

> I, for one, still believe that there are important functions to be exercised by the States and their subdivisions. There are highly proper and necessary contributions that the Federal Government should make, but if the States, in order to obtain Federal funds, surrender too many of their rights and functions to the Federal Government, something very precious, something very valuable and democratic, and something uniquely American will have gone out of our public service. The danger is that our people, looking to Washington indiscriminately for aid, will sell their political birthright for a mess of Federal pottage.

We have come to the weaning time. That is always a difficult time, in politics as well as elsewhere. We have come to the time when we must wean the bureaucrats, and the public is demanding that. That is what they said on November 5. I for one shall vote to wean as many of them as possible to keep our Government American and from becoming communistic, and we all know that it has been tending that way a long time ago. Let us not be deceived. Everyone likes the Government's protection, Government aid. We have been spoon feeding, we have been nursing the bureaucrats too long. There is no record in history of any human being who wanted to be weaned away from Government aid. They get a taste of it, and it is almost impossible to get them off of it.

Many years ago former United States Senator Robert L. Owen, one of the first Senators from the State of Oklahoma, one of the authors of the bill creating the great financial institution that largely controls our Government today, the Federal Reserve System, a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, a man who had few equals and no superiors when it came to statesmanship, a man who now has seen 91 summers but is still intellectually brilliant, the recent inventor of the Global alphabet, when he saw this danger approaching made a statement that may sound crude coming from a statesman, as he was, I say, and may sound a little commonplace. Nevertheless it is illustrative of the weaning time that has approached. Senator Owen in speaking on the point that we are now discussing, of weaning people from the Federal pay roll, referred to a 6-foot boy 16 years old chasing his mother through the cornfield and howling, "Damn her hide, she's trying to wean me." That is the point we have arrived at right now. That is why we are being damned, if you please, by some of our brethren who have long been promoting this program. They are damning our hides because we have called the weaning time.

Here is a statement from a man who recently delivered a speech which most of you got in the mail this morning, Paul M. Millians, vice president of the Commercial Credit Corp., of Baltimore, Md., before the annual meeting of the Council of State Chartered Building, Savings, and Loan Associations of Maryland. He said:

> Please understand, however, we are not condemning all Government aid.

Neither are we.

> There are great and deserving needs which Government must support * * * many demands for public aid have strong emotional appeal.
>
> No one here is without sympathy for the social unfortunate and we are all willing to provide a floor for these high enough to violate no one's self-respect. We can all think with deep emotion about the Nation's obligation to the returned veteran, we can think with still deeper emotion about those who did not return and about their loved ones who weep. The hunger and despair of peoples in war * * * devastated nations of the world pull at our hearts.
>
> But national solvency comes ahead of all claims against the Federal Treasury. About public debt we must be cold, dispassionate, rational. We cannot feel about public debt, we must think.

Now we think that the weaning time has come. Let us wean the bureaucrats. They are old enough to wean. Most of them have been in the Government for 14 years. Let us not be afraid that they will upbraid us. The people elected us to do the job. Let us acquit ourselves like true representatives and get back to peacetime appropriations of figures such as I have referred to and could refer to in many other instances.

We have a bill here, Mr. Chairman, that in my humble opinion is too high and not too low. The figures should be further reduced.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am rather amazed at the extent to which the Republican Party has gone in its efforts to circumscribe the rights of labor. When I refer to labor, I mean all labor, organized and unorganized. There are something like 55,000,000 workers in the United States. I hope they take cognizance of what has been going on under the auspices of the Republican Party in this Congress.

Why this onslaught against labor? Why this apparent coordinated effort to restrict the activities and the rights of labor by denying sufficient funds to carry on the work of the Conciliation Service, the Vocational Training Service, the United States Employment Service, the National Labor Relations Board, and many other functions of the Labor Department? This is not the first attempt that has been made in this session of Congress to cripple the functions of the Government dealing with labor or to deny the rights of labor. So the question naturally poses itself—why this concerted efforts on the part of our Republican friends?

The Conciliation Service has done a great deal of good in the prevention and settling of labor disputes—thousands of them each year—not given publicity in the papers because they have been handled silently and efficiently. Mind you, these crippling actions are being carried forth at a time when all of the functions of the Federal Government leading to the prevention and settlement of labor disputes are so fundamentally necessary. I am constrained to say that the workingman today is being persecuted on all sides. Restrictive labor legislation is being proposed which would prevent him from exercising his natural rights as a workingman for the protection of his family. Adequate funds are being denied the agencies of the Government which have as their prime purpose the handling of labor disputes, at the same time that this Congress has failed to reduce the cost of living and to enable labor to achieve a proper living wage, which was suddenly taken from it when the war ended. Let us not forget that when we are talking about doing something to lessen labor disputes and to keep labor relations harmonious a negative position is not sufficient. The important thing is to take a positive position and do something for the welfare of labor. People who are persecuted—and I use this word advisedly—such as are labor families today by the majority of the Congress, make fertile soil for the growth of radical doctrines.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it would really start beginning to get amusing if it were not so serious to listen to our friends on the Republican side make the speeches that they are making. They started out with a 20 percent cut across the board for the wealthy income-tax payers. Now they have been forced to make a mild concession with a few crumbs. Then they got tied up on the matter of a six billion or a four and a half billion dollar budget reduction and now cannot get out of it. The bill has been in conference for several weeks.

While I do not know how many times the Republican members of the conference committee have met, there has been but one meeting of the full conference committee.

Now we hear the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] standing in the well of the House weeping crocodile tears for economy. Yet, he introduced a soldiers' bonus bill which would cost the people billions of dollars. Yet, with reference to a few millions of dollars which mean so much to labor, organized and unorganized, they would wipe that out which would have serious effects upon the Conciliation Service, upon the National Labor Relations Board, agencies of government which are of great importance to both management and labor. The gentleman argues vigorously how strong he is for economy.

Only the other day I heard my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who is now in the chair, whom I personally like, and who I believe is a great legislator, argue against false economy. But then when my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], took the floor and warned the Republican Members about the $6,000,000,000 cut which they have promised the American people to make in President Truman's budget, my friend, the gentleman from Kansas, on a bill costing twelve to fifteen million dollars more to keep foreign labor in the United States, argued it would be false economy if the bill did not pass. I voted with him.

I thought it was all right. If it is all right for him to argue false economy, then it is all right for us to argue false economy in this case. I say he and other Republicans have caught themselves in a trap on the $6,000,000,000 cut.

I wonder how they are going to reconcile that. I wonder when the projects come in later and when the Committee on Appropriations cuts them out and our Republican friends stand in the well of the House and cry for assistance, what are we going to say and what are we going to think? You have caught yourselves in a beautiful trap. On the roll call vote on the measure which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] so brilliantly led the fight, and I was with him, you will find outside of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], all of the Republican leaders voted for the bill. Only two outstanding Republican leaders——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I am no leader.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Oh, of course you are a leader. The gentleman is chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments. That automatically makes the gentleman a leader. Whether his party likes him as a leader or not, we admit the gentleman is one of the outstanding, although probably one of the most annoying leaders of the Republican Party—annoying to his own party.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did I annoy you any yesterday?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Now, the gentleman is my chairman and I do not want my chairman to lessen himself in my eyes. I place you among the leaders of the Republican Party and you cannot escape your responsibility.

Let us see what the majority party is doing in this bill. By "majority party," let us call names; the Republicans. Well, they are practically wiping out the effectiveness of the Conciliation Service. They take away 100 employees, top officials included, and then they say they cannot be replaced. Some of those officials have been there for 37 years. One of the officials has been in the Department of Labor 37 years. Another man has been in the Federal service 39 years, 8 years of which was in the Department of Labor. Another man has been in the Federal service for 29 years, in the Department of Labor. So it is men of experience of that type who are being eliminated. They cannot be replaced even by other persons. We placed a veto upon replacements at the hands of the executive department.

Then, we have the National Labor Relations Board. Half of its appropriations are cut, and at a time when there is greater demand for their services; at a time when we are having hearings before the Labor Committee. They are going to report out a bill. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] said the other day it is not going to be a punitive measure. I believe him. I do not know what it will be when it gets through this House, in which I have seen coalitions work. I have seen them work before. No matter what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] intends, no matter what his committee reports, I predict it is going to be a far different bill when it gets through this House than when it comes into the House, if there are not punitive measures contained in this bill against labor and I hope there will not be.

Now, for all practical purposes they are wiping out the Conciliation Service.

We have labor troubles in Massachusetts—differences between labor and management. Every State is trying to explore to see what can be done. We are all Americans. We realize that labor and management have to live together, and the public interest has to be served. In Massachusetts we have a problem. The present Governor, Governor Bradford, a Republican by politics, appointed a committee to investigate and report recommendations to him in relation to labor legislation. That committee is known as the Slechter committee, and is composed of Mr. Sumner H. Slechter, of Harvard, Mr. Douglas V. Brown, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Father Thomas E. Shortell of the Holy Cross College, and several others. That committee made a unanimous report to Governor Bradford only recently. I have that report before me and the recommendation of Governor Bradford to the Massachusetts Legislature. What is the main thing they report? "New

and stronger conciliation service, which gives new opportunities and new responsibilities to employers and trade unionists; and new arbitration service of assured competence and impartiality." Governor Bradford in his message to the legislature called this conciliation service the Magna Carta of labor-management good-will relations.

We have in Massachusetts a Republican Governor and a Republican legislature recommending a strong conciliation service. We have here in the Federal Capitol a Republican-controlled House, recommending practically the abolition of the effectiveness of the conciliation service that has been in existence for some years in the Federal Government. Management has all testified to the fine character of service rendered by the Conciliation and Mediation Service.

The National Labor Relations Board is handling itself in an excellent manner and at a time when we need them. Their appropriation is cut in half, practically wiping away the effectiveness of the National Labor Relations Board to give even a minimum of service to both management and labor when disputes arise.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] said a few moments ago, the record is being laid for the country. They, the Republicans, are in control, but they have to answer. Political parties must lie in the political bed they make, just the same as all other persons in public life.

We have got to take the consequences of our acts. We see this pattern being set up with the cloth being cut to fit into the picture of the vested few of this country: The 20-percent-across-the-board tax reduction; cutting down the statute of limitations in suits over wages and hours to 1 year; this indirect attack upon the agencies that are of great importance to the workingmen and the workingwomen, not alone the organized but the unorganized. We find this whole pattern, and the record might as well carry the fact.

I realize the chances are that nothing will be done in this body. Under the hysteria of attacking a man they expect to get it over. I know a prominent Republican who occupies a high position, who was the governor of a great Commonwealth—and I admire him. He became a member of an organization the nature of which he did not know, but he resigned only a few months ago. That man knew nothing about the real purposes of the organization—and he comes from Massachusetts and is a man whom I respect very, very much. That man said he did not know what he had joined and I believed him. I met another man 12 years ago when I was chairman of a special committee investigating communism, nazism, fascism, and bigotry. I was in New York and we came across a prominent judge of New York City who belonged to a bigoted organization. I called him in. I asked him if he belonged to this organization. He said, "Yes, I do." I asked him if he knew what the organization was. He said he did from the constitution. I said, "That is what I thought; you did not know what the real purposes of this organization were and I thought you did not know. You joined an organization with a fine patriotic constitution without making a special investigation as to the character of the leadership." I said, "Forget it, it will not be made public." Yet, if I had followed the tactics of some others I would have made his name public and he would have been branded as a member of a bigoted organization, smeared in the press, and his reputation ruined. I wanted more evidence than that to convict a man of being a member of a bigoted organization. The man was well known, one of the chief jurists of New York City. I do not know whether he is alive today or not.

A number make mistakes, sometimes, of joining organizations and then finding the objectives such that we are not in agreement with them and withdraw. That happens. Men join organizations without knowing, and when they find out certain things they withdraw. We have one of the Justices of the Supreme Court who did that, yet he has developed into one of the soundest Justices of the Supreme Court, a man whose opinions on civil liberties are absolutely sound. In my own mind I started out being critical of him, but he has made a great reputation for himself; and he said he did not know the real purpose of the organization when he joined it. Those things can happen in the case of others. It could happen in the case of this man Warren. But outside of that, assuming he is guilty of everything, why destroy the Conciliation Service? Why for all practical purposes destroy the Conciliation and Mediation Service by writing into the bill language which prevents those hundred employees and top officials of this agency from being replaced in case under present circumstances they have to be let go.

And so, Mr. Chairman, this talk about economy; yes, we have the case of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE], with his bill. We have the case of my friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. I was with him. We have others. It will be interesting to make a survey of the bills introduced by the Members of this House requiring the appropriation of money, introduced by those who voted for the $6,000,000,000 cut, to find out what bills they have introduced and how much they will cost the taxpayers if they become law.

Yes; economy. I say to the Members of the House and particularly to my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], that it is false economy, as he said it was false economy only a few weeks ago, to fail to put through an extension for 6 months permitting alien labor, foreign labor to remain in the United States and to make the appropriations therefor. I joined with you in that action. I say it is false economy to make these drastic cuts that are carried in this bill at the expense of the workingman and the workingwoman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to say anything at this time in connection with this bill, but I trust that the committee will indulge me if I dwell upon cuts in an appropriation bill that has previously passed the House. I think what is now happening is of more than passing concern to all the Members without regard to which side of the aisle they sit on.

It has been brought to my attention through the press as to what is happening now at the ports of entry, chiefly in New York, San Francisco, and Detroit, and along the entire Canadian border as the result of the—should I say looseness?—in prescribing cuts in order to arrive at what our Republican friends term economy. Not so long ago the Board of Commerce and the merchants of Detroit appealed to me to protect the merchants and the businessmen throughout the Nation against the uncontrolled influx of goods from Canada. We of the Committee on Ways and Means, prescribed an effective rule, and it became part of the customs law. Today, regardless of the law, by the elimination of customs guards along the border and in the ports of entry this country faces a deluge of foreign goods and the entry, by the way, of perhaps unwanted illegal immigrants. The situation is very drastic, very dangerous, and I want to protest this unwarranted, this senseless economy as prescribed by the Committee on Appropriations.

I want to say to you that I think the Committee on Appropriations does not know enough about it all to justify what they have done in the past. The situation is desperate. It is a dangerous situation which exists, and it ought to be corrected promptly. I want to say on this occasion that unless the committee treats these subjects with more care and diligence and with greater intelligence and foresight, the time will come when the Committee on Appropriations will be abolished, as I have advocated for a long time, and its functions reinvested in the legislative committees who know more about the subject matter covered by appropriations. This is one outstanding example of a condition created by the Committee on Appropriations in its desperation to arrive at what they call economy, which is working against the best interest of the American merchant, the taxpayer, and against the citizens generally.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is that I read in the paper yesterday, I believe, that as the result of this drastic reduction in appropriations, that at the port of New York the personnel would be reduced from 840 to 100 persons.

Mr. DINGELL. I understand that is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. They are maintaining only a skeleton organization in that important office.

Mr. DINGELL. That is right, and it will permit smugglers and dope peddlers in New York and elsewhere to operate as they please. The condition of demoralization is going to be general, because

the cut is drastic from one end of the country to the other.

Another thing I want to touch upon is the unwarranted cut affecting the Internal Revenue Department and the special agents charged with the responsibility of recovering millions of dollars in taxes due the Government from tax evaders. Preliminary work of these highly trained specialists in tax-evasion work indicates possible recovery of over $600,000,000, which is being jeopardized by an appropriations cut of less than one-twentieth or thirtieth of the amount to be recovered. This is not economy, but rank injustice to the Treasury and to the honest taxpayers. I am told that estimates of recovery for the next 2 years from this source amounts to four or five billions of dollars. I will have more to say on these matters later.

EXAMPLES OF TAX EVADERS WHO MIGHT IN THE FUTURE ESCAPE DETECTION IF THE INVESTIGATIVE STAFF OF THE BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE SHOULD BE REDUCED

An oyster packer, operating in the Chesapeake Bay area, acquired oyster beds either by lease, or from the State, or by purchase of leases from other dealers. During the slack period when oysters were plentiful and the market was low, he would buy all the oysters he could get and then have them dumped overboard on one of his oyster beds, where they could be readily dredged or tonged when very few oysters were coming into packing houses from other sources. When they were purchased and dumped overboard, the prevailing price was between 50 cents to $1 per bushel, but when the price rose to $3 or $4 per bushel, they were redredged and sold at the prevailing market price. Investigation disclosed that the oysters were charged to purchases on the books of the packer at the current market price when redredged, thus overstating purchases by the difference between the price when actually dumped and the market price when taken up. Additional tax and penalties of over $27,000 were levied in this case.

Alex Steinberg, of Dallas, Tex., was one of the most important figures in the liquor trade in the Southwest. He was charged on four counts with attempted evasion of his and his wife's income taxes, amounting to almost three-quarters of a million dollars for the single year 1943. Testimony in his trial brought out that Steinberg dealt in enormous quantities of whisky, the payments for which were frequently shipped to him by express in the form of currency. Steinberg was found guilty as charged, and reports by newspapers in the Dallas area indicate that this conviction had had a very salutary effect on potential tax evaders throughout the Southwest.

In 1934 a promoter was convicted in the Fulton County, Ga., Criminal Court on three counts of larceny after trust and two counts of violations of the Georgia securities laws, and sentences of from 2 to 3 years on each count, to run consecutively, were imposed. After slightly more than 2½ years imprisonment, he obtained a pardon from Governor Talmadge and moved to Miami, Fla. Said to have been insolvent at the time, he first found employment as a parking lot attendant, and later as an electrical appliance salesman. In 1939 he entered the real estate field and organized several corporations that developed vacant properties by erecting groups of store buildings and theaters, which upon completion were rented or sold. Using borrowed funds he also dealt extensively in bonds of Florida East Coast Railroad which were depressed because of the road's financial straits prior to the war. With a group of associates he has gained representation on the boards of directors of the Missouri, Kansas & Texas, Chicago & Eastern Illinois, and Chicago & Great Western Railways. His battle for control of the first-named, and his plan for consolidating the three carriers into a Great Lakes to Gulf system, have been nationally publicized. Investigation of this individual and two of his corporations disclosed additional taxes and penalties of approximately $173,000 to be due.

A Kentucky doctor was in the penitentiary from 1932 through 1936 as the result of a conviction of violating the narcotic laws. After being released from the penitentiary he began an abortionist business in Covington, Ky., and was able to make contacts with several prominent doctors in Cincinnati who assisted him by furnishing him with prospective clients. This doctor was found to have 15 different bank accounts or building and loan savings accounts in different banks and associations, all under assumed names. No other assets of any consequence were discovered, and it is not believed that any other assets existed, inasmuch as the doctor, due to the nature of his business, was afraid to list his assets under a correct name, thus laying himself liable for civil action in those cases where his abortions may have been a failure. Investigation found assets totaling $140,000 and additional tax for the years 1937 through 1945 was assessed in the amount of $71,938.

A notorious operator of a policy-numbers racket in the St. Louis area was subject to tax deficiencies and fraud penalties in the amount of $224,471 for the years 1942 through 1945. This man maintained no records and investigation had to be based on other sources of information. It was finally proven that this man received large amounts of currency in connection with his operations which he failed to report on his tax returns. He had accumulated a large amount of net worth but had reported only nominal income.

An individual operated a wholly owned corporation and a sole proprietorship on the black market in nylon yarn and hosiery. The total income tax paid by the corporation and his individual business amounted to $68.19 whereas the aggregate taxes due for the years investigated exceeded $112,000. Before the investigation was completed, the individual died and after appointment of his wife as executrix for her husband's estate two safe-deposit boxes were located in New York, N. Y., one of which contained $107,345 and the other $76,750, all in cash. An additional safe-deposit box maintained by the taxpayer where he resided in Philadelphia, Pa., yielded $2,370 in cash. This cash no doubt represented the proceeds of the taxpayer's sales in the black market. Upon the discovery of the funds in question, the taxpayer's representatives consented to the payment of the additional taxes previously mentioned.

One of the largest fraud cases developed during the drive against tax evaders was that of the Longchamps Restaurants in New York City, headed by Henry Lustig, who started his career many years ago behind the handles of a pushcart. There were four codefendants in the case, namely, his nephew, E. Allen Lustig, secretary of the seven Longchamps corporations; Joseph Sobel, certified public accountant; Wallace Platt, office manager; and Platt's brother, Martin, the restaurant king's bookkeeper.

The fraud operations in this case consisted of keeping two sets of books—one "honest," the other "elaborately falsified"—the siphoning of approximately $2,000,000 in cash from the restaurant chain's tills into Lustig's personal safe deposit box, and Lustig's asserted pocketing of thousands of dollars in tips handed by customers to his attractive hatcheck girls.

The Platt brothers turned State's evidence and their sentences were suspended. Allen Lustig was sentenced to a prison term of 3 years, and Joseph Sobel, the chief accountant for the Lustig Enterprises, to a 2-year term. Henry Lustig was sentenced to 4 years on 22 counts for willful failure to defeat and evade taxes of the various corporations, the sentences to run concurrently, and was sentenced to 2 years on a conspiracy count to also run concurrent with the 4-year sentence, and to the payment of a fine of $115,000.

The total taxes and penalties in this case amounted to $7,726,124.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of today:

LOOKS LIKE POOR ECONOMY

We're as strong as ever for a big slash in the Truman $37,528,000,000 budget, and think from the debate on the subject up to now that radical cuts can be accomplished without damage to any of the Government's essential services.

We're still taking with plenty of salt the solemn warning of spend-and-spend New Dealers that disaster will follow if Congress forces the Government to come down a bit from the high level of luxurious living on which it has been riding during the New Deal era.

However, it does look as if the House pulled one boner, at least, in its recent approval of a slash of $80,000,000 in the Treasury Department's 1947–48 operating expenses.

Included in this reduction of Treasury spending money was a cut of $6,500,000 in the Customs Bureau's allowance. The Customs Bureau has charge, not only of collecting tariffs on goods coming into this country, but also of maintaining border patrols and other devices for keeping goods from being smuggled in without paying duty.

Because of this $6,500,000 Customs Bureau slash, about 1,600 of the Bureau's employees are in process of being let out, effective March 28, which is next Friday. Customs work at the key port of New York, where most legitimate tolls are paid, and most smugglers ply

their trade, will be crippled by this proposed cut.

Harry M. Durning, collector of the port of New York, now has a staff of 840 men engaged in this valuable work. Durning has been forced to notify 740 of his staff, including 600 war veterans, of their impending dismissal. This will leave America's greatest port with a skeleton force of 100 men.

According to John C. Tulloch, an old collector of the port and border-patrol organizer at the important boundary point of Ogdensburg, N. Y., these dismissals also will leave the Canadian border wide open to smugglers of all manner of contraband, and to illegal entry of aliens as well. Similar results are expected along the Mexican border.

The loss in revenues to the Government, if such a condition lasts any considerable length of time, will more than outweigh the cut of $6,500,000 in the Customs Bureau's allotment of funds for 1947-48.

Altogether, the House apparently made a bad mistake. It is made the more striking by the sudden and simultaneous expansion of the Civil Service Commission, which calls for between 2,500 and 3,000 extra investigators, in order to root disloyal and subversive employees from our Government pay roll.

We hope this project works. But, somewhere in the hiring-and-firing confusion, a serious injustice has been done our Customs Bureau, and it is one which ought to be rectified without delay.

The Senate can still perform this job, when it acts on the cost-cutting bill passed by the House. We hope the Senate will do just that, and plug these serious port and border leaks. It seems obvious that better ways to save money can be found than this one.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAYFIEL].

Mr. RAYFIEL. Mr. Chairman, I have read the report of the Appropriations Committee very carefully and cannot recall ever reading a report of a committee of this House which is so vindictive in its approach to the problem before it. It is well established that the Appropriations Committee has as its only function the consideration of legislation for the appropriation of money for the efficient functioning of the executive offices of the Government. In carrying out that function the committee must, of course, exercise judgment as to how those functions can be conducted most efficiently and economically. However, this does not give to the committee the power to direct the executive side of the Government as to how its functions should be carried out.

The report of the committee on the pretext of alleged maladministration by Director Warren recommends the virtual elimination of the entire administrative and supervisory staff of the Conciliation Service. If the report is adopted it will make the Conciliation Service a headless body.

Public, labor, and management representatives in the field of industrial relations are virtually unanimous in their belief that a strong conciliation and mediation service is the cornerstone of a sound government labor-relations policy. Although some of these groups may differ as to the method whereby that function should be carried out, they are all in accord with the basic principle that a strong conciliation service is essential in the maintenance of our free collective-bargaining system. It is, of course, fundamental that a strong conciliation function requires adequate and effective supervision, for without proper direction it is impossible to perform the conciliation and mediation functions efficiently and effectively.

The committee report recommending the elimination of the supervisory structure of the Conciliation Service is a repudiation of the virtually unanimous informed opinion that we should have a strong conciliation service. It is a repudiation of the unanimous recommendation of the President's Labor Management Conference that the Conciliation Service be strengthened. It is a repudiation of the recommendations of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee which participates on a regular periodic basis with the Conciliation Service in the program of building and strengthening the Service.

The committee's action is based upon charges made by disgruntled laid-off employees against Director Warren. These charges are preposterous on their face and are completely unfounded. They have been refuted by responsible public officials, such as Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, who was a former public member of the War Labor Board, and by five former public members of the War Labor Board under whom Mr. Warren served.

It has been charged that Mr. Warren has hired a group of high-priced WLB people to build up his organization. Let us look at the facts. Of the 30 grade 14 and 15 employees who may be affected by the proposed cut, only 5 were ever employed by the War Labor Board. Of the 7 regional directors whose jobs would be eliminated by the committee report, all were employed by the Department of Labor before Mr. Warren took office as Director of the Conciliation Service and none were employees of the Labor Board. Let us look at the records of these regional directors whom the committee would have thrown out:

Name	Years of Labor Department service	Total years of Federal service
Colwell, H. Ross	8	39
Cunningham, Edward J	37	37
Durham, Howard E	8	11
Marsh, E. P	29	29
Spillane, James J	6	6
White, William F	12	12
Williams, Clarence H	12	13

Under the committee's proposal, these 30 grade 14 and 15 employees having a total of 346 years of service in the Federal service, 254 years of which were in the Department of Labor, would be removed from Government office. These men have an average of 12 years in Government service. Is it wise governmental policy for us as Congressmen to wipe out this vast reservoir of experience when the public is demanding that we provide for a strong Conciliation Service? Upon what foundation are we to build if we eliminate this vast store of experience in government and labor-relations work?

The report of the committee is based upon distortion and misrepresentation of the transcript of the record. The sole reason given by the committee in its report for the elimination of the positions of regional director and assistant regional director is that in an office out of which work only three conciliators, there is no sense in having a regional director and an assistant regional director. The facts are that there are actually from 20 to 50 conciliators supervised out of each regional office with a regional director and an assistant regional director. This one misconception is sufficient to invalidate entirely the premise on which regional staffs were cut. Such unsoundness in the exercise of judgment on the part of the committee should cast doubt upon the merit of the whole report, particularly as it relates to the United States Conciliation Service.

These unfounded charges upon which the committee relies are merely being used as a smoke screen to cripple the Conciliation Service. If the report is adopted the Conciliation Service will be left a less-effective organization than it was before the President's labor-management conference.

The record of the Conciliation Service in the year and a half since Mr. Warren assumed office has been acclaimed by both labor and management representatives and by impartial experts in the field of industrial relations. In 90 percent of the disputes in which the Conciliation Service has been called in prior to work stoppages they have succeeded in closing the cases without a work stoppage occurring. This is a truly remarkable record when we consider the difficult problems which confronted the Service during this reconversion period from a war economy to a peace economy. That record was possible only because there was sound direction from on top and through the supervisory personnel in the field. Without supervision and close watching of key cases throughout the country, it is doubtful that this remarkable record could have been made. If we vote for an appropriation which contemplates that each conciliator go off on his own without any supervision or direction, we are voting for industrial chaos. We are voting for more strikes. I do not think the Congress wants more strikes. I know the people do not want them. I know the people expect us to provide means for peaceful settlement of strikes. This appropriation bill would defeat that purpose. Unless the funds for the office of the Director and his administrative and supervisory personnel are restored, the people of the country will know that this Congress has voted for industrial chaos and for more strikes.

The recommendation of the committee represents an attempt to usurp executive functions through an arbitrary use of its control over the Government's purse strings. It attempts to give the executive departments detailed instructions as to how the executive shall carry out its designated functions. Such an attempt is, of course, contrary to our basic constitutional concept of separation of powers.

I do not believe that the Congress desires to usurp the executive functions of the Government. I do not believe that the Congress desires to promote strikes.

I feel confident that the Congress will not adopt this irresponsible report.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, at this time I should like to protest the cut in the appropriations for the Veterans' Placement Service, as has been proposed by the majority members of the Appropriations Committee.

An examination of the hearings before the subcommittee reveals that this Veterans' Placement Service has done a singularly outstanding job in behalf of veterans. During the first 11 months of 1946 there was something in the neighborhood of 5,394,000 applications filed by veterans. Employment-counsel interviews to those veterans amounted to 952,000. Local job referrals of veterans were in the neighborhood of 4,231,000. The number of handicapped job seekers during the first 11 months of 1946 totaled more than 640,000 with approximately 400,000 of that number being disabled veterans. In addition to assistance to those there has been a steady increase in the activities of the employment counsel. Actual job placements directly attributable to the Veterans' Placement Service have been increasing each month, and the figures that we have show that 198,000 local placements of handicapped workers was made by this service during the first 11 months of 1946.

I would like at this point to read from the statement of Mr. Faulkner regarding this service, and I here quote:

> We know of no precise method of directly measuring the contribution which the activities of the public employment service has made to the economic well-being of this country. We have attempted, however, to make some conservative estimates from time to time of the importance of selected activities. For example, if we take the total number of nonagricultural placements, exclusive of short-time placements, made during the first 11 months of 1946 and make the assumption that the Employment Service has been responsible for shortening by only 1 week the duration of unemployment for the individuals placed, the savings to the State unemployment compensation funds, and to the Veterans' Administration servicemen's readjustment funds on the basis of average weekly benefits amounted to more than $50,000,000. If, in addition, account is taken of the fact that such placement activities resulted in an extra week of employment and earnings at the average weekly wage of $35, the additional wage payments to individuals would increase the national income by $150,000,000.

The veteran represents the biggest investment that this country has today. Many men are still being discharged from the service. Thousands of veterans are now getting out of colleges and schools. These men also represent the greatest productive factor that the United States has. It is important not only to them but to our economy and to the country as a whole that these young men are placed in worthwhile jobs and become self-supporting and productive. The Veterans' Placement Service has succeeded in a great measure in bringing this about thus far.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to see the appropriations for this service reduced in any way because this is the service that has given aid to the veteran who is not going to school under the GI bill of rights and who is not receiving his $20 for 52 weeks of unemployment. This agency is designed to assist those veterans who are anxious to become productive and useful citizens forthwith. It has rendered a great service thus far. It is entitled to our continued support. The veteran needs and wants the assistance of this agency, and this Congress will be practicing false economy if it does not grant to them the appropriation which has been requested.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee is using this appropriation bill to hamstring the Labor Department in the functions which have been assigned to it by the Congress and thus not only reducing the effectiveness of this Department, but placing the general welfare of the working people of this country at the mercy of the employers.

It goes further than that because it will cripple the Veterans' Employment Service, practically eliminates the Conciliation Service, and abolishes the Division of Labor Standards.

The Division of Labor Standards is a small division set up to carry out the over-all function of the Labor Department, which is to promote and foster the well-being of the workers of the United States. The Service is a clearinghouse for all types of labor information and administration to State labor departments, to labor, to management, to all groups that are interested in improving the working conditions. Through the work of this division, accident prevention has not only gained a foothold in this country, but already has made remarkable progress. It has not only saved lives and limbs of workers, but it also has saved millions of dollars to employers.

To eliminate this division completely is, to my mind, not sound economy but, rather, an expensive venture.

I can see in this action just a part of the over-all pattern which, when pieced together, will show that through anti-labor legislation and through the withholding of appropriations this Republican-controlled Congress is out to whip labor into submission to the whims of the employers. I regret to note that the majority party has decided on such a course.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to recommend a reduction in the amount going to the United States Employment Service, and particularly the service provided for veterans in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. This is one of the most worth-while laws we have passed for the benefit of the serviceman. It is being carried out in an efficient manner. All of the employees working under this service are quite busy and have produced excellent benefits in finding positions for veterans. The service should be strengthened—not reduced.

In the months ahead positions and jobs are going to be even more difficult for the veteran to find and therefore more veterans will be calling upon the Readjustment Service for assistance. And yet, in the face of this, we are trimming the personnel of this Service drastically. I am glad that an amendment will be offered to increase the funds for this service. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, we on numerous occasions have legislated when the Supreme Court, in the judgment of the Congress, has invaded the legislative field, such as just recently in the McNabb case, the Insurance case, and the case of Local 807, but jealous as we are in the protection of our prerogatives, it seems that we ought to be recognizing the prerogatives of another of the integrated branches of our Government.

We are endeavoring today to do by indirection that which the Supreme Court said not so long ago could not be done when we limited an appropriation so as to prevent any part of it from being applied to the salaries of three Governments officials that we did not feel ought to be on the pay roll. I voted for that limitation, albeit with grave apprehensions as to the legality of what we had done. But it certainly seems to me that now, when attention is going to be paid to the loyalty of people on the Federal pay roll, we should adopt another way of removing those people whose services are no longer desired.

I, for one, feel that Mr. Warren has outlived his usefulness. I am thoroughly convinced that his membership in two organizations which were branded by Francis Biddle as being subversive makes it impossible for that man to function satisfactorily in that position. On the one hand you will find management regarding him with suspicion. On the other hand you will find employees going farther than they might ordinarily do because of the belief they have in philosophies they think he might possess. It seems to me that if Mr. Warren is interested in the preservation of a service that means so much to the workers of America he will resign immediately, and if he does not resign I am thoroughly convinced that it will not be very long before he is separated from the service. However, I repeat what I said at the outset of these few brief remarks, we ought not invade a field that is not ours.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is very easy to understand why the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] works himself up into a sweat and wears out the carpet walking back and forth through the well of the House. All you need to do is go back over the record and recall the finding of the so-called Shepherd committee—a Democratic committee—in the other House, where they found that money appropriated by the Congress for the relief of the unfortunate

and the needy was being used for political purposes. That report was filed several years ago. The practice then condemned has continued to this day. All you need to do is recall the report of another committee of the same body about the political activities down in Kentucky, where money appropriated for the needy, for the unfortunate, was used to elect a Member of the upper House. During the last campaign Republicans promised economy. They promised to do what they could to get rid of government by bureaucrats. The first time we make a move to carry out those promises along come the Members of the minority side and complain of what we are doing. Why should we not keep our political promises? I know that is a novel doctrine to some of the gentleman on the other side. From the time when the New Dealers first came into power and repudiated the promises they made and which got them elected to office—within 6 months of the date they took office and from then right down to the present moment that party has had no idea of carrying out a campaign promise.

This is not a move to do something that should not be done. Whatever Mr. Warren may have believed in the past is at the moment to me of no concern. It is what they are doing now. Here is a letter dated March 22 from a constituent who is honest and straightforward. Listen to what this department, the Wage and Hour Division, is doing. Not last year; not 2, 5, 10 years ago but in March of 1947. Their representative went down to this industry. Here is the report from the employer:

At the end of the day he—

The Labor Department's representative—

had been able to find that we should have started paying overtime 2 months before we did, and so he requested us to make up the 2 months' back overtime. Up to this point, although we did not agree with the law, we had no fault to find as we want our employees to have all they are entitled to. Even though this may be more than our agreement called for, we will pay.

There is the statement of a man who is complying with the law and with the request of the Department. Then, what happened? This man from the Wage and Hour Division asked the employer if he could ask the employees some questions.

He had asked if he could visit the employees in the shop and was given permission to do so. He went out and asked them if they were satisfied with their jobs and asked them about their wages.

Now, get this:

He asked them if they had previously worked for another firm in St. Joe, to which they replied in the affirmative. He then said he thought he would be able to get them some extra money from this firm by which they were previously employed; and if they would get it, to remember who got it for them and to tell their friends.

For whom was he campaigning?

Now, what do you think of an employee paid by the taxpayers' money going out into the factory after he has settled all the questions which arose in that factory and after the employer has agreed to make all the payments suggested, going back to the men and women in the factory and saying, "For whom did you work before?" Of course, there was no complaint from anyone concerning that, but he said, "I will go over and see if I cannot get you some more money from your old employer." In other words, if that man were a lawyer, he would be disbarred and would not be permitted to practice. A Federal employee going around to factories in the country asking the employees if they work too hard and if they work too long, and if by some possibility they might not think that they were entitled to something—some additional compensation—from someone else. That is a practice which I understand has continued since 1937. And if they say they are satisfied, this Federal employee still says, "I will go over and look over the books of your last employer and see if I cannot stir up a lawsuit for the employer." An employee of the Federal Government who goes about the country stirring up agitation is not needed on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have received a number of telegrams this morning from various veterans' posts of the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans and Veterans of Foreign Wars protesting the arbitrary cut the majority party has made in the Veterans' Employment Service. I understand the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] will offer an amendment to correct that mistake so that this service for veterans will continue.

If the Republican Party is really interested in helping the veterans, I believe the House would be interested in knowing just why this cut of nearly a million dollars was made in the appropriation. I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill, has 13 minutes remaining, and we would appreciate having his views as to just why this arbitrary cut was made, and how he thinks it can be justified.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the welfare of our men and women who have been disabled in the service of their country is in jeopardy. Does anybody deny that disabled veterans have earned a right to the pursuit of happiness found in jobs that are suited to their abilities, interests, and to their ambitions? Does anyone deny that these same veterans, disabled in the service of their country, shall have the assistance they need in finding and establishing themselves in jobs that provide for them the shelter, the food, the clothing they need? Does anyone deny that disabled veterans have a right to dignity and to self-respect in their occupations and to the satisfaction of work well done?

These questions, my colleagues, we must squarely face in our consideration of appropriations for the support of the Veterans' Employment Service. Can we return to our States and face our neighbor's boy who lost a leg at Anzio Beach or the butcher's son who left his eyes on Saipan and tell them "There wasn't enough to go around for you. You'll have to shift for yourselves."

Disabled veterans seek only an opportunity—an opportunity to demonstrate their capacities, their skills, and their abilities to do things as well, yes, better, than their nondisabled fellows. They want the opportunity to prove that they will stick to jobs much better than these fellows; that they are better accident risks; that they are better producers than their fellows.

This is the message which the field assistants of the Veterans' Employment Service are bringing to employers in behalf of disabled veterans. The results are apparent: From January 1, 1946, to November 1, 1946, the placements of disabled veterans increased almost 300 percent. This increase did not just happen. Constant, conscientious, and consistent effect upon the part of the Employment Service produced these results.

The development and application of special techniques for counseling and placement of disabled veterans will be completely abandoned with the curtailment of the United States Employment Service. Disabled veterans need counseling and guidance. Their choice of job opportunities is substantially broadened through job leads developed only through the use of these techniques. Continued development and improvement of special selective placement techniques for disabled veterans by the United States Employment Service is imperative if disabled veterans are to continue to have the service they have earned.

I appeal to you in behalf of the disabled defenders of our great Nation that you face your conscience—remember the sacrifices made by these disabled defenders—and give to the Veterans' Employment Service enough to enable them to serve the disabled veterans adequately.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] was not on the floor of the House yesterday afternoon when I addresed myself to the appropriation for the Customs Department. Had he been on the floor yesterday afternoon or had he read my remarks in the RECORD this morning, he would not have made the remarks he did on the floor of the House today.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the debate thus far is indicative of the approaching contest. The question is: Are we going to make a courageous and determined effort to keep faith with the people and reduce expenses of government in accordance with the mandate given to the Eightieth Congress.

Within a few minutes the Clerk will be reading the bill for amendment. In accordance with advance notice, given by those who are opposed to reducing these expenses, amendments will be offered, the very purpose of which are to destroy the accomplishments of this subcommittee. I warn the House that crippling amendments should be voted down if

there is to be any real saving by the Congress.

For week upon week this subcommittee has been meeting daily, from early morning until late at night, in an effort to see that adequate money to carry on the necessary functions of government is provided. There is no disposition on the part of the committee or the majority to cut expenses simply for the sake of cutting expenses. The real purpose is to carry on Government efficiently and at the least possible expense—plenty of dollars for necessary and proper activities but not one penny for waste, extravagance, or political partisan activities. I hold in my hand the printed hearings. There are 847 pages. Every item carried in this bill has been justified before the committee and it is now the duty of the Congress to uphold the hands of a committee possessed of sufficient courage to make cuts where cuts can be made without injury to government, even though pet projects are eliminated and selfish interests are offended.

According to the printed report accompanying this bill, it carries $77,825,520 less than the Presidential budget estimate. The bill as reported carries a total of $1,685,586,780. Now that is not as great a reduction as I should like to see; however, the committee says that this is the largest amount that can be taken from this particular budget and still permit adequate money for the several agencies and departments to do the things that should be done in the interest of all the people during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, let us approach the amendment stage in a spirit of calmness and sincerity. Let us act conscientiously, thoughtfully, and not emotionally. Let us forget that the center aisle divides us politically. Up to now the indication is that those who have controlled the Congress during the last few years have become so in the habit of increasing budgets rather than decreasing budgets that it is going to be very difficult for them to espouse the new philosophy of the majority and proceed along the line of less spending, less taxes, more efficiency, and eventually a balanced budget.

Mr. Chairman, unless we do adopt this philosophy and act accordingly, we will have betrayed the trust that the people placed in us in November.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time in order that I may answer a few of the questions that have been submitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, it ought to be perfectly apparent how difficult it is to keep a pledge made to the American people to reduce expenditures of Government. Everyone says, "Oh, yes. Don't touch this agency. Go over to the other one. It is all right to go into that one but don't touch this one."

I just could not understand how my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] could get up here and make the speech he made. Evidently my friend has not even read the report of the committee. Evidently he does not know anything about what is in the report or he could not have made the statements he made.

Let me give you a few facts to demonstrate the truth of what I have just said. He has stated that we have emasculated and killed the Conciliation Service. Yes. We have practically killed the Conciliation Service by our action. Let me give you the figures and let us see whether we have or not.

Under the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts and a strong New Deal Congress, what did you do for the Conciliation Service? In 1938, you gave them $273,000. In 1939, you gave them $283,470. In 1940, you gave them $325,000. In 1941, $383,400. In 1942, $444,300. In 1943, $475,917. In 1944, $502,700. In 1945, $493,000. In 1946, $504,350. In 1947–48, $2,050,000. You did not tell the Congress that. You did not tell the American people that. Those figures speak for themselves.

Now, you said we have destroyed the functions of the National Labor Relations Board. What are the facts? Again I say the Minority Whip evidently has not read the report. He listens to a lot of propaganda from these birds down in the Department. Let me give you the facts. In 1945, the National Labor Relations Board, under the generous treatment of the New Deal Congress and under the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts, got from this Congress $3,664,373. What did they get in 1946? I will give it to you. Let us not listen to a lot of bunk. Let us get the facts. In 1946, the same Congress, under the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts, so generous, gave to the National Labor Relations Board $4,307,530. And in 1947, $4,481,900. The 1948 estimate was $7,934,000. Your committee this year gave to them $4,033,700. How does that stack up?

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

Mr. KEEFE. I do not.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course you will not.

Mr. KEEFE. I have given you the facts.

Mr. McCORMACK. But there is one important fact lacking.

Mr. KEEFE. There is no important fact lacking. Anyone who wants the facts can look in the record and find them. It is too hard to do that for some people. They prefer to listen to a lot of this bunk that is passed out by the interested parties.

Now I want to talk to you about this Veterans' Employment Service. I had a lot of people come to me this morning, and it is perfectly obvious that the Members of Congress themselves are not familiar with that situation. Let me see if I can tell it to you and thus dispel a lot more bunk that has been handed to you, showing how hard it is to try to reduce an appropriation once it has been granted.

Under the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act, with which I assume you are all familiar, which was passed by the Congress in 1933, if you read the Wagner-Peyser Act you will see there is a provision in that act for the establishment of a veterans' placement service. Ever since 1933 right down to the present moment, there has been in every employment office in the United States a veterans' placement and counseling service. That is the service some of you think we have cut down. I have had Member after Member come and say: "You can't cut that old Veterans' Employment Service that has been in these employment offices."

We have not taken a dollar away from the Veterans' Placement Service and the Veterans' Employment Service. That has been in the employment offices since 1937.

We have given $71,000,000, the exact sum asked by the States to carry on that function; every dollar they asked for we have appropriated.

Then what have we done? Let me tell you. You will have difficulty finding out and some of you do not want to find out. Some people do not want the truth. They want to give you some more bunk.

There is an outfit called the Veterans' Placement Service, which was created as the result of title IV of the GI bill, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. I had something to do with preparing the language in that bill and I know what I am talking about. In title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act a committee is set up consisting of the Secretary of Labor; Mr. Hershey, the head of Selective Service; and General Bradley, the head of the Veterans' Administration They are authorized under the provisions of that law to select a secretary, and they selected, or somebody selected, a man by the name of Perry Faulkner, from Ohio. He came down here to be the secretary of that veterans' placement body set up in title IV of this bill. Now, if you read title IV—and I suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts and others read it so they will know what there is in title IV—you will see it provides for a liaison between this committee set up here in Washington——

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

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield. The gentleman cannot interrupt at this moment.

It provides for a liaison in the form of a representative to be appointed to sit in each State, one man who would transfer to the local employment services the ideas of this committee set up under title IV.

Instead of doing that, what have they done? They have created a new Federal employment service for veterans, an entirely new service superimposed upon the regular Employment Service, and they have hired some 677 special agents throughout the country operating under the direction of Mr. Faulkner here at the Federal level. The Employment Service is under the Department of Labor. Mr. Faulkner's service is responsible only to General Bradley in the Veterans' Administration. Administratively the Secretary of Labor has no control over it whatsoever; and, as I told you yesterday, when the Secretary was discussing this matter before our committee, he said that as an administrative proposition the whole thing was simply "nuts."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield. I want to give these facts to the gentleman.

The party in power, represented by the majority of this committee, had tremendous difficulty in getting from Mr. Faulkner this year just exactly what he wanted. Look at the record and read it, and you will find it. He had a lot of difficulty understanding the budget estimates. He could not understand what the Bureau of the Budget had done. He said he wanted only 500 people in the field. The Bureau of the Budget gave him 640. He could not understand that, neither could we. So we cut his outfit about a million and a half dollars, that is all.

We have given everything to the Employment Service to carry on its veterans' service as it has carried it on up to the establishment of this service, and we gave Mr. Faulkner $1,700,000 to carry on his service on top of that. I think the committee has been exceedingly liberal.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that the request made of the Bureau of the Budget and by Mr. Faulkner, the head of this veterans' employment service, was in the amount of $3,309,300, and that the committee cut it to $1,756,800?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is absolutely misinformed; and whoever gave him those figures has been just as guilty of misstating the facts as many of these other things that have been said here during the debate on this bill. I have the figures right before me. I do not have to take it from somebody down in the department. Look at the budget itself; it is there, nobody can take it out. The Employment Service for 1948 requested $2,650,600. They had for expenditure in 1947 $2,342,500. Now, the committee allowed them $1,756,800, or a reduction of $585,700 in that item.

Now, let me say this to you, my friends. You are going to be right up against a wedge in the road. You are either going to keep your promises to the people that sent you here or you are going to listen to this suave talk that I have listened to now for 8 years. You will never cut the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget until you cut, and that requires action here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, namely:

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members read the Times-Herald for today, they will have observed an editorial which says that Congress evidently pulled a "boner" in enacting the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill with a slash of $6,500,000 for the Customs Service.

Now, the accuracy of that editorial is on a par with some of the inaccuracies that have been ventilated on this floor. No. 1 is that there was no slash of $6,500,000 in the Customs Service. The committee did take out $3,500,000, but only when they came to us with an estimate of more than $6,000,000 over and above the fiscal year 1947. So, in truth and in fact the bill as it left this floor had in it over $3,000,000 more for the Customs Service than in the fiscal year 1947.

Now, when some inquiry was made as to how that editorial was written and where they got the figures, it was stated—and I shall not use names this morning—but it was stated this morning over the telephone that that editorial came from New York, and it indicates what is going on at the present time by way of an organized effort on the part of the bureaus and the agencies and the departments of government to seek to roll back the intent of Congress and to have this money restored. In other words, the bureaus are seeking to frustrate the efforts of Congress to achieve economy.

Now, it is only a few days that the Treasury announced that 8,200 revenue agents would be fired, who are collection men. The Treasury forgets that there are over 33,000 administrative employees in the Treasury, as compared with 26,000 who are gathering taxes in the field, and in that report—and I wrote the language myself—we said the committee was going to review Treasury and make sure that the field force was not dissipated and impaired. But notwithstanding that expression of intent, they are firing them in the wrong place, and I have been advised from very credible sources that the best propagandists and informational specialists and publicists in the Treasury Department have been assigned to carry on this campaign in the country. That is a pretty fair indication of what is going on.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman, in all fairness, ought to state the source of his information.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely not. I am not going to give anybody the ax. You know what will happen. Any person's job will be just as good as through at 6 o'clock tonight if his name is revealed.

But I am telling you about the announcement in the paper, and it is on a par with this editorial that appeared in the Washington Times-Herald this morning. Evidently they do not want any economy, so they send any number of inaccuracies into all the corners of the country. That is why the governors and others are calling up Members of the other body right now, and they are wanting to find out what we did and what the basis for it was.

They are getting $3,000,000 more in the Customs Service than they had last year, and they asked for a good many additional employees over and above the number now on the rolls. The committee took out $1,668,000 for new personnel—that is more persons than they had in the fiscal year 1947. Now, how do you justify this statement from the Treasury Department that men now in the Customs Service have to be laid off? That is a part of an organized campaign.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that the bureau also asked for a foreign agency, which the committee disallowed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. They wanted $2,200,000 for a customs agency service abroad, a service that can be performed by the consular service in the State Department.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I think, with all due deference to the gentleman, there is much to be said for a foreign connection in the customs service with which, perhaps, the Committee on Appropriations is not at all familiar. A smuggler is frequently detected before he leaves a foreign land.

I want to ask this question of the gentleman. The gentleman admitted that a cut has been made in the customs service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; half as much as was reported in the newspapers, but still more than three million above the fiscal year 1947.

Let us get the facts straight. They asked us for $6,500,000 more for fiscal 1948 than they had in fiscal 1947. We just halved that amount and gave them $3,150,000 more in 1948 than they have in the current fiscal year. Most of the cut came out of the fact that we disallowed not the people who are on the rolls today but the increased number that they requested over the current year of 1947. Then, in addition, we disallowed the amount for setting up this foreign agency, because we thought the State Department facilities could provide the information that is necessary.

I want to admonish the agencies of government that they forget that the Congress, which has the appropriating power, also has the rescinding power. I am going to suggest to the chairman of the subcommittee that we ask the bureau chiefs in the Treasury Department, including the Secretary, to come up some day soon and confront them with these releases and say, "Where did these come from? Where did you get these figures?" And then point the finger at them and say, "Look here. Maybe the cut should have been more. Do not forget that if we cannot enforce the will of the people for economy and there comes a test of strength as to whether the Congress or the appointed bureaus are running the Government of the United States, we can exercise the rescinding power over in the Appropriations Committee and take away a little more."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in talking with the Chief of the Secret Service yesterday, he informed me that they have to let 95 of their agents go, at a time when counterfeiting is going to come back actively again. He told me that about 95 would have to be let go, men assigned to the important duty of detecting counterfeiting.

On this situation in the Customs Service our Republican friends are apologizing and defending themselves, and it is going to grow and grow and grow, until between now and June 30 they will arrive at the inevitable result of having trapped themselves.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has a very unusual habit when anybody disagrees with him of charging in his loud-voiced manner that everything the other fellow says is bunk, bunk, and he uses a lot of other common, common phrases of that kind. The gentleman has referred in such a manner to everything that has been said by any Democrat who disagrees with him, and I have heard him say the same thing about Republicans who disagreed with him, so it is apparent that the only inference we can draw is that the superintelligent Member of the House is the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

He overlooked putting in some important facts when he made his presentation on dollars and cents. He did not tell you that the activities of the Conciliation Service in 1938 would not be comparable with the activities in 1948 or the fiscal year 1947. He did not tell you that there would be increased business. He did not tell you that there are increased salaries.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman refused to yield to me, but I yield to him.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman very much. That is very kind of him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have never refused to yield to the gentleman, that I can remember.

Mr. KEEFE. I suggest again that the distinguished gentleman read the record and the report, and he will see that they have a rapidly declining business in the Conciliation Service, instead of an expanding one. That is their testimony.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman overlooks the fact that during the war there was not so much activity in the lines in which many agencies were engaged, but that they will have to engage in increased activities after the war. This applies to the Conciliation Service and the National Labor Relations Board. The War Labor Board took over during the war and had jurisdiction over a lot of these activities. Now, with the termination of the War Labor Board, the Conciliation and Mediation Service and the National Labor Relations Board must pick up these activities.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not a fact that the cases which now come before the Conciliation Service are much more involved and take much more time and are very much more important to the economy of our country?

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe the statement just made by the gentleman from New York is based upon his study and experience as a member of the subcommittee having jurisdiction of that subject matter.

I have here an editorial from the Washington Star. While I admire that paper, I do not believe by any means that the Washington Star is a Democratic paper. In talking of the action of the subcommittee on appropriations under the heading of "Bad politics," the editorial said:

> On the whole record, however, it would be difficult to say that Congress would be wholly unjustified in coming to the conclusion—

That is, talking about Mr. Warren—

> that Mr. Warren is the wrong man for the job he holds. But that is an entirely different thing from saying that the Appropriations Committee is justified in the action it has taken.
>
> The committee has not been content merely to lock the door on Mr. Warren. Instead, through an abuse of its control of the purse, it has assumed a veto power over the filling of Mr. Warren's post and the posts of about 100 other executives and employees of the Conciliation Service.

That is what I said during my remarks. That is what the gentleman referred to as "bunk." Well, the Washington Star is in the same category as the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, if I may say so, in his dynamic character, has an unfortunate habit of characterizing the remarks made by other Members. So far as I am concerned, any time he criticizes anything I say as bunk, I consider the characterization coming from the gentleman from Wisconsin as one of the finest and highest compliments that I can receive.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure to listen to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. He says it is all right with him to have what he says characterized by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] as bunk. You know what was said when the fellow kissed the cow—"Everyone to his taste." If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has no objection to the characterization, I am sure I have none. Whether his statements were accurately described as bunk can be determined by a reading of the RECORD.

Here is what is griping some of our friends on the other side. There are a lot of good, fine, patriotic gentlemen on the other side, and they vote with us once in a while and sometimes twice in a while—in fact, whenever they think we offer something worth while. We helped them to put through some good legislation last year. That brings me to the point of asking: Did not the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] vote for this bill, the Treasury and Post Office bill which went through the other day, one of the bills which he is criticizing today and because of which he now complains about the discharge of some people in the customs service?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The vote was 387 to nothing.

Mr. HOFFMAN. To nothing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] must have voted for it. Nevertheless the gentleman comes here today and cries and weeps and moans about the cut in the bill and criticizes what he says is going to happen and of what he thinks is going to happen he is fearful. Here is what is the matter with some of those boys on the other side, if I may violate the rules by so referring to them, and I would like to address my colleagues on this side of the aisle.

For years the agencies down there in the executive departments and elsewhere all over the country have been spending Federal money to elect New Dealers and some good Democrats from the South, and some of us are glad to know that is one good thing that has come out of all that spending. Now, when they find that we intend to carry out our promises and give the country a little economy and a little efficiency, a little freedom from bureaucratic rule, they realize that if that pocketbook is taken away from them they will not have all that money to be spent in their behalf. Sure, it hurts. Running for office on your own pocketbook is one thing, and running for office with Federal funds and influence is something else again. If I had been running in that kind of a campaign in that way, I too, would be fearful of what might happen to me the next time because my funds could not possibly equal the funds of the Federal Treasury. If you cut some folks from the Federal funds and their jobs they cannot buy any more CIO-PAC support through the activities of the Labor Department and the National Labor Relations Board and all those Federal agencies which have been campaigning over the years. They are fearful of what might happen in 1948. Cry about it? Sure. Weep? Sure. It will not do them any good because the Republicans are going to carry out those campaign promises they made. That may be something of a shock to some, as I said before. It is unusual, but that is the way I think it is going to be. That is the way I hope it will be.

Republicans and Democrats who want economy and efficiency, who are tired of government by Federal employees, will do well to deprive the bureaus and agencies of the funds which enable them to carry on extralegal activities.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman, of course, speaking as he does, has lived up to just what I said he was a little while ago—one of the great leaders of the Republican Party.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I only wish that were true. For 10 years I tried to get the House—but you so dominated it that they

would not listen—I tried for 10 years to get the Communists kicked out. When President Truman found out the Congress was about to do it, along he came, tagging along behind. I will not say that of him and I will not say it of any Member of this House, but I will say that of somebody, just like the stink that follows an automobile when the gas is burned out, along they come. Now, they are all against Communists. They all want to do something about these wicked departments, because they do not believe the people were exercising good judgment in November but they nevertheless realize it might happen again in 1948. So they want to get in before the storm comes.

Oh, do not let them steal your thunder. Let us cut this appropriation just as the committee suggested we should, for the reasons given by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who know what they are talking about, and not follow along some of these campaign speeches that might well be made on a soap box in Boston or somewhere else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for more time this morning to supplement my remarks of yesterday on the abolition of the Division of Labor Standards in the Labor Department appropriation bill. I understand that after I left this hall yesterday, the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Labor Department and Federal Security Appropriations, undertook to instruct me as to the action of the committee on the child-labor and youth-employment function of this Division. He attempted to reassure me that I might save what he apparently regarded as my crocodile tears, or something of the sort, over what the Republican majority had done to the future protection of our Nation's youth.

Let me assure the chairman and Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee that I have read their report with exceeding care. But I am sorry to tell them that it does not make me feel any better. Had they extended me the courtesy yesterday of allowing me to finish my remarks, I would have explained why. I shall do so this morning, although I hope some of you may be sufficiently interested to read my full statement in the RECORD of yesterday. The Republican majority of the House Appropriations Committee cut in half the funds available for the child-labor and youth-employment function of the Division of Labor Standards and transferred the functions to the Wage and Hour Division of the Department. Now that action to which they point with pride will satisfy nobody who is seriously concerned for the welfare of children.

The functions were transferred on the score that the Wage and Hour Division administers the wage-and-hour provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, and therefore could and should administer the child-labor provisions and perform all the research and advisory services now being carried on by the Division of Labor Standards. Now if anybody should know what the intent of Congress was when it enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act and conferred upon the then Children's Bureau, and now the Division of Labor Standards, the administration of the child-labor provisions of the act, I really think I should. I was chairman of the House Labor Committee which deliberated over many possible methods of administering this act. Every draft proposed to use the experience and skill of the Children's Bureau in some way to enforce the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. The final version placed all responsibility for their administration in the Children's Bureau.

I also understand that my remarks were construed by the gentleman from Wisconsin as reflecting upon the competency of the Wage and Hour Division. I can assure you that they were not so intended. I have a high regard for the Wage and Hour Division, but I know full well that that Division is an enforcement agency. Its job is to check employers' pay rolls, time records, invoices—things like that, a type of accounting job. Why should they now be saddled with research on hazardous jobs for youngsters? Why should we believe that they are equipped to work with State administrators and women's groups and labor and community organizations in developing better State child labor standards? Why should they be asked to negotiate agreements with States on certificates of age?

I note by the report that you are also proposing that they become safety and health inspectors for the States. At the same time you cut their funds by 25 percent. They are now getting around to only 8 percent of the plants and you expect them to take on all of these new functions. With a smaller staff they will probably get around to 4 percent. They have plenty to do in the enforcement of the Wage and Hour Act without becoming the promoters of improved standards of child labor.

The Congress that passed the wage and hour bill, as I have said before, decided after much deliberation to keep the child labor and youth employment functions separate from the Wage and Hour Division. What facts had this Congress that would change the decisions of its predecessor? A small House Appropriations subcommittee has taken upon itself to rewrite the law.

If this Congress takes that step, it will not be on the merits of the question, I can assure you. This Congress will be playing politics with its future generations. It will be doing so at a time when, as a result of war, over two and one-half times as many youngsters are at work as in 1940, at a time when a million fewer children are in high school than in 1941.

In further reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I fear that there is some misunderstanding about the point of view expressed by the Secretary of Labor concerning the transfer of the child-labor and youth-employment functions of the Bureau of Labor Standards to the Wage-and-Hour Division. He did not state definitely that he would recommend the transfer of the entire functions of the Bureau to the Wage-and-Hour Division but said that he would study the problem when the Wage-and-Hour Division was transferred back to Washington. It may be that there are some inspection functions which could be transferred to the Wage-and-Hour Division, and in cases of duplications of functions, I would not oppose such a transfer. However, I would oppose the transfer of the entire Division, as it was erroneously stated the Secretary of Labor suggested. The majority of this Congress insist they received the people's mandate last November to economize in government. We Democrats are as interested as anybody else in true economy. But we do not think you Republicans received any mandate to exploit America's future citizens. The American people did not give you a mandate to recreate the sweatshops of the nineteenth century. They gave you no mandate to condemn their 12- and 14-year-olds to long hours, night work, back-breaking toil for starvation wages, hazards of life and limb, too early contact with the seamy side of life. They gave you no mandate to deprive their children of a chance to learn to work and to live and to develop to the height of their capacity. They gave you no mandate to deny their children the proudest heritage of America.

Further reference was made to the transfer of a considerable amount of money from the Bureau of Labor Standards to the Wage and Hour Division for the child labor and youth employment program. The truth of the matter is that this bill decreases the funds of the child labor and youth employment program by 50 percent. That 50 percent has been transferred to the Wage and Hour Division appropriation. The other 50 percent is so-called economy.

The kind of economy that will help to provide a tax decrease at the expense of the children of America.

I presume, Mr. Chairman, this economy is considered necessary because I understand that tomorrow a bill will come to the House to cut the taxes of the wealthy people of this country who can well afford to pay taxes, 30 percent. Is that the kind of economy you want? It certainly is not the kind of economy I want. Or is that the kind of economy you believe the people gave you a mandate for?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I address my remarks not only to the Members here, but to the gentlewoman from New Jersey, who I know cannot disagree with what I shall say, because she well knows that they have the so-called Walsh-Healey Act still on the books; not only the Fair Labor Standards Act but the Walsh-Healey Act. She did not tell you about that. She did not tell you that ever since the Walsh-Healey Act has been on the books that the Wage and Hour Division has not only made the inspections for child-labor violations, but the Wage and Hour Division has done all of the work of enforcement and punishment and recommendations, every single thing, that the Children's Bureau does as to child-labor work

under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Now then, to say that the Wage and Hour Division is not equipped to handle this function is to say that they are not able functionally or otherwise to handle the functions placed upon them as to child-labor interests.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentlewoman did not yield to me but I will yield.

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman knows perfectly well that the Wage and Hour Division cannot handle the children's affairs as well as the Children's Bureau can. He knows that.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, that is a categorical statement by the gentlewoman, and may I say to her that I recommend that she read the hearings, and if she does, she will see.

Mrs. NORTON. I have.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, if she has, then she knows that her statement is not correct, because she knows that I asked the specific question of Mr. Walling, "Is the Wage and Hour Division equipped to do this work?" And the answer of Mr. Walling, the Wage and Hour Administrator, was that they were; that they are already doing that work under the Walsh-Healey Act.

Now, then, why give any misrepresentation to the press or the public or this Congress? The fact of the matter is that Mr. Schwellenbach himself very definitely said they were giving consideration to turning this over to the Wage and Hour Division, and perhaps the only reason that it was not turned over at the time of the hearings was because the Wage and Hour Division was still located up in New York and had not got back to Washington. Now, that is all there is to it.

May I say to the gentlewoman from New Jersey something that perhaps she does not know and she ought to be informed on the subject, that we were given a budget estimate showing just exactly how this transfer could be effectuated, and it is in the record.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield further. The gentlewoman has not read the record. If she had she would know those facts, and she would not make the statements she made on this floor, and I think it is high time that instead of just going on with these glittering generalities of talking about how we have done away with the protection for the little children and the youth of America, you ought to listen to what Katharine Lenroot, the head of the Children's Bureau, said about the man who is addressing you on that subject, when she spoke night before last in my own city, and you would get a different impression and you would not be talking about the gentleman from Wisconsin like you have been. I know something about the Children's Bureau and I have been one of its protagonists, as the gentlewoman from New Jersey well knows, ever since the Children's Bureau has been in existence.

You shake your head. I am not going to try to convince the gentlewoman from New Jersey. A lot of people have tried to convince Boss Hague up there and they have not been successful.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in summing up this debate, which has been very interesting, there comes to my mind the fact that the people of these United States of America spoke out at the last election as to the course they would like for their Government to follow.

Something was said by one of the previous speakers about our getting certain mandates. We did get a mandate to reduce the cost of Government, because the people know that the only way to balance the budget, the only way to reduce taxes, and the only way to get the ship of state out of the dangerous position it is in at the present time is to move it out of the danger zone through economy in Government back toward a sounder financial economy. We are their representatives, supposed to carry out their wishes. The Republican majority have from the first day they came here up to this very minute given every evidence of carrying out that mandate of the people. We have worked and voted for economy. The Republican Party has been opposed in this effort by you of the minority at every step of the way from the day the President called for a budget of $37,500,000 to run this Government in peacetime, four times what it had ever cost to run the Government in peacetime before. You are opposing us again today. You of the minority here on the floor of the House made your initial step by trying to defeat the will of the people which we of the Republican majority were trying to carry out when we voted in this House to cut the budget by $6,000,000,000. After we had achieved that objective, then the strategy of opposition to every economy became very plain through the minority leader and the minority whip, who has injected himself so forcefully into the debate today. That strategy is to fight the reduction in the cost of Government, the reduction sought by the Republicans, every time an appropriation bill comes on the floor of the House. They seek to prevent the Republican majority from reducing governmental expense in the interest of the taxpayers.

It is unfortunate that all of the American people who voted in this last election and who will have an opportunity to vote in the 1948 election that they cannot be in this gallery today, yes; that they could not have been here when we were voting to reduce the budget, yes; that they could not have been here when we were voting 2 weeks ago on the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation bill, so the people in the districts represented by those on the minority side who have sought to block the way, could have found out exactly what their strategy is, and what they are trying to do. After they had opposed reducing the appropriation in the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation bill and sought to block the reduction that we sought to bring about in the interest of the American people, when they had to answer a roll call go down in the printed record they voted 100 percent to support the action the majority had forced through on that particular bill. I predict that when the roll is called today the dissidents on the minority side will make a similar record, so that they can say in the next campaign to their people, who are so far away that they cannot be here to keep a watchful eye on them, "Oh, yes; we voted for a reduction in the cost of government."

This is the people's fight, and the Republicans will not turn back. They will keep their promises. If we do not cut the cost of government now and thereby reduce the Federal pay rolls it will never be done. The people of the Nation should know the opposition on this floor joined with the bureaucrats here in Washington are standing together as they have stood for the past 14 years solidly fighting against our efforts for economy in the interest of the great mass of the American people.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: For personal services in the District of Columbia, $819,500.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 2, line 6, strike out "$819,500" and insert "$1,190,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion is not in order now, until some debate is had on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The motion is not in order at this time, since there has been no debate on the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, being a member of this great subcommittee, I suppose I should defend my chairman, the gifted gentleman from Wisconsin, who does not always use the word "bunk," who does not always answer the gentlewoman from New Jersey by referring to Mayor Hague, incidentally a great man, who has done more for public health, welfare, and education, and to help the little man in the State of New Jersey than the gentleman from Wisconsin ever did in his life. The gentleman from Wisconsin is really a charming fellow, when you get to know him. I spent 9 weeks with him as a member of this subcommittee, and it was just one grand tea party. If you did not agree with him, whether you were a member of the minority or the majority, it did not get you anywhere. He wrote the bill. You saw him on the march here awhile ago, strutting as he usually does from one side of the floor to the other, and you have listened, I am sure, to all those fancy expressions of his.

In yesterday's debate he quoted the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schwellenbach, as having said that the set-up in the Veterans' Employment Service was

"nuts." I will say at this point that Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach at no time in the hearings reflected in the slightest degree upon the ability or integrity of Mr. Perry Faulkner, the Director of the Veterans' Employment Service, appointed by General Bradley, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, or upon the work of the Veterans' Employment Service. He did say that it was an unusual situation where General Bradley appointed Mr. Faulkner and he—Secretary Schwellenbach—appointed the entire staff. Mr. Schwellenbach advocated a much larger appropriation—larger to the extent of about a million dollars for the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service.

We now have before us the first item in the march of the gentleman from Wisconsin to cut the vitals out of the functions of the Department of Labor. We have here an item requested by the Bureau of the Budget in the amount of $1,190,000 for salaries and expenses in the District of Columbia for the Secretary's office. Is it such a great increase? Oh, no. In the present fiscal year the amount under which they are now operating is $1,015,400. But the gentleman from Wisconsin has cut that down to the amount of $819,500. It is apparent, as pointed out here yesterday and today, that the march of the gentleman from Wisconsin and his colleagues against the Labor Department is well on the way. Why have they singled out that particular Department and not the other items in this general bill, the total amount of which is $1,763,412,300? Although the amount requested by the Department of Labor for its annual appropriation for fiscal 1948 is only $103,578,700, which is less than 6 percent of the total amount $1,763,412,300 requested in this appropriation bill, nevertheless the gentleman from Wisconsin and his colleagues on the majority side have cut the Labor Department operations to the tune of $12,714,500, which is 46 percent of the total cut of $27,725,500 referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, can anyone advise us how long it will be before we vote?

Mr. KEEFE. At the present rate, and if the same tactics are indulged in, which I understand will be indulged in all through the bill, I assume we will be here until midnight.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Let me say that that is another familiar expression of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object to the extension of 5 minutes if that is the way the gentleman is going to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The objection of the gentleman from Michigan comes too late.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say that the usual careless language so often used by the gentleman from Wisconsin has again been heard. When anyone who disagrees with him is talking, that Member is using dilatory tactics—tactics designed to interfere with what? With the gentleman's full sway as a dictator and as a czar of this appropriation bill. He might well stop, look, and listen.

There was an editorial in this morning's Times-Herald referring to a subject which has been discussed previously. I quote from it:

Because of this $6,500,000 Customs Bureau slash—

And that was the slash, you know, in the Treasury, Post Office appropriation bill passed a week or so ago by this House—

about 1,600 of the Bureau's employees are in process of being let out, effective March 28, which is next Friday. Customs work at the key port of New York, where most legitimate tolls are paid, and most smugglers ply their trade, will be crippled by this proposed cut.

Harry M. Durning, Collector of the Port of New York, now has a staff of 840 men engaged in this valuable work. Durning has been forced to notify 740 of his staff, including 600 war veterans, of their impending dismissal. This will leave America's greatest port with a skeleton force of 100 men.

According to John C. Tulloch, an old collector of the port and border patrol organizer at the important boundary point of Ogdensburg, N. Y., these dismissals also will leave the Canadian border "wide open" to smugglers of all manner of contraband, and to illegal entry of aliens as well. Similar results are expected along the Mexican border.

The loss in revenues to the Government, if such a condition lasts any considerable length of time, will more than outweigh the cut of $6,500,000 in the Customs Bureau's allotment of funds for 1947-48.

Somewhere in the hiring-and-firing confusion, a serious injustice has been done our Customs Bureau, and it is one which ought to be rectified without delay.

The Senate can still perform this job, when it acts on the cost-cutting bill passed by the House. We hope the Senate will do just that, and plug these serious port and border leaks. It seems obvious that better ways to save money can be found than this one.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I am sorry. I do not have time.

So I say, you are here today doing the very same thing in connection with the Labor Department appropriation when you single them out for slaughter and cut them 46 percent of the actual amount admitted by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] as the amount cut from the budget estimates in connection with this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly to hear the kind of speech that has just been delivered on this floor, when a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and the Federal Security tries to make the Members of the House believe that the chairman of this particular committee is a swaggering czar, strutting, and so forth, and so on; and that the chairman of this subcommittee has written the bill without consultation with his colleagues. I feel that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has violated the rules of the House in so stating, and I am looking right at him when I am saying this.

Mr. ROONEY. I say I am looking right at the gentleman, too.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is regrettable that we cannot discuss this particular bill upon its merits. I know and any member of the majority on the subcommittee will testify to the fact, that very little interest was given in the hearings by either of the two members of the minority on that committee. Scarcely ever did they offer anything constructive. I ask you to go through the hearings and see whether you can find any place where those two members of the minority offered any constructive suggestions.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I refuse to yield. The gentleman might as well sit down. Scarcely any place in the record can you find anything constructive offered by either the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], or the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and I challenge them to find it.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I also refuse to yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I refuse to yield.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me too bad, after 6 weeks' hearings and attempting to do something worthwhile for the people of this Nation, that the majority members of the committee must virtually carry the entire load by themselves. Certainly we had to write the bill, the four of us in the majority. There was no cooperation from the others whatsoever.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. With the exception of the Public Health Service.

I am just saying these few words in the hope that we can get down to sanity in the discussion of this bill, Mr. Chairman. Let us discuss issues, let us not try to attribute to the chairman of this subcommittee, one of the most capable men in the Congress of the United States, statements to the effect that he is a czar, that he is strutting around, and so forth, and so on; whereas, if the truth were known, that particular man knows more

about this bill than any Member of either body of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, may the amendment be read again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 65, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7:

"Contingent expenses: For necessary expenses of the offices and bureaus of the Department, for which appropriations are not specifically made, including purchase of two passenger motor vehicles (including one at not to exceed $3,000); transfer of funds to United States Public Health Service for costs of health service program as authorized by act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658); commercial and labor-reporting services; when authorized by the Secretary of Labor, dues for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members, not exceeding $400; newspapers, press clippings, and teletype news service not to exceed $7,300; and contract stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600); $468,400, of which $1,000 is for payment of claims pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this amendment applies to the Veterans' Employment Service I ask unanimous consent that at this time all four amendments be considered at once and that I be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 3 strike out lines 3 and 4 and following the figure "600;" add the following: "$474,950, of which $21,510 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV except section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and of which $1,000 is for payment of claims pursuant to part II of the Federal Court Claims Act."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, at this time I do not speak for any particular department of Government.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman and say that I do not have any objection to his having five additional minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. May I make this inquiry? Will the gentleman agree to the consideration of all four amendments at this time?

Mr. ROONEY. Not at this point. I cannot say that I have studied it sufficiently. You see, the minority has been in entire accord with the accepted position of the gentleman in regard to increasing the Veterans' Employment Service. That has been our position all through the hearing. So I withdraw my objection to his proceeding for five additional minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I renew my request that I be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I speak at this time for two of America's great veterans organizations, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Naturally, they are concerned with the employment of veterans so much that at the moment they have at heart the interests of 1,300,000 unemployed veterans in the United States, the majority of whom are veterans of World War II. These organizations cannot understand why it is necessary to cut from this bill less than $1,000,000, and in so doing deny the unemployed veteran the service of 644 agents, whose responsibilities are to secure and place veterans in employment.

In the enactment of the provisions of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—Public Law 346—Congress declared as its intent and purpose that there should be set up an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans and that to this end policies shall be promulgated and administered so as to provide for them the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment. For this purpose there was created to cooperate with and assist the United States Employment Service a Veterans' Placement Service Board. The present Chairman of this Board is Gen. Omar Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, and the Honorable Lewis B. Schwellenbach, Secretary of Labor, are the other members. This Board is charged with determining all matters of policy relating to the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service.

The Chairman of the Veterans' Placement Service Board was given direct authority and responsibility for carrying out its policies through the Veterans' Employment Representatives in the several States. This authority has been delegated to Mr. Perry Faulkner, executive secretary to the Veterans' Placement Service Board and Chief of the Veterans' Employment Service. The veterans' employment representatives in the several States are charged specifically by title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 as follows:

In cooperation with the public employment service staff in the State, he shall (a) be functionally responsible for the supervision of the registration of veterans in local employment offices for suitable types of employment and for placement of veterans in employment; (b) assist in securing and maintaining current information as to the various types of available employment in public works and private industry or business; (c) promote the interest of employers in employing veterans; (d) maintain regular contact with employers and veterans' organizations with a view of keeping employers advised of veterans available for employment and veterans advised of opportunities for employment; and (a) assist in every possible way in improving working conditions and the advancement of employment of veterans.

Section 605 of the Servicemen's readjustment Act of 1944 assigns budgetary responsibility to the Board as follows:

The Board through its executive secretary shall estimate the funds necesasry for the proper and efficient administration of this title; such estimated sums shall include the annual amounts necessary for salaries, rents, printing and binding, travel, and communications. Sums thus estimated shall be included as a special item in the annual budget of the United States Employment Service. Any funds appropriated pursuant to this special item as contained in the budget of the United States Employment Service shall not be available for any purpose other than that for which they were appropriated, except with the approval of the Board.

In March of 1946 the Veterans' Placement Service Board, in order to adequately carry out the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, deemed it necessary to materially increase the field staff of the Veterans' Employment Service. It was only after careful planning that the additional field staff was requested of the Bureau of the Budget. This additional staff was to include a few more assistant veterans' employment representatives in those States where the necessity warranted; but in the main the requested personnel, which are now called field assistants, were to be located in strategic areas throughout the various States and their duties were to locate job opportunities for veterans. However, the actual placements were to be made by the local employment offices as the Veterans' Employment Service had no desire whatsoever to attempt setting up its own employment service.

The headquarters staff very carefully planned, with the assistance of each individual State veterans' employment representative, the areas wherein the selected field assistants were to work. Vigilance has been maintained at all times to insure that the individual worked within his assigned area. The number of field assistants requested for their respective States was planned on a basis of 1 to every 30,000 veteran World War II population. Following this plan of expansion, the Veterans' Employment Service in March of 1946 requested approval from the Bureau of the Budget

the following positions for the fiscal year of 1947.

Field: 1,029 positions at a cost of $3,101,750.

Department: 66 positions at a cost of $241,529.

Total positions, 1,095; total cost, $3,543,279.

The Bureau of the Budget did not approve the Veterans' Placement Service Board's expansion request, however the Appropriations Committee of Congress granted the following positions:

Field: 738 positions at a cost of $1,924,405.

Department: 57 positions at a cost of $171,990.

Total positions, 795; total cost, $2,096,395.

The Veterans' Employment Service, by exercising extreme conservatism in recruiting practices and observing economical management procedures, was able to successfully meet the ever-increasing demands being made upon it as of the first of the calendar year of 1947. However, it was apparent that the excellent record of job placements for veterans could not be maintained with the then current Veterans' Employment Service staff. The Veterans' Placement Service Board, therefore, after careful study, again recommended to the Bureau of the Budget in February of this year substantially the same addition in personnel as was made last year.

For the fiscal year 1948 the following positions were requested of the Bureau of the Budget:

Field: 1,005 positions at a cost of $3,263,446.

Department: 57 positions at a cost of $209,044.

Total positions, 1,062; total costs, $3,472,490.

The Bureau of the Budget recommended that Congress grant to the Veterans' Employment Service the following:

Field: 644 positions at a cost of $2,521,697.

Department: 32 positions at a cost of $128,799.

Total positions, 676; total cost, $2,650,496.

H. R. 2700, the present bill you are considering, grants to the Veterans' Employment Service only $1,756,800 for personnel services. Such a radical cut in appropriation would force the Veterans' Employment Service to lay off all of its newly appointed field assistants. These men are doing a splendid job of selling merchandise—the veteran. It is by placement of veterans in jobs that the Veterans' Employment Service is seeking to carry out congressional directives. Job placements of veterans represents the greatest of all benefits to veterans. Successful placement of veterans in jobs, in the minds of the Veterans' Placement Service Board, represents the most economical and beneficial service that could possibly be rendered to those citizens who have risked their lives in the service of their Nation.

Your cooperation and support is earnestly and sincerely solicited to the following amendments to H. R. 2700.

Inasmuch as section 605, paragraph (a), of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, specifically states:

> Sums thus estimated shall be included as a special item in the annual budget of the United States Employment Service. Any funds appropriated pursuant to this special item as contained in the budget of the United States Employment Service shall not be available for any purpose other than that for which they were appropriated, except with the approval of the Board.

It appears necessary to earmark all funds assigned to the Veterans' Employment Service. H. R. 207 does this only on personal services, hence a qualifying clause is suggested in each of the other budget items.

I. CONTINGENT EXPENSES

The Veterans' Employment Service requested the Bureau of the Budget for contingent expenses the sum of $21,510, and they, in turn, recommended to Congress that the Service be granted $18,700. In reporting out the appropriation bill the committee recommended a 20-percent cut in contingent expenses. The bill should be amended to increase the amount of $468,400—line 3, page 3—to $474,950, of which $21,510 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV—except section 602—of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

The above category covers what might well be called practically all expenses for items other than personnel, travel, and printing and binding. The items include supplies, communications, transportation of things, equipment, and other materials necessary for the maintenance of any Federal service. In their request to the Bureau of the Budget for the sum of $21,510, the Veterans' Employment Service felt they were justified if they were to carry out their work efficiently and in good order. The Bureau of the Budget in their recommendation to the Congress lowered the figure to $18,700, or $2,810 less than the original request. No doubt this lesser figure was due to general cuts of practically all objects which we requested in the budget for the fiscal year 1948. The amendment serves to restore the original amount requested.

II. TRAVELING EXPENSES

The Veterans' Employment Service requested of the Bureau of the Budget for traveling expenses—departmental and field—the sum of $888,000 and they, in turn, recommended to Congress that the Service be granted $600,000. In reporting out the appropriation bill, the committee recommended a 30-percent cut for this item. The bill should be amended to increase the amount of $2,112,400—page 3, line 6—to $2,580,440, of which $888,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV—except section 602—of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Requests for travel funds for field personnel were figured on a formula which the Veterans' Employment Service has learned from many years' experience is quite accurate.

Twelve dollars a day covers both transportation and per diem. The State veterans' employment representatives, naturally, due to their administrative duties, are not in travel status as much as the assistant veterans' employment representatives, while the field assistants, whose work is solely in the field and not of an administrative nature, should be in travel a great portion of the time. However, with the exception of those field assistants working in thinly populated areas, there will be very little of this $12 a day travel cost spent in per diem. Nearly all will be transportation costs.

To arrive at the figures requested of the Bureau of the Budget, the Veterans' Employment Service merely multiplied the number of days the various members of their field staff should be in travel status, in order to properly do their job, by $12.

Each agency in the Government bases their individual travel requests upon such a formula, although the amount for each day's travel may vary in some instances. The Veterans' Employment Service formula is their own and, as has been previously stated, is based upon past travel records of field personnel. Stringent travel regulations are carefully enforced by the administrative staff of the Service. Employees in travel status are limited to their specifically assigned territories on the basis of a preaudited itinerary.

III. PRINTING AND BINDING

The Veterans' Employment Service requested of the Bureau of the Budget for printing and binding the sum of $50,000, and they, in turn, recommended to Congress that it be granted $40,000. In reporting out the appropriation bill the committee recommended a 20-percent cut. The bill should be amended to increase the amount of $414,700—line 8, page 3—to $432,700, of which $50,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV—except section 602—of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

The request for $50,000 was made by the Veterans' Employment Service to cover necessary items involved under printing and binding. A successful potential employer—potential employer relationship is considered absolutely essential in the present pattern of the Veterans' Employment Service job-promotion program. Explanatory documents, technical tools such as charts, graphs, maps, and illustrative materials, as well as leaflets, pamphlets, and booklets have known to be invaluable media in aiding the promotion of the program. Receipt of systematized summaries of new legislation, changes in regulations, new directives, and actual listings of job opportunities are musts from the standpoint of both the field operations of the Veterans' Employment Service as well as the United States Employment Service. With the pending liquidation of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration and the apparent necessity of discontinuing certain functions of the Selective Service System, the absolute need of increased effort in this field appears obvious. Media for transmitting vital information to the various

State employment services also is included in this item.

IV. UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

General administration: In reporting out the appropriation bill the committee recommended that the United States Employment Service be granted the sum of $2,656,800, of which $1,756,800—line 8, page 5—shall be for, and so forth. The bill should be amended to increase the total of $2,565,800—line 8, page 5—to $4,372,496, of which $3,472,496 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV—except section 602—of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

Justification for this amendment is found in the forepart of the document. Your attention is called to the current liquidation of the Retraining and Reemployment Administration and the suggested transfer of certain responsibilities of the Selective Service System to the Veterans' Employment Service. Acceptance of additional responsibilities once assigned to these agencies on the part of the Veterans' Employment Service certainly should be considered as potential additional evidence for the need for the sum requested by the amendment.

I want to call to your attention at this time, and I repeat what I said in the beginning, there are more than a million unemployed veterans in the country today. You who are Members of this body look to the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the D. A. V., and the other great veteran organizations to assist the Government and assist the people in general to place the veteran in employment. All, we agree, these organizations have done a magnificent job. But when you deny them the services of these 644 field men, you are taking away one of the most valuable assets they have to place the unemployed veterans in jobs.

We of organized veterandom believe in economy, sure we do, but we do not believe that economy should be practiced at the expense of the men who bared their chests to the bullets of the enemy on the many far-flung frontiers of this last war. We earnestly solicit your vote in support of these amendments all offered in behalf of these great veteran groups who speak for the veterans of this country.

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend the gentleman for his statement and say that I am in entire accord with him at this time. I withdraw my objection to considering the four amendments en bloc, as proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I have now had time to study them.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the four amendments may be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the remaining amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 3, strike out line 6 and substitute therefor the following: "Department, $2,580,440, of which $888,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of Title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 3, strike out line 8 and substitute therefor the following: "Department, $432,700, of which $50,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of Title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 5, strike out line 8, and substitute therefor the following: "Public Law 600), $4,372,496, of which $3,472,496 shall."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, how easy it is to run to cover in the field of economy.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman rising in favor of this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I want to understand for what purpose the gentleman rises.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has been recognized.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman who attempts to be so facetious will just sit down for a little while, I am sure when I have finished he will understand thoroughly why the gentleman rose. He cannot wait to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin speak. He wants to clap his hands because the Congress of the United States will not be able to save as much money as we thought we were going to. He gets up on this floor and agrees to everything that my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] says. Oh, yes, he is for it. He is not only for that but he is for every other thing that will be presented here that will spend more money, and you will find that out before we are through with this bill.

I have received all the telegrams that you have received from the Veterans' Affairs Members of Congress. We went into this thing very thoroughly. This is not anything new. May I say to you of faint heart who get these telegrams that I told you back about 3 weeks ago that you were going to have to have courage if you were going to cut the expenditures of Government. I told you in this well and warned you what was going to happen. You are not going to get any help over on this side except from a few fine Democrats who want to save this country.

You are going to get the type of thing that my friend from New York is suggesting—that we increase everyone of these appropriations. That is what you are going to get. I warned you about it then, and it has all come to pass. Now, turn to the record. How many of you have read the record on this Veterans' Service? I do not think very many have read it from the questions that have been asked me. You have not had time to read it and it is not fair to expect that you would have had time. But you do have a committee that has worked diligently on this thing, may I say to you, despite the statements of the gentleman from Brooklyn who from the very first day that he came on this committee has attempted at all times to give no real suggestions, as the gentleman from Minnesota, has said, except to throw flies in the ointment all the time, as he is doing today. I expected that, too.

How many of you know what this agency is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is talking about? How many of you actually know what this organization is? I tried to explain it here a few moments ago when there were a few people on the floor. I tried to point out to you just what this veterans' placement service is and what is involved. I told you then, and I repeat now, that ever since 1933 when the Congress of the United States passed the Wagner-Peyser Act there has been a veterans' placement service in every United States employment office in the land. When we enacted the GI bill, if you remember, and you can go back and read it in title IV, we made provision for a board composed of the Secretary of Labor, the head of the Veterans' Administration, and the Director of Selective Service. They chose a secretary of that board. His name is Perry Faulkner, and he is supposed to represent that board. To do what? Read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, does the gentleman suppose that we will finish this bill by midnight?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not think so, if we give it the consideration that it is entitled to receive. In view of some of the statements made here, I think it is going to take quite a long while.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. I am trying to give you this information because many Members on both sides of the aisle have asked me to give this information. There is quite a bit of confusion in the minds of many people on this subject, and the confusion has been deliberately generated.

Let me read to you, if you will, some questions and answers appearing on page 488 of the hearings:

Mr. KEEFE. The thing that the Congress would be interested in and is interested in, I think, Mr. Faulkner, is this: We had a Veterans' Employment Service in the United States Employment Service and it was contemplated to have one under the Wagner-Peyser Act, in the State operations. This is an intensification of that veterans' program that you are undertaking?

Mr. FAULKNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. And it may be summarized by the statement that you are intensifying the

scratching of the field for jobs and job openings for veterans?

Mr. FAULKNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. And you are doing it in a supplementary way, over and beyond what the regular service is doing. That is right; is it not?

Mr. FAULKNER. Yes, sir; and it is all encompassed in the one phrase in the law that you wrote, that the veteran shall be given a maximum job opportunity.

Mr. KEEFE. And when you have found these job openings you report them to the Regular Establishment, and the Regular Establishment then calls in the veterans who have those skills to fill those jobs.

Mr. FAULKNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. And if there are no veterans, then a civilian has a crack at it?

Mr. FAULKNER. And my men are supposed to be out at veterans' meetings, where they can find veterans, hunting veterans for those jobs, too. That is the other end of it.

Mr. KEEFE. I assume that the work is not as onerous in those locations where there is a surplus of jobs and job opportunities; is it?

Mr. FAULKNER. No.

Now, the fact of the matter is, when you provided in title IV of the GI bill for this committee and Mr. Faulkner was appointed secretary of that committee, there was absolutely not a thing in that bill—and I defy anyone to get up here and point it out if he thinks otherwise—that provided for a Federal veterans' placement service of the character and kind that is contemplated in the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. In fact, it is the opinion of those who know about it that the whole thing is subject to a point of order, and there is no authority for it in point of law. This committee has gone along with this program despite the fact that we think it is subject to a point of order, and we have not raised the point of order and are giving Mr. Faulkner $1,700,000—enough to employ 500 men in this field to supplement the tremendous number of men who are engaged in that work in the regular employment offices that we are giving $71,000,000 to in this bill. All I can say to you is, if you just want to go out and say the sky is the limit and say the limit is there, because the veterans' organizations ask for it, that is the privilege of the Members of this House. But let me tell you something, if you are going to save any money, if you are going to cut Government expenses, you have got to exercise some reason.

We have given to the veterans every single service you can think of in the way of finding jobs and job counseling. Those are in the regular offices of the employment service. We are now adding 500 more to go out in the States and assist veterans in job placement. The committee has given Mr. Faulkner over $1,700,000 for this purpose. I ask you in all seriousness, my friends, to read the hearings. If you will only do that I am sure you will conclude, as the majority of this committee concluded, that we have done right well by the veterans who fought this last war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will first say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that my record in this House on the Committee on Appropriations belies the statements he made a while ago. For me to take his position in regard to this amendment would be to act like an undertaker, and I am sure I do not look like an undertaker at a funeral, not only of the Veterans' Employment Service but of the United States Employment Service and the Labor Department as well. This I refuse to do. Justice has a great part in these appropriation items.

The veterans of this country are very much interested in the Veterans' Employment Service. Secretary Schwellenbach has stated that they have been doing a fine job. He pleaded for sufficient funds to the amount submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, to carry on their work. He has stated that Mr. Faulkner and his staff, whom he appointed, as Secretary of Labor, were doing a fine job in this service.

I am in receipt of a telegram from the department commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of my State, Mr. C. Burton Huse, in which he says he understands the Labor Department appropriation bill H. R. 2700 does not provide adequate funds for Veterans' Employment Service:

> This is a most important service; absolutely necessary that it not be curtailed. Urge support of amendments to increase funds.

I agreed to consider the four amendments proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] en bloc, and after having read the language and figures in those amendments I stated that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be commended for the position he took. I am sure no Member of this House wants to curtail the employment services for war veterans, nor does any Member desire to curtail, as suggested and proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], the regular United States Employment Service, which has been cut to a ridiculously small amount by the gentleman from Wisconsin and his colleagues.

Before I sit down I would like to say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], who reflected upon the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] as to his attendance at committee hearings, that our attendance was much more faithful and diligent than his. I vigorously resent his statement on the floor of this House or anywhere else about the attendance of any member at any committee meetings. I happen to be a member of three subcommittees of the House Committee on Appropriations, all important and all sitting at the same time during the past 10 weeks.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield, although the gentleman did not see fit to yield to me.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I regret if I did not see fit to yield to you at the time, but under the circumstances it was impossible. May I ask the gentleman if the subject under discussion was not the question of attendance but——

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman brought it up, though.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It was a question of whether the gentleman had made any suggestions worth while throughout the hearings of several weeks.

Mr. ROONEY. The suggestions of the gentleman from Rhode Island were worth while to my mind and to the mind of the gentleman from Rhode Island. They probably were not worth while in the eyes of the gentleman from Minnesota because he represents a farming district and is strictly looking out for the interests of his people. It is my responsibility to see that the gentleman from Minnesota does not so gage a Labor Department appropriation bill as to cripple the activities of the Department and bring about the attendant wrecking of a program which is for the benefit of an industrial district such as the one I represent.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. Let me say one thing more to the gentleman from Minnesota. He has made a statement here on the floor with reference to a number of questions asked by the gentleman from Rhode Island and myself during the hearings. A reading of the record of the hearings will disclose that most of the record was taken up by the imposing gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], the chairman. As a matter of fact, although he started out, as he said, to streamline the hearings and cut the volume of the record——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I object unless the gentleman will yield to me.

Mr. ROONEY. I will gladly yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments do now close.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendments do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 130, noes 89.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. KEEFE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 163, noes 99.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 110, noes 145.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 113, noes 150.

So the amendments were rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the Department, $414,700.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, after line 8, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and purchase and distribution of reports and of material for informational exhibits, in connection with the promotion of health, safety, employment stabilization and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry, and the functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act (except the enforcement of the child labor provisions of such act) transferred under and pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946, $473,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores to the Department of Labor, Division of Labor Standards, what has been stricken out by this committee. It is a function of government which I sincerely believe is a very necessary function. As you will note, the sum that I have included in the amendment is $473,000. That does not include the enforcement provisions of the Child Labor Act. The amount that was spent by the Division of Labor Standards in 1947 was $642,142. The Division of Labor Standards this year requested for the fiscal year 1948 $865,142. So you can see by this amendment that I am not attempting to justify the budget that has been sent up here, but just asking for $473,000.

There has been one item in this bill that has been discussed pro and con, yesterday and today, and that is whether or not the Wage and Hour Division can do this work that has been done by the Division of Labor Standards, pertaining to the Child Labor Act. As I remember the hearings, when Mr. Walling was asked by our chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], whether or not he could take over the enforcement provisions of this act, he said, "Yes." The Budget Director said, "Now, you are talking about the enforcement provisions." And again the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said, "Yes; the enforcement provisions of this act."

The enforcement provisions of the Child Labor Act is the smallest part of that sum. It only amounted to $92,000. The youth employment and research part of the Child Labor Act amounts to the largest part of that sum, which is $236,557. That is what I intend to leave in the Division of Labor Standards. I do not believe the Wage and Hour Division can do it, and if this committee had any advice from Mr. Walling, Director of the Wage and Hour Division, if he could do it, they did not ask him at that time how much money he needed. But in my contact with the State directors all over the country, I have yet to find one who has harmonious relations with the Wage and Hour Division. This Division of Labor Standards that has operated so successfully in the past has made a record second to none when we talk about States' right. They do not attempt to go into any State and enforce any actions of their own. Their intention has always been to work with the various directors of labor in enforcing the provisions of the Child Labor Act and setting those standards for minimum wages and the doing away of the sweat shops that our children work in today.

One of the most important functions of the Labor Standards Division is the Accident Prevention Division. I have definite proof in the State of Rhode Island that they have done a good job with the funds allotted to them. In Rhode Island they have supplied safety technicians, they have set up State industry-wide safety programs, and it has helped us to train management and union safety representatives.

Last year, 1946, with this Division's help, we were able in Rhode Island to reduce job accidents 14 percent, and save management and labor, in the smallest State of this Union, over $3,500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to point to the record and let us get the facts. I have before me, on page 554 of the hearings, the colloquy which took place between the gentleman who is now addressing you and Mr. Walling, Director of the Wage and Hour Division, referring specifically to the thing which my friend from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has just discussed.

Instead of making any generalized statement as to what was said and putting the conclusion that you want to put on it to suit your own convenience, let us listen to the questions and answers as they were submitted:

Mr. KEEFE. All that would be necessary would be to set up within the over-all picture of the Wage and Hour Division this group that devote themselves to a study of these reports which your agency makes and determines the policy ultimately as to what is going to be done with these violators.

It seems to me that some very substantial savings can be effected, and it was contemplated by the President when he submitted his reorganization plan to the Congress that substantial savings would be effected by this transfer. Up to date it is costing us a lot more money, according to the figures that have been submitted. Mr. Watson Miller indicates that on the Federal Security side, they see no savings that can be effected.

Suppose this committee, in its wisdom or lack of wisdom, decides to abolish completely the appropriation for the Division of Labor Standards, and transfers to your Division a sum of money to carry out these functions. Could you carry them out?

Mr. WALLING. I am sure we could.

What is the use of talking any further about that situation? That is what the committee did. We transferred the functions relating to child labor that had just been put in the Division of Labor Standards, by the way. Let us get this thing straight. The Children's Bureau went over to the Federal Security Agency and they left in the Labor Department the enforcement and the child-welfare provisions and functions; and Mr. Schwellenbach, the Secretary, said "All right, I will turn those functions over to the Division of Labor Standards." That was done only recently.

What actually happened was that they took the personnel and the functions that were in the Children's Bureau and left them in the Labor Department, and said: "You are now part of the Division of Labor Standards." That is all that happened.

All we have done is transfer those same functions over to the Wage and Hour Division; and Mr. Walling says, "We can handle the job." By so doing we are saving about $150,000; that is all. The amendment offered by my friend from Rhode Island would simply mean to put back into this bill the appropriation request and would nullify completely the action of this committee.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 53, noes 147.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9:

"Commissioners of Conciliation: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Labor to exercise the authority vested in him by section 3 of the act creating the Department of Labor (5 U. S. C. 611), including not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of arbitrators and mediators on labor relations without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; and not to exceed $133,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $2,080,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY:

On page 3, line 17, after the words "not to exceed" strike out "$50,000" and insert "$125,000."

In line 20, after the words "not to exceed" strike out "$133,500" and insert "$291,000."

In line 21, after the words "District of Columbia" strike out "$2,080,000" and insert "$2,678,400."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, if it were to be acted upon favorably, would restore the amount requested in the budget estimates for the United States Conciliation Service.

Since the start of the debate on this bill yesterday you have listened to quite

a bit about the Conciliation Service and about the charges made by the gentleman from Wisconsin against the Director of the Conciliation Service.

The committee report provides for the appropriation of funds for the office of Associate Director of the Conciliation Service. It calls for the elimination of the position of the Director, Mr. Warren's, and along with this, the elimination of 101 positions, most of them dealing with the top directing force of the Conciliation Service who have been so successful in directing its affairs.

Now, the position of Associate Director, which has been allowed by the gentleman from Wisconsin and the majority of the committee, implies that the associate will be associated with a director, but no funds are supplied or provided for an office of director. It seems to me that just because the gentleman from Wisconsin makes the charges that he does against Mr. Warren, No. 1, that he made a speech one time in which he referred to the matter of the right of Federal employees striking against the Government, which right he has denied; No. 2, that he at one time belonged to an organization known as the American League for Peace and Democracy, a Communist-front organization, as well as the Washington Book Shop, from both of which he resigned as soon as he found out within the space of a month or two that they were Communist fronts, that it does not follow that 101 other employees, among them 32 low-paid clerks, all in the low grades, should be summarily removed from their jobs and the Conciliation Service wrecked.

You have heard a great deal in this debate regarding the Conciliation Service. You know that it and its activities have been endorsed by both management and labor. If you read today's RECORD you will find a number of such endorsements made by the leaders of management throughout the country. They are all agreed that Warren has done a fine job. I yesterday read to you a letter from one of the heads of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which letter was one of many such, in which the vice president of the company stated that were it not for the efforts of Mr. Warren and his Conciliation Service, a strike which would have tied up this country's communication system would have occurred.

We are penny-wise and pound-foolish to reduce appropriations for an organization which has done so much to keep industrial unrest at a minimum, an organization which has the approval of labor as well as management. In today's RECORD, as I previously stated, you will find any number of similar endorsements. You will find that Mr. Warren and the Conciliation Service have been wholeheartedly endorsed by the National Association of Manufacturers and the leading industrial firms throughout the country. If the Conciliation Service were run on any basis that would smack in the least of communism or Communist ideas these firms would not have endorsed Mr. Warren and his associates as they did.

Under the permission which I expect to obtain after the Committee rises I include at this point an editorial from the Miami Daily News of March 19, 1947:

LEGISLATION BY FIAT

At the core of President Truman's proposals for labor legislation last January was the strengthening of the Government's conciliation services for the settlement of disputes before they reached the strike stage. That proposal fell on deaf ears insofar as the Republican Congressmen were concerned.

Now, according to Washington reports, the conciliation service already functioning in the Labor Department will be crippled by withholding its funds, another example of the second way to skin a cat which the Republican leaders have hit upon since they obtained control of congressional committees.

Representative FRANK KEEFE, of Wisconsin, who heads the House Appropriations Subcommittee in charge of Labor Department funds, does no conceal the fiat legislation he is preparing. "I have said this before," he told a reporter at the Capitol, "and I will say it again: I intend to do everything I can to see that Edgar L. Warren does not continue as head of the Conciliation Service." Having been rebuffed, presumably, in his request to Secretary Schwellenbach for Warren's removal, Representative KEEFE will recommend withholding funds to pay the salaries of Director Warren and at least 11 of his assistants.

Congress was sat upon by the Supreme Court when it attached a rider to an appropriations bill specifically withholding the salaries of Goodwin Watson, Robert M. Lovett, and William E. Dodd in 1943. Representative KEEFE might keep his act constitutional if Warren and his aides were not named in a bill cutting the funds of the Conciliation Service. But constitutional or not, such an act is fiat legislation usurping the right of the executive department to name its own officers.

There are legal ways by which the Congress can abolish the Labor Department's Conciliation Service. There are not enough votes in Congress to do so, and Representative KEEFE's proposal is a subterfuge designed to accomplish the end without a roll call of the majority.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, again, my friends, I think we will turn to the record. Loose talk does not get very far, and certainly you must recall that the gentleman who left the well of the House just got through saying that Mr. Warren made a speech some place out in Chicago in which he referred to the right of Government workers to strike. Why, what a loose statement that is. Do you know what the facts are? He ought to know them, because he participated in the hearings.

Now, let me read to you something from the hearings of last year. You will find, if you turn to pages 145 and 146 of last year's hearings, the complete text of the speech or statement that Mr. Warren made, in which he advocated the right of Government workers to strike. Did he make that in his speech out in Chicago? He did not. He made it in the fall of 1945 after he was made head of the Conciliation Service and he made it to an interdepartmental group of Government employees right down at the Labor Department. Now, why not give the people the facts about this situation?

Here is his own statement: He says:

As far as I know, that is a correct or approximately correct quotation of what I said in this panel discussion in the autumn of 1945.

You have heard the statements with respect to Mr. Warren. I told the Members of this Congress that I did not even know whether Mr. Warren had ever been a member of any subversive organization until I asked the Committee on Un-American Activities to send me a list of everybody in the Labor Department with any such leanings and tendencies, and for the first time I found the name Edgar L. Warren. So when I had him up before the committee—I deal across the board in these things; no running around behind the bush; I lay the stuff out on the table—I asked him this question which appears on page 662 of the hearings:

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Warren, were you at any time an economist with the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor?

Mr. WARREN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KEEFE. Did you live at 103 George Mason Drive, Arlington, Va.?

Mr. WARREN. I did.

I did not even know the man, and I had to identify him because the report from the Committee on Un-American Activities showed that Edgar L. Warren was at that time an economist with the Wage-Hour Division and that he lived at that address. So he admitted, as the record clearly showed, his record with these two subversive organizations.

My friend from New York says, "Oh, he only belonged to them for just a little while. He resigned." How does he know it? Where did he get the information?

You are not going to get rid of radicals in the Government if you are going to permit them to come in here and say, "Oh, yes, I joined this organization. I did not know what it was. When I found out that there were Communists running the show, why, I got out. I changed my viewpoint." He says he got out years ago, yet in the autumn of 1945, after he was made head of the Conciliation Service, he advocated the old party-line concept of the right of workers to strike against the Government.

Now, you can have it for what you want, that is merely incidental. This fellow Warren down there, in the manner in which he is running the Conciliation Service, which the RECORD will show I have supported 100 percent as a member of this committee, and have supported it in every way up until this year, is simply overloaded with $10,000-a-year men that he has taken over from the War Labor Board, and is now reorganizing the Conciliation Service. In the reorganization he is getting rid of the philosophy that the place to have conciliation is out in the field. He wants to build a bureaucratic outfit here in Washington of these $10,000-a-year cronies.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

COMMISSIONERS OF CONCILIATION

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently advocated the need for maintaining a Federal labor conciliation service of the highest and most efficient type to help settle labor-management disputes. If we are to have labor peace we must provide such an agency. On the one hand to strike out the appropriation for the top direction of the United States Conciliation Service and on the other to ask for labor peace is an irreconcilable position. I am opposed to sweeping labor legislation setting back the clock for labor, and I am for legislation which will deal with specific injustices that may have arisen in the course of the years which affect the public interest. I believe such a policy to have been the true mandate of the people last November 5. An essential element in such a policy is the maintenance, unimpaired, of at least the machinery for conciliation which we have, and its strengthening and improvement. An appropriation bill should not be made a vehicle for crippling this vital service at this time.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

I would also like to refer to the sharp cut in the appropriations for the United States Employment Service contained in this bill, a cut of 80 percent. No one can tell now how soon we may have another serious depression. Certainly the high cost of living, the touch-and-go relations between labor and management and the still prevailing tendencies in our economy to excesses of rise and fall promise that we had better be aware of this danger. The whole fate of the world hangs on the security of our internal economy, too. Under these circumstances I consider it very unwise to eliminate, what is for all practical purposes the core of a national employment service system, and to make the United States Employment Service almost solely a bookkeeping agency. If considered in terms of only a stand-by agency—and its work of coordination, technical development, and supervision of the State employment services is far more than that—it would yet be worth the money needed to keep it in shape to head off or to cushion a major depression. I am also opposed to diminishing the services made available for veterans under the Veterans' Employment Service, and voted for the amendment to restore the full amount of that appropriation. I believe that the USES is a necessary factor in maintaining the full value of the Veterans' Employment Service. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the amendment to give the USES the money to do the job.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I think I should explain to this Committee the incident that occurred Saturday in regard to Mr. Homer Hartz, president of the Modern Frog & Switch Co. in my congressional district, inasmuch as his name has entered into the debate.

It happened that Mr. Hartz called at my office Saturday morning, and I confronted him with the article regarding Mr. Warren which appeared in the Washington Star last Friday evening, stating that he and some leading industrialists in the city of Chicago, had signed a statement in behalf of Mr. Warren. When I asked Mr. Hartz how he happened to sign that statement, he said a good friend of his, head of one of the large industries in Chicago, had called him up stating that he and another party were signing a statement and asked if Mr. Hartz would join with them. Having confidence in this man, Mr. Hartz innocently signed the statement. He signed it by an emissary of Mr. Warren's coming to his office, a man that Mr. Warren had sent out to Chicago from Washington for the explicit purpose of getting this statement signed. I understand that Mr. Warren has sent emissaries to other cities such as New York, Boston, and other places, to get so-called character witnesses.

I then called on the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in his office and introduced Mr. Hartz to him. Mr. Hartz was astounded when he was shown the testimony of Mr. Warren where he admitted being a member of Communist-front organizations. This is the reason why character witnesses in a case of this kind are of no value.

We have seen a demonstration here today with the galleries full. We have seen a party of 500 delegates of the Congress of American Women, another group which has been identified by the Attorney General and is mentioned in the Washington Daily News of today along with 10 others as a Communist-front organization. The list also includes the Washington Book Shop and the American League for Peace and Democracy, to which Mr. Warren belonged. If Mr. Warren did not know what these organizations were and what they stood for, he certainly should have because he was a director of the Washington Book Shop. Furthermore, anyone who knew about the Washington Book Shop at all knew it was not only a Communist-front organization, but it was the Communists' headquarters in Washington where they held meetings in the back room. If Mr. Warren did not know this, then I do not think he is qualified to fill the position he has been holding in the Government.

The President of the United States came out Saturday with an order to get rid of people who have belonged to Communist-front organizations. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that if we are going to start cleaning house we had better start now.

In regard to this matter of character witnesses and the telegrams and letters that Mr. Warren has solicited, I direct your attention to the case of Carl A. Marzani, one of the most notorious Communists we have in this country who has just recently been indicted. He held a key position in the State Department. I asked for his record at the Civil Service Commission. Here in brief is what they said:

> The Commission rated Mr. Marzani ineligible. From this rating Mr. Marzani appealed and was given a hearing before the Board of Appeals and Review, at which time Messrs. H. C. Barton, Chief of the Presentation Division; Emil Depres, of the Board of Analysis; Prof. Edward S. Mason, of the Board of Analysis; and Maj. D. Thompson, of the Army Services Forces, all of whom were fellow employees, with the exception of Mr. H. C. Barton, who was the supervisor under whom Mr. Marzani was employed, and all of whom were with the Office of Strategic Services, testified emphatically regarding Mr. Marzani's loyalty. Thereafter the Board of Appeals and Review recommended eligibility, and the case was again reviewed by two staff members.

Then Mr. Marzani was rated eligible.

It is a well-known fact that character witnesses are recruited generally among people who do not know all the facts.

There are thousands of men capable of filling the position of Mr. Warren, and as well as others who have never held membership in Communist-front organizations.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to attempt to defend the name of Mr. Warren because I do not know anything more about him than the chairman of my committee knows about him, and that is not very much. But I do not think it is the right way to do things. I think you are establishing a bad precedent in taking funds away as to any particular individual in the Government.

As the previous speaker just stated, the President has given notice of how he intends to rid the Government of all Communists. But in that notice he is also fair enough to say to all those who are being accused that they have a chance for a trial. That is something we are not attempting to give anybody here. We do not give anybody any kind of a trial to prove whether or not he is right or wrong. But let that be as it may; what you are doing in this appropriation bill today is cutting the Conciliation Service $600,000, at a time when industrial peace and stable relations between labor and management is more essential than it ever has been in the history of our country. In the face of the grand job that the Conciliation Service has done in the past year and a half in preventing strikes and settling strikes and in view of the good record they have made, you say you are going to slap their face by cutting them to the tune of $600,000. Oh, yes, it is all right to talk out of one side of your mouth one day and then talk out of the other side of your mouth the next day, but when you go throughout the country preaching to the people that you are going to take care of this labor situation and that you want peace between labor and management you are not going very far in that direction today when you are cutting the most effective arm of this Government for the prevention of strikes and industrial unrest.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this pending amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Apprentice Training Service: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Labor to conduct a program of encouraging apprentice training, as authorized by the act of August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), including personal services in the District of Columbia, $2,015,600.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 4, line 8, strike out "$2,015,600" and insert "$2,544,200."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to increase the amount allowed by the majority of the committee for the Apprentice Training Service to the amount set forth in the President's budget estimate.

In the figures submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, $2,544,200 was requested for this very vital training service. The majority of the committee saw fit to cut this requested appropriation almost 21 percent.

The Apprentice Training Service is a State program, supervised by the Federal Government. It is one that is entirely voluntary. Neither the employees nor the employers are compelled to participate in the program, but they do participate in it because they wish to do so and because the employees wish to learn a skilled trade. This policy of voluntary cooperation between employer and employee has accounted for a great increase in the apprentice-training program for the ensuing fiscal year. This is because of the fact, first, the deficit in the number of skilled workers caused by the war and the preceding depression years; second, because of the experience employers had during the war with workers with limited skills and who were not skillful to the extent that they were of sufficient use to the employer; third, because of the increasing age of the present skilled labor force in the country. You can appreciate what this means in such industries as the construction industry which is at the moment one of the most important industries with which the American people are concerned.

Fourth, because of strong aid in favor of the program from national employer organizations, as well as from international unions in promoting apprenticeship among their members.

And lastly, because of the availability of a large number of veterans who desire to learn a skilled trade.

The work load of the Apprentice Training Service has been greatly increased, has been increased far beyond the amount of work that can be handled by the present staff and by the amount of funds which have been allowed in the present fiscal year. As a matter of fact, as I pointed out yesterday, the program has grown in this respect: The number of establishments participating in the Apprentice Training Service, in this voluntary program—not a program in which the Federal Government says to the employer or employee, "You must participate"—the number of establishments which have participated in the program as of January 1, 1946, in the amount of 30,628 has grown to the amount 78,753 as of January 1, 1947. In other words, an increase of 157 percent.

The number of registered apprentices participating in this program as of January 1, 1946, was 28,329, whereas, as of January 1 of the present year, 1947, we had 105,679, or an increase of 273 percent.

Yet in the face of this substantially added number of establishments, this added number of registered apprentices, the majority of this committee have seen fit to cut 21 percent of the appropriation for this worthy service. I trust you will support my amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one would think that this apprenticeship training service that the gentleman just talked about is a Federal service in its entirety. As a matter of fact, may I state again that apprenticeship at its State level had its origin in my State. I know something about it and I have been one of the people who supported it vigorously down through the years. The man who heads this, Mr. Patterson, headed the apprenticeship training service in my State. What does he do down here since they called him to Washington? What he is doing is to give leadership from an office here in Washington to the extension of apprenticeship in the States and trying to get those States, of which there are many, which have no State laws on the subject of apprenticeship, he is trying to get them to see light and to enact legislation providing for State systems of apprenticeship, not Federal systems.

So in that effort this terrible committee, headed by the strutting slave driver, the gentleman now addressing you, gave to the apprenticeship training service at Washington exactly within $6 of what they had for expenditure in 1947.

One would think that the gentleman on the other side would at least tell the members of the committee what the subcommittee has really done. He has left you the impression that we have destroyed this service—oh, how we have battered it down, these terrible people, the czars!

Well, we have given to the apprenticeship training service—and you can understand that this is the truth; all you have to do is read the record on page 11 of the report—we are giving them within six bucks of what they had last year. I think you will agree that is a pretty generous act, in view of the necessity for money in other parts of the world.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman means that he as czar cut $6 out of them?

Mr. KEEFE. That is what this "terrible" committee did.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this amendment be voted down.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Did the gentleman from Rhode Island speak on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. KEEFE. Very well.

Mr. FOGARTY. For once the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, it always amuses me to hear the chairman of this committee get up and ask those of us on this side: "Why do you not give us all the story?" I do not know yet of one amendment today where he has given you all the story when it meant something to him to have the amendment defeated.

Why does he not come out and tell the whole story? Why does he not tell that this apprenticeship-training program is one of the great programs of our Government, that the service is doing an excellent job and wants to expand to the tune of $500,000 more this year. But this generous committee, headed by that overgenerous gentleman from Wisconsin, says "No, we do not believe that program is helpful, we will give you what you had last year and see if you can get by with that, notwithstanding the housing and other programs that need so much skilled labor."

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Has the gentleman read the report of the committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes; I have.

Mr. KEEFE. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this "terrible" committee the gentleman has castigated so many times this afternoon states in this report on page 11 with reference to this service:

This has been a splendid contribution on the part of the apprentice-training service and should be continued. The committee has been very sympathetic to the apprentice-training service and desires to see its work continued at the level it has been carried on in the current fiscal year.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think that is exactly what I said, but I said further that they are asking an additional $500,000 to expand and that the majority refused to give them that $500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $5,500 for purchase of newspaper-clipping services; reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered; and not to exceed $15,000 for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600); $3,373,400, of which amount not to exceed $2,202,700 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia and not to exceed $695,000 for a cost-of-living study and report.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma: Page 4, lines 15 and 16, after the semicolon, strike out the figure "$3,373,400" and insert "$2,373,400."

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this is simply an amendment to cut $1,000,000 off of this appropriation. We have heard so much recently about the unreliability of statistics that the Government statisticians have been foisting upon the people, especially from the Department of Labor, and about all of the soft jobs that they have in that Department, that I think the only mistake our committee made with reference to this amount was by fixing the amount $1,000,000 larger than it should have been.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that the requested budget was $6,750,000. This committee has already seen fit to decrease it by $3,000,000, and even though we do not have any agreement with those on the other side, there are a great many people in this country that think the Bureau of Labor Statistics is one of the very fundamental and necessary functions of our Government today, and it seems to me that when you cut out $3,000,000, almost in half, that you have gone far enough.

I hope the amendment is not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

General administration: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the United States Employment Service, including one Director at not to exceed $10,000 per annum and other personal services in the District of Columbia and contract stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), $2,656,800, of which $1,756,800 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944: *Provided*, That the appropriation in this title for traveling expenses shall be available, in an amount not to exceed $2,000, for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the United States Employment Service when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Page 5, line 8, strike out "$2,656,800, of which $1,756,800" and insert in lieu thereof, "$4,796,000, of which $2,650,600."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FOGARTY. I appreciate the generosity of the Republican leadership on this day.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to make a little correction here? I know what he is endeavoring to do, but may I suggest that we have already just voted down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to raise the amount for the Veterans' Placement Service, and that same thing is now embodied in the figure which the gentleman has submitted in his amendment, so we would be voting on the same thing again.

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, now, I am not going to yield any further. This is not just on that Veterans' Placement Service at all. It raises the appropriation for USES, which I think is advisable at this time.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that part of his amendment which relates to the Veterans' Placement Service on which the House has just voted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order comes too late.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the recommended appropriation for the United States Employment Service, exclusive of the funds specifically appropriated to the Veterans' Employment Service, amounted to $3,912,900. The committee recommendation provides for only $900,000, a cut of 77 percent. The funds requested specifically for the Veterans' Employment Service amounted to $2,650,600, and the recommendation by the committee is $1,750,000, a cut of 34 percent.

This action in effect emasculates the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 by abolishing the responsibility placed upon the Federal Government by that act to maintain a national system of public-employment offices and for coordinating these offices throughout the country and increasing their usefulness. This is apparent when account is taken of the fact that the funds appropriated to the States for carrying out their responsibility under the Wagner-Peyser Act, amounting to $71,728,000, are to be administered by the United States Employment Service. An appropriation of $900,000 to the United States Employment Service is scarcely adequate to maintain the separate accounts for the 51 State employment service agencies. In fact, I seriously question whether the United States Employment Service will be able to account to this Congress whether the State expenditures have been made in accordance with the requirements of the Congress under this appropriation. Under these circumstances, it is impossible for the USES to carry out its responsibilities for promoting and coordinating these public-employment offices and for providing minimum standards of efficiency and uniformity in administrative procedures.

The United States Employment Service, to carry out its responsibilities, must develop operating methods and tools as required in the face of changing labor market conditions, analyze the experience and practices in the various States in order to provide for the prompt extension of the best operating practices to all local employment offices; in addition, it must provide employment counseling and specialized placement materials to assist disabled war veterans and war-handicapped workers to find useful employment; maintain a national uniform reporting system to appraise operations and work load; provide for exchange of labor market information on employment opportunities among local offices; and provide for the clearance of labor among the States.

On the basis of the testimony presented before the committee, it is utterly impossible to understand the committee's recommendation. A clue is found, however, in the committee report, which states, and I quote:

It impresses the committee that the functions to be performed by the United States Employment Service are no greater or much different from those performed by the Bureau of Employment Security in the Social Security Administration, which administers the unemployment-compensation program.

Even a casual comparison of the Wagner-Peyser Act with the Social Security Act will disclose at once that wholly different kinds of responsibility are placed on the Federal agencies administering these programs. There is no reference in the Social Security Act to a national system of unemployment compensation. On the contrary, the responsibility of the Bureau of Employment Security consists almost entirely of administering grants-in-aid to independent State unemployment compensation systems. The United States Employment Service, on the other hand, is specifically required by law to promote and develop a national system of employment offices and to coordinate the activities of the employment offices and to increase their usefulness by developing and prescribing minimum standards of efficiency and by assisting them in meeting problems peculiar to their localities and by promoting uniformity in administrative and statistical procedures.

It is obvious that the committee is in error when it states that the responsibilities for administration of the unemployment compensation and of the public employment service are the same and on this basis appropriates to each of the agencies $900,000 for the next fiscal year. The only responsibility which is common to both of these agencies is the administration and allocation of funds to the States, and it is for this reason that I say $900,000 will scarcely provide for the bookkeeping functions required of the United States Employment Service in making grants to the States and accounting for State expenditures.

The committee has erred also in assuming that the appropriation to the Bureau of Employment Security represents the total costs of providing administrative grants to the independent State unemployment compensation agencies. On this basis, it has recommended the same amount to the United States Employment Service. The committee has failed to take into account the fact that over and above the $900,000 which it recommends for the Bureau of Employment Security, it is also appropriating to the Social Security Administration, Office of the Commissioner, $2,072,000 for salaries, consolidated operations. This latter amount covers the central services to all

offices in the Social Security Administration, including the Bureau of Employment Security. These services are personnel and business management, accounting and auditing, informational services, and over-all statistical and analytical activities. For example, it is not the Bureau of Employment Security which audits the State agency expenditures, but rather the Social Security Administration. Likewise, State personnel merit standards and examination materials are not developed by the Bureau of Employment Security, but by the State Technical Advisory Service in the Social Security Administration. Indeed, a considerable part of the $2,072,000 appropriated to the Social Security Administration is for services to the Bureau of Employment Security in addition to the $900,000 recommended for that Bureau. The United States Employment Service, however, is supposed to provide for all of these services in addition to the administrative services it renders to the Veterans' Employment Service out of the appropriation recommended by the committee.

The committee recommendation for the United States Employment Service in effect does away with a Federal-State system of public employment offices and substitutes independent State employment office systems. It destroys a capital investment of many million dollars made by the Federal Government in the development of the public employment service. The report throws aside the wealth of employment-service experience acquired by the National Government during the depression and war years. It means the dissolution of professionally qualified and experienced personnel developed in the public employment service over the years. It is my firm conviction that to liquidate the most effective machinery we have developed for mobilizing our manpower resources is ill-advised.

USES SERVICES TO DISABLED VETERANS AND HANDICAPPED WORKERS

I should like to point out to this Congress that if the committee recommendations for appropriations to the United States Employment Service remain unchanged, a great disservice will be done to the millions of disabled war veterans and handicapped workers of this Nation. You perhaps realize that this segment of our labor force requires a most specialized job assistance if they are to obtain suitable employment and take their rightful place in our economy. To deprive these handicapped people from entering on gainful employment because public employment offices do not have in their possession the kinds of techniques and methods supplied by the United States Employment Service represents no economy at all. On the contrary, any job assistance to handicapped people made possible by the cooperative action of the United States Employment Service and the State employment services is a real contribution to improving the welfare of their families and their communities. Only in this way can the handicapped job seekers become taxpayers.

The specialized job placement problems of disabled veterans and handicapped workers requires a thorough knowledge of physical capacities of these workers and the physical requirements of the jobs to which they may be properly referred.

We cannot allow job services to disabled veterans and handicapped workers to be limited to the resources of the individual local employment office. I have here a document that I wish to insert in the RECORD, which the United States Employment Service within the past few weeks has forwarded to all States, entitled "Plan of Employment for Physically and Mentally Handicapped Through Public Employment Services." This document is only one illustration of the type of activity which the United States Employment Service must undertake to develop programs in a State employment service.

I say to the Members of this body that the Public Employment Service is not just another Government agency, but one which in all of its daily operations is dealing with the human problems of obtaining and holding jobs. These problems are even more difficult and more complex for our disabled veterans and handicapped workers. We must not deny to these groups the assistance which the United States Employment Service renders. It is our undeniable obligation to assure adequate funds to the United States Employment Service so that these responsibilities may be carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes. This matter has been quite thoroughly discussed. However, in view of the statements just made and in order that the record may be kept straight, let us bear in mind that this so-called United States Employment Service here in Washington during the period of time in which the United States Government operated the hundreds of employment offices throughout the Nation had the responsibility here in Washington for looking after the management of all these offices scattered from one end of the country to the other.

On November 15 last those local offices and all the services connected with them, including the very services that the gentleman from Rhode Island just spoke about, were returned to the States. They are now being operated by the States, and we are giving them $71,000,000 to carry on those services in the next fiscal year, the very services the gentleman has talked about, except this: The service of coordinating and collecting the ideas of the employment services here in Washington and funneling that information out to the States, and of making the studies of the grants that are made for the administration of these employment offices in the States.

When I made the statement that we gave them $900,000 for that service we gave them that sum because that is all they need to function in that field. We gave as an illustration the amount of money that is given to the social security function which handles the administration of the unemployment-compensation grants, which is almost identical to this employment service here in Washington.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION. Is not that part of the program that is carried on by Mr. Faulkner?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Faulkner's program is part of it. The other part of it is carried on by Bob Goodwin who is head of the USES.

Mr. ROBSION. The States handle that.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say that all Mr. Goodwin has to do is supervise the allotment of funds and the gathering together of information that can be sent out to the various employment offices which since last November are being operated by the States.

Mr. ROBSION. This includes the funds for the program carried on by Mr. Faulkner that the Secretary of Labor labeled as "nuts." Is that right?

Mr. KEEFE. That is correct; yes, sir; that is correct.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not think the Secretary of Labor ever said that that program of Mr. Faulkner's was "nuts."

Mr. KEEFE. Well, do you want me to bring the record here?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes; I would like to see the record.

Mr. KEEFE. Would you like me to bring the record here and prove it to you?

Mr. FOGARTY. You have been talking about what is in the record. Let us see it.

Mr. KEEFE. You were there and heard it just the same as I did. It is part of the record.

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not get it the same as you did. Let us see the record. You have been talking about the record all afternoon. Let us have the record and let us take a look at it and see who is right.

Mr. KEEFE. You will get it if you just keep your shirt on.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, may the amendment be read again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 8, strike out "$2,656,800, of which $1,756,800" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,796,000, of which $2,650,600."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 56, noes 131.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries: For personal services for the Wage and Hour Division necessary in performing th duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and by the act to provide

conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C. 38), and the functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act transferred under and pursuant to reorganization plan No. 2 of 1946, $3,748,400, of which amount not to exceed $746,100 may be expended for departmental salaries.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 9, line 2, strike out "$3,748,400" and insert "$4,803,100."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to increase the amount allowed by the majority of the committee for the Wage and Hour Division, to make up for a cut of 22 percent which the majority has made.

As you know, the Wage and Hour Division enforces the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, as well as the Public Contracts Act, known as the Walsh-Healey Act. There are approximately 550,000 establishments in this country, with a total of 20,000,000 covered employees, subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act alone. For the last few years about 50 percent of the establishments inspected by the Wage and Hour Division have been found to be in violation of the major provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. That is, with regard to minimum wage, as to overtime, and as to child labor. Of these 550,000 establishments covered under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Wage and Hour Division has been able to inspect only 45,000, or 8 percent of them, each year. Nearly 380,000 establishments, two-thirds of the total of the currently operated covered firms, have never been inspected during the past 8 years. As I said, under the present budget estimate—and the Department is seeking no increase over the amount allowed them for this purpose for the year 1947—they have been able to make only about 45,000 inspections per year. There is no way in which these laws, the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act, can be enforced unless actual physical inspections are made, and they cannot be made under the amount of appropriation which has been proposed in this bill.

To repeat, the current inspection schedule of 45,000 establishments per year is only 8 percent of the total covered establishments. I would like to tell you something about the inspections in the fiscal year 1946, just 1 year ago. The Wage and Hour Division made 43,832 inspections of establishments under both the Walsh-Healey Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act. Of this number, 22,058, or more than half, were found in violation of one of the major provisions of the acts; that is, the minmum wage, overtime, or child labor provisions. Almost half of them, 20,184, were in violation of the overtime provisions of one or both acts, at some time during the period covered by the inspection. Eleven percent of the inspected establishments were in violation of the minimum wage provisions. The minimum wage law is 40 cents an hour for a 40-hour week, or $16. It seems to me it is poor economy and not to the best interest of the people of this country if we cut an appropriation which seeks to enforce this minimum wage law and which seeks to enforce other provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Walsh-Healey Act, such as the overtime and child labor provisions.

The facts with regard to the child labor provisions of the act were discussed by me on yesterday.

Let me close by saying that any reduction contemplated in this bill is going to cause a great deal of danger to the people of this country and the public welfare insofar as enforcing the provisions of these acts is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 5:

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1948."

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before and during the war out in the San Francisco Bay area we had a rather unholy alliance of the CIO Machinists' Union, Local 1304, and the A. F. of L. Machinists' Union, Local 68, headed by three notorious and unsavory characters known as Hook and Dillon and Turkeyneck Smith. During the war they repeatedly and successfully prevented work on Government and merchant ships, and in some instances even prevented convoys from sailing on time. It got so bad that on one occasion the President at the request of the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission sent a directive to Messrs. Hook and Dillon and Turkeyneck Smith to cease and desist in their efforts to prevent work on vitally needed ships for the Navy and Maritime Commission. Now I refer to page 299 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1943, and quote this directive from President Roosevelt:

I am informed by Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission that actions of your union are seriously interfering with vital war production and have delayed shipments of men and supplies to fighting fronts because, contrary to the action of practically all other labor, you have refused to abide by agreements for work on Saturdays and Sundays and to comply with measures established to prevent unnecessary migration of labor.

You are directed to conform with the amended Pacific coast shipbuilding and ship-repair stabilization agreements and to antimigration measures adopted and generally operating in San Francisco Bay area.

The individuals referred to heretofore ignored the directive. And now—good grief. And good gravy. What next? Here is a letter I received the other day from the California Metal Trades Association of San Francisco:

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: It has come to our attention that Mr. Harry Hook, business agent for the International Association of Machinists, Lodge No. 68, until March 1946, when he was thrown out by the International, and presently business agent for Local No. 168, United Steel Workers of America, CIO, is being seriously considered for a position as labor consultant with the United States Department of Labor.

That is one letter.

Here is another from the National Motor Bearing Co. of Redwood City:

You are probably familiar with the fact that Messrs. Harry Hook and Edward Dillon were the organizers of Local 68, International Association of Machinists, in San Francisco for a number of years and that these men, in their position as organizers, called illegal and unjustified strikes in shipyards and various metal-working industries in the bay area off and on during the war. The situation was so bad at one time that President Roosevelt asked Messrs. Hook and Dillon to return men to work and they ignored this request right in the midst of a crucial period of the war.

* * * * *

I am writing to you at the request of a number of firms in San Francisco and Oakland who are very disturbed over the fact that Harry Hook has applied to the National Labor Relations Board for a position as labor relations adviser, hoping to become a negotiator for the National Labor Relations Board and, as such, seeking civil-service status. We, as manufacturers, object to the National Labor Relations Board appointing a man of Harry Hook's stripe to a Federal agency wherein he could continue the nefarious operations that he has carried on for so many years in the machinists' union.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to put the Department of Labor and the National Labor Relations Board on notice that Mr. Harry Hook will only be employed by the Government over my prostrate form. It's high time that our Federal agencies took care to insure the fact that the persons they employ to serve the public are loyal citizens of the United States and that they are possessed of the highest character and integrity.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, we have now reached title II of the bill dealing with appropriations for the Federal Security Agency. I am wondering if we cannot by unanimous consent agree to consider all of the items under title II as read in order to expedite matters, but any paragraph to be open to amendment. I understand there is no objection to the provisions of title II.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to dispensing with the further reading of the bill provided I am granted the opportunity to offer two amendments, and I believe the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has one amendment and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] one.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II may be considered as read, and that amendments may be in order at any point thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 15, line 20, strike out "$14,200,000" and insert "$19,842,759.97."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because I find that under the George-Barden Act, Public Law 586, passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, for the further development of vocational education, including vocational education in agriculture, which act provides for 100 percent matching of funds by the States, there will be a great

deal of difficulty caused in the program unless we now appropriate the amount $5,842,759.97 to cover a deficit in the amount of allowances to the States under this item. In order to assure to the States, most of which have promptly cooperated in this program of 100 percent matching funds, in order to grant them the same amounts as they have in the present fiscal year for vocational education, it becomes necessary to allow this $5,842,759.97 increase provided in my amendment.

I therefore ask that my amendment be favorably acted upon by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, in the appropriation for the Office of Education for grants to the States for the further maintenance of vocational education, he asks that the amount provided in the bill, namely $14,200,000 be increased to $19,842,759.97, and I am only taking this time because this is a very difficult and technical situation.

You will recall that last year this House passed the so-called George-Barden Act, a very good bill, I will say to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, and in that bill they raised the amount of authorization for vocational education in three of its aspects to twenty-nine odd million dollars in the form of grants to the States, but when they wrote that bill they did something else. They changed the formula under which these funds are allocated to the States.

Under the law as it existed prior to the enactment to the George-Barden Act there was a distinct formula written into the law setting forth the bases upon which these funds were to be allocated to the several States. Now, that formula was changed, so here is what we are up against. We get this bill from the Bureau of the Budget, and what does it provide? It provides for an allocation of funds on the basis of $29,000,000, the authorization of the George-Barden Act, and then it carries a budget appropriation of $14,200,000.

Now, how ridiculous. When the committee got to going into this item, and we had to go into it very diligently, we found that if we accepted the Budget suggestion as to the amount of the appropriation State after State would not get as much money under this new formula as they received under the old law. So the vocational people all over the country began to write and wire me and come to my office with a delegation pointing out the difficulties of the situation and what it would do to the vocational-education system in many of the States of the Nation.

What we were up against was this. We wanted to assure to the States of this Nation that have built their vocational systems of education upon the theory that they would continue to receive these vocational grants the same amount of money that they had in the current fiscal year, so the committee asked Dr. Studebaker when he appeared before the committee to figure out how much he would have to allocate and what sum in the allocation process would guarantee to all of the States at least the amount of money that they have had in the current fiscal year. He came up with this figure of $19,842,000 and said, "That is the figure that we must use for our allocation."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. I will not object, although the gentleman objected to Mr. FOGARTY's continuing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. I have not objected to any person continuing, and if the gentleman does object I assure him I will be very happy to sit down, because I am exceedingly tired. However, I think the gentleman and the Members of this House ought to know just what is involved in this very complicated and difficult situation that we have to deal with.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman and his colleagues for the very effective work they have done in trying to effect some real economy in government. It is quite apparent by now that some of our friends on the other side of the aisle yet persist in pursuing that extravagant spending course that has characterized the conduct of government under their leadership for so long a time. I hope the country will understand that we on this side are intent and determined upon making some real economies in government, and that it is now, as I say, apparent that we are going to have to do it on our own.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

There is just this about this situation. In the limited time that is available I of course cannot give you all the technical information that is necessary with respect to what the committee did with this paragraph. Simply let me say this to you, that with the appropriation of $14,200,000 and the allocation of funds on the basis of $19,000,000 each State will have allocated to it the same amount of money that it had last year under the old formula. We are forced to do this because of the new formula that was written into the George-Barden Act, and you would not want it to be any other way than the way this committee has written this provision into the law.

I may say to you that there will come a time before long when we shall have to raise the amount of this appropriation, because when you passed the George-Barden Act you authorized $29,000,000 to be appropriated, and there will come a time when the States who have to match those funds will come in with matching funds sufficient so that they can very properly ask us to appropriate more money. If the States actually appropriate at the State level the matching funds necessary to meet the allocation of $19,000,000, I will be the first one to come in here as a member of the Deficiency Committee and ask that those funds be provided.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman explain to the House the difference in the formula between the present act and the old law?

Mr. KEEFE. The principal difference is this: Under the old law they had it on the basis of population, generally speaking. Under the new law they have provided a minimum amount that must be certified to each of the States, a minimum of $35,000. There are a lot of States that will benefit by that. They are going to get more money than they ever had in their lives under this program, under this so-called minimum amount that must be given to the various States of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I probably am playing a little unusual role today in supporting an amendment to increase appropriations. My normal tendency is in the other direction.

May I say to the Members of the House it is time to check up a little when you begin to cut the funds off of the vocational-training program, the one great piece of legislation that this House put into effect and had on the statute books for many years, to encourage work, to encourage thrift, and to encourage boys to learn how to earn a living.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman although he was not so kind as to yield to me.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that we have not cut the budget and that we have allowed appropriations in the exact amount that the budget recommended?

Mr. BARDEN. When you stop a program dead in its tracks and the need for that program continues to grow, then you have cut it. You can kill it in that way. Do not make any mistake about that. You can kill it. The formula the gentleman talks about as some mysterious formula, I have never heard of before, and the committee on education has not been a party to any change that would be detrimental to the program.

There is the gentleman from Michigan and many of the finest Members on your side of the aisle. We worked for months and months and turned out a bill which when explained to the House was virtually accepted with unanimous approval on the record that was made at that time. On that basis the legislatures of the various States have already met the requirements under this bill and have appropriated moneys in anticipation of these funds.

I do not know of a piece of legislation that is benefiting the average veteran, whom we talk so much about, any more than this legislation. The vocational-training schools in my section of the

country are crowded with them. This is the cheapest way in the world for the Government of the United States to render this service.

I heard the gentleman talk about how complaints are coming in from all over the Nation. I have been somewhat in the center of this vocational-education picture. I want to say to the gentleman that not one single complaint, not one single criticism, has come to my attention, and I have spoken, I reckon, to as many vocational schools as any man in the country. I am for them 1,000 percent and this House is for them. With all of the schools that have made good you cannot expect to stop that movement dead in its tracks.

I am asking that this appropriation be fixed at a practical sum. The States are going to meet it. If the States do meet it, then the money will remain in the Treasury. If they do, and I think they will, it will be the finest investment that any dollar of the Government of the United States could take part in.

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

Mr. BARDEN. Yes; I yield to my friend.

Mr. JUDD. If this sum is increased and the States do not qualify under the program, the money cannot be spent. Is that not correct?

Mr. BARDEN. Certainly; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. JUDD. Then we are authorizing and making available the sums that we promised under legislation which this House passed?

Mr. BARDEN. That is right. The gentleman knows that the committee was not only tight but very conservative in arriving at the amount of money, and we turned away every request to match in every other way except on a dollar-per-dollar basis. We stood firm on that. We brought the bill here with a fine report. The House adopted it and practically just embraced it. The gentleman from Wisconsin voted for it and everybody was delighted to have that bill because it was a very carefully prepared piece of legislation. It sickens me now because I know there is not a hamlet, there is not a county, there is not a big city that is not drawing real genuine benefits from the money being spent on this matching fund in the vocational-training program in this country. If it had not sold itself to the people, if it had not done such a wonderful job, there would not be such a genuine wholesale cry for its continuation and program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 4 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. KELLEY. Is not this program under the Vocational Training Act an expanding program that millions of people in this country need for vocational training?

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Michigan and I have served on this committee. We have seen this fund grow from a little small amount every year, and he knows and I know that it has justified every dollar of its expenditure.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman on your side who addressed the question to you referred to an entirely different matter when he referred to the vocational rehabilitation program. That has nothing to do with this particular item.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, if he did, he intended to say "vocational training." Vocational rehabilitation is in another field, but the vocational-training program is what the gentleman meant to refer to.

You have many counties and sections of States that are calling for these schools, and we have to say "No" to them. I have some of the finest vocational-training schools and instructors in my district in the country. The white people have taken the lead, and the Negro schools are joining in doing a fine job.

Let me tell you of one colored school in my district—an excellent vocational-training school headed by a fine instructor. That one man has approximately 40 of the Negro veterans in that school and is making every dollar do $10 worth of work. Then to say that we must stop there—I cannot understand it, gentlemen. You cannot stop the progress in this movement.

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

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. Is this appropriation the maximum amount, or will it still be permissible for the Congress to appropriate under a supplemental appropriation?

Mr. BARDEN. You will either put it in now or I am afraid the program will be cut down.

Mr. MACKINNON. How is the law worded? Is this the amount of money appropriated for the full year, or is there a definite obligation on the part of the Government to match every nickel that the States put up?

Mr. BARDEN. No; there is no obligation to match anything beyond the amount of appropriation that you make. If the appropriation is made and a State does not match it, dollar for dollar, it will stay in the Treasury. So the gentleman was wrong when he said we had done any great changing in the formulas. You have got three or four different formulas in the bill. You have always had different formulas. When you are dealing with agriculture the formula is one thing. When you are dealing with the city population the formula is another, and when you are dealing with home economics it is another. The gentleman intended to be fair about it, but there are three or four different formulas.

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

Mr. BARDEN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I am a little surprised that my friend, if he has read the record, would make the type of argument he is making——

Mr. BARDEN. Well, now, do not lecture me. What is your question?

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that I made the statement on this floor that, if the States will match this up to the $19,000,000 which, under this bill, we are permitting the Office of Education to allocate, that I, as one member of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies on the Committee on Appropriations, will be in here asking for an appropriation to match those funds? But there is not a single showing that you can point to that indicates that the States are going to match this $19,000,000 which is authorized.

Mr. BARDEN. I can call one State to the gentleman's attention. That is the State of North Carolina. That State has matched every dollar, and they look around and they find beyond the allocation of the $14,000,000 it will not be available. I wish I could construe the gentleman's statement to mean that, if the need arises, the gentleman could, just by turning a little valve, provide the funds. However, I am going to construe the gentleman's statement to mean that he and his committee will take care of the program if the need arises. I hope the House will make these funds available now, however.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I read and understand the record correctly, I think that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], while not always right, perhaps took just about the same position with regard to this particular appropriation as any other member of his party would have under the circumstances. While I am just as anxious as my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] about the welfare of the vocational education program, I must say that a reading of the record—and I say this in fairness to the gentleman from Wisconsin—indicates that the gentleman from Wisconsin is entirely friendly to vocational education. But the trouble is not so much with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] as with the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget fixed the figure and he stayed within the figure. As anxious as I am for the figure to be increased substantially, I doubt very much if we should criticize the committee in following, as it did in this case, the exact recommendation of the Budget.

If I understand the record clearly, it also indicates that under the $14,200,000 appropriation, some States will actually receive less this year than before, and we would need to provide $1,532,922.73 additional to prevent any State receiving less than it received heretofore; but to add $1,532,922.73 would be, to that extent, going beyond the recommendation

of the Bureau of the Budget. Congress has definitely recognized the great value of vocational education and the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget should have been compatible with the expressed will of Congress. Personally I think it is one of the finest programs the Government has ever undertaken. Not only have we recognized it, but we have authorized expenditures in excess of $29,000,000 annually. Notwithstanding our authorizations and the approval of both Houses of Congress, the Bureau of the Budget holds this program down to $14,200,000. Congress should not hesitate to override the Bureau of the Budget and provide additional funds. Certainly, however, we would hardly expect economy-minded Republicans to go beyond the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, especially in view of their expressed intention to reduce drastically the recommendations which have heretofore been made by the President and the Bureau of the Budget. I do hope, however, that the leadership in the Republican Party will appreciate the wisdom of providing additional funds for this particular item which means so much to the welfare of the people of the Nation.

I can, of course, appreciate the difficulties involved in trying to increase this amount at this time here in the House, but I do hope that the Senate will increase it. If the Senate does not increase it, then I hope that additional funds will be provided in a deficiency bill which may hereafter come before Congress.

With regard to North Carolina, as my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] has pointed out, we predicated and based our program on the maximum, in the honest belief that Congress would keep faith with the authorization and that the money would be provided. We are going to be shortchanged to the extent of about $378,000 unless Congress does provide additional funds. Whether or not it will provide it hereafter in a deficiency bill remains to be seen, but at least we have the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who is chairman of this subcommittee, that he for one is willing to vote for the necessary deficiency appropriation.

Now, if we have others on his side who will go along on a deficiency appropriation then we certainly are encouraged to believe that the States which can justify and can match the Federal funds will not be handicapped in the vocational-education field.

I understand that Dr. Studebaker will be able to give the Congress the actual data between now and April 15, which is not too far away. If he can obtain the information from the States with regard to the needs, he can give the information to the appropriate committee, then the deficiency can be provided, and our States can be taken care of. I for one am delighted at the support offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I hope that we may be justified in the belief that his Republican colleagues in the House will support him in the very definite position he has taken with regard to this particular matter.

As I stated in the beginning, I do not feel that we should be too severe on the subcommittee, in view of the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, and especially in view of the fact that the several States have failed apparently to furnish the data necessary in the determination of the amount of Federal funds which may be needed in the expansion of the program. I am delighted that the State of North Carolina has demonstrated such a great interest in vocational education, and has placed itself in a position to take advantage of the increased grant in aid. Vocational education is close to the people and should be expanded greatly in the interest of the general welfare of the people of our Nation. The program is not restricted to any particular section of the country, and I have every reason to believe that a great and magnificent job has been done in all areas. Skilled workers still constitute one of the great needs of this Nation. Our recent experience has demonstrated to all sections of our country and to all segments of our population the great need for skilled men and women in all vocations. States should be encouraged to expand vocational education as a means of lifting higher the standards of living in America. Now that we have the assurance of the very distinguished and able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] that an expanded program will have the benefit of his support, and since everything indicates that additional funds in substantial amounts will be needed, I express the earnest hope that the Bureau of the Budget will approve the increase which will be indicated by the information which is now being collected and which will soon be available.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to try to limit debate on this bill. It is now 4:30, and if we are going to finish this bill today we must have some limitation of debate.

Mr. DONDERO. I can make my statement in 2 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will it be in order afterward to move to strike out the last word?

Mr. KEEFE. My request relates to this amendment only.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this bill, but this amendment has challenged my interest and attention. As one who had something to do with the framing of the George-Barden Act I want to confirm everything the gentleman from North Carolina has said regarding that bill. That legislation is a matching program, dollar for dollar.

The President in his budget message requested $14,200,000. The committee has tried to follow that recommendation. The committee has said to the House and to the country that if the States should provide funds beyond the $14,200,000 and up to the $19,000,000 figure then the Congress would at a later date provide the difference between the two figures in order to match the State dollars so appropriated.

I will ask the chairman of the subcommittee if that is not about the whole thing in a few words.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman has very succinctly stated the situation.

Mr. DONDERO. Under those circumstances we should support the Committee and also provide the funds if at a later date it becomes necessary to meet the State appropriations.

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

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Suppose the $14,000,000 should be exhausted or all allocated to States now participating but that in October or November when Congress was not in session other States wanted to qualify; how would they be able to get any money under their authorization when the deficiency committee would not be able to function?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield to permit me to answer the inquiry?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I think if the gentleman will read the record of the hearings and examine what Dr. Studebaker said, he would have observed that Dr. Studebaker hopes by the middle of April to be able to have the figures from the States on this situation. All Dr. Studebaker has got to do then is to convey those figures up to the appropriate committee and the Congress, of course, will see to it that this vocational program is carried out.

Mr. JUDD. Through a deficiency for this fiscal year?

Mr. KEEFE. Why, of course; exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Is a point of order against an item in title II in order at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. That stage has been passed, and it would not be in order at this time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 21, line 10, strike out the paragraph beginning with line 10 and ending with line 24, and insert "hospital and construction activities for carrying out title VI of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (Public Law 725, 79th Cong.), $1,509,965, of which not to exceed $965,000 shall be available for administrative expenses incident thereto, including printing and binding; purchase of eight passenger motor-vehicles; and travel, including attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, in pointing out the fact that this bill does not carry one dollar of appropriations for

hospital construction, I do not in any way contend or desire to suggest that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee or any member of it intends to deny appropriations for the implementation of the Hill-Burton hospital construction bill.

I rise, however, to point this out and offer an amendment to correct it, for two purposes: One, because of genuine interest in seeing the hospital construction expedited and, two, to prevent juggling of the budget bookkeeping.

You will note in the hearings, if you have read the hearings, and if not, you can find on page 389 this statement by Dr. Hilleboe, who was testifying before the committee in support of provision of the bill. He said:

So the whole chain of circumstances really awaits the statements from us that there is money in the Treasury and it is allocated, and when the plan has been approved and you have started your construction funds will be certified for payment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that on page 21 of the bill, instead of following the budget recommendation of placing in the bill an appropriation, the committee has deleted entirely the appropriation item and has written into the bill contractual authority. There, again, we are but postponing the reckoning day for appropriation, but in postponing the date you raise doubts in the minds of many small communities as to whether or not their funds will be matched, because you are placing no money in the Treasury, no money in the bank, so to speak, available for this purpose.

Now, on yesterday the distinguished gentleman and my friend from Wisconsin said that he did not intend this to be shown as a reduction in the budget, and he pointed out that the report did not so indicate. But, Mr. Chairman, if you will notice on page 44 of the report, and if my distinguished friend from Wisconsin will notice, you and he will see listed there $50,100,000 as a reduction in the President's budget and then if you will note on the recapitulation page of the report you will note that it shows a total reduction below the President's budget of $77,825,520. The fact stands that of that $77,000,000 reduction below the budget, $50,000,000 is in hospital construction.

Now, much has been said here about economy. We have been debating a good deal about cutting this bureau some and that bureau, but the over-all figure is what counts in economy. The fact stands that this bill, if passed as reported, reduces the President's budget by only 4½ percent, and included in that 4½ percent is this $50,000,000 item which the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin says is no reduction at all. So, you see, there is an actual reduction according to his statement of only $27,000,000 which is a little more than 1 percent.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not quite all the story. The contractual authorization authorizes this agency of Government to enter into contracts, not just to the extent of $50,000,000, but to the extent of $150,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, that is why I offer the amendment to make actual appropriations in the amount the committee authorizes to be contracted. This business of postponing the day when we make appropriations, this business of leaving it all to some deficiency committee at some later date raises doubts and a lot of indecision in the minds of the people, and it also casts doubt on the authenticity of the figures of the legislative budget. Here we have another example of a cut which is not real, it is an optical illusion, a committee report showing a cut of $77,000,000, when actually there is no cut at all. If you authorize contractual authority of $150,000,000, this bill represents an upping of the President's budget by $75,000,000. So where is this economy? We are but postponing the date when we will live up to our commitments. The original Hill-Burton Act authorized the appropriation of $75,000,000 for each of five fiscal years, beginning with this year. Therefore, my amendment would make available the funds for matching the funds raised by the local governmental units for this year and for next year, which is living up to the full obligation of the Hill-Burton bill. I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have just this to say. This afternoon the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] challenged me to produce some testimony. I stated that I would. In justice to the House, I desire to read it. It is the testimony of the Secretary of Labor when he appeared before our committee on March 14, 1947:

Mr. KEEFE. Did you have anything to do with the selection of Mr. Faulkner?

Mr. Faulkner is head of the Veterans' Placement Service.

Secretary SCHWELLENBACH. No, I did not. I said that I felt that the set-up, to quote my exact language—I thought the set-up was nuts, that there would be within the Department of Labor an organization that had no responsibility within the Department of Labor and whose head is General Bradley.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORE) there were—ayes 66, noes 129.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday, as will appear on page 2482 of the RECORD, I stated that the committee has not claimed we were making a $50,000,000 saving in the hospital program.

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

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I do not wish to enter into any argument with the gentleman about what the report shows; but if he will look on page 44 of the report and the specific item on page 49 of the report, he will see what I say is printed in black and white.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman well knows that from all the racket that has been coming today from the other side of the aisle certainly we must have injured somebody's feelings. So far as I am concerned, it is too bad, but we have to hurt somebody when we are doing this job of cutting down expenditures.

We have, however, in the hospital program, allotted under this bill contractual obligations for $100,000,000 more than the Budget had seen fit to give in direct appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe I ought to contribute this much at least. I was advised by the Budget Bureau only 2 days ago that while there was a request here for $50,000,000, only a fractional amount of that could have been expended in the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I might add to that in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that not a single State program had been sent in for approval to the Public Health Service in relation to this entire picture at the time our subcommittee wrote this bill. So why have $50,000,000 lying around doing nothing? The Congress will make every cent available that is matched up to the authorized limit.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on title 2 and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 137, noes 79.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KEEFE and Mr. ROONEY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 146, noes 71.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLMER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I think in my experience here this is the first time I have ever made such a motion. I am not too proud of making that motion today, but we are confronted with a situation here where we have to protect ourselves as best we can.

I had an amendment on the Clerk's desk that I wanted this Committee to consider. I had no opportunity to present that amendment, and I took this method of bringing the amendment to the attention of the Committee.

Since it is likely that the forces that are in control will prevail, I am going to take further advantage of this opportunity to state what that amendment is, at least. I recognize, of course, under the circumstances and the temper of the situation that my plea may have possibly little effect.

Mr. Chairman, about 12 years ago when I first came into this House I was rather proud of the fact that I succeeded in collaboration with the late lamented Senator Pat Harrison of Mississippi in getting a bill through the Congress known as the Sea Food Inspection Act. We succeeded in getting an appropriation to implement that act, after a knock-down and drag-out fight in this Chamber. We got $80,000. Subsequently the Department, as the demand for that inspection grew, recommended a cut and they got only $40,000. This appropriation has been granted annually now for the past 12 years.

The purpose of sea-food inspection, Mr. Chairman, was to prevent the sale of bad sea food that was canned in these factories; to protect not only the packers but the public also.

This year we have asked for the same $40,000 that has been in the budget and appropriated for the past 12 years. It is not in the bill, even though it was in the budget. The Department of Agriculture receives $11,000,000 to inspect meat that is processed in the packing houses, yet we are denied this one little item of $40,000 to inspect seafood as it is canned in the factories.

Yes, we believe in economy, but I contend that this is the falsest kind of economy. Why, the life of one person which might be taken by the consumption of one can of bad shrimp is worth more than $40,000.

The factories themselves put up about two-thirds of the money necessary to operate the Inspection Service and we ask for only $40,000. It is argued that if the packers can put up two-thirds of it why can they not put up all of it? The answer comes from the testimony of one of the witnesses from the Department that appears in the record, that the chances are that some bad sea food will be packed in some of these small factories. They do not, of course, compare with the big meat packers and it is said it will cost the Government more than the $40,000 to go out there and enforce it.

I have brought this to the attention of the committee now and I hope my amendment will prevail.

Permit me to say that this Service has proved of inestimable value to both the public and the sea-food industry. And while I appreciate the fact that the gentlemen over on the left side of the aisle, the Republicans, are in control of this House and have their machine well-oiled and are running roughshod over others, their action certainly comes with ill grace in cutting off by the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], the chairman, even an opportunity to offer this and other amendments that are to be offered. Especially is this true when it is realized that under the system that prevails those of us who are interested in this and other appropriations are prevented from appearing before the committee and knowing whether our appropriations are included or not because of the fact that these committee hearings are conducted in secret. The first opportunity that we have of knowing whether our appropriations are in the bill is when the bill is reported to the floor of the House. It is to be hoped that in the Senate where the rules of procedure are more liberal this most worthwhile item may be again included in the bill.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, I submit herewith a telegram which I have just received from the Biloxi Seafood Shippers Association, by Mr. R. H. Sewell, manager, which indicates how these packers who are affected feel about the matter:

BILOXI, MISS., *March 25, 1947.*

Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The chamber of commerce has contacted us regarding your wire of today advising that House Appropriations Committee has deleted the $40,000 item for sea-food inspection. Also regarding your intention to offer amendment to reinstate this amendment. We strongly urge in behalf of local packers and packers in other areas that you do all in your power to have this item retained. Canned shrimp and oysters items are experiencing considerable consumer resistance due to present high costs and additional cost at the packer level will only result in increased consumer resistance. Food and Drug Administration has apparently been misinformed as regards packers being in position to assume full cost of inspection. It is our understanding that meat packers, packing for distribution in interstate commerce, have long been furnished inspection on their products by the food and drug at no cost to them whatever. The $40,000 heretofore granted for sea-food inspection, while but a portion of the total cost of sea-food inspection, has been of great help to the canners in this area. Please be assured that anything that you can do toward having this appropriation retained will be greatly appreciated by all concerned.

Kindest regards.

BILOXI SEA FOOD SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION,
R. H. SEWELL, *Manager.*

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

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the committee does not care very much about this little item of $40,000 that has been carried in the bill heretofore. The only reason it was stricken out was because we assumed from what Dr. Dunbar testified—and his testimony is right here for anybody to read—that the industry itself would take care of this item.

This $40,000 item, may I say to my friend from Mississippi—and I think he knows it—is only a portion of the money that is spent in the seafood inspection service. I believe that service costs about $121,000 and of this $81,000 is made up of fees paid by the industry itself. The Department asks for only $40,000 to supplement what they were getting from fees.

Now, Dr. Dunbar, the head of the Pure Food and Drug Administration, on page 80 of the hearings, testified in reference to this item, and it was on his testimony alone that we decided to strike this $40,000 out. But the only question involved is just this: Seafood inspection to the tune of $81,000 is being paid for by the industry, and the industry ought to pay for its own inspection in order to police it, and they are policing it, spending $121,000, and here they are only asking $40,000 from the Congress.

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I want to say first that the gentleman has both in private conversation and otherwise shown the most sympathetic attitude toward this, and I have not criticized the gentleman about that.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman right at that point, if he will read the report of the committee he will see that the action of the committee is absolutely in harmony with the suggestion of the President of the United States in his budget message, in which he made the suggestion himself that Congress should consider the extent to which fees should be charged to services of this character, for those who are the beneficiaries of it.

Mr. COLMER. But the item was carried in the President's budget, was it not?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. Then the fact that 80 percent of it is furnished by those packers, is that any reason that the 20 percent should be denied them, when 100 percent of the meat packers' expense is furnished by the Government?

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I do not think that has anything to do with it at all.

Mr. COLMER. It is the same principle, is it not?

Mr. KEEFE. We found all sorts of certification services in the Pure Food and Drug Administration, where the industry itself is paying for the examination and certification of its products. I want to say as one Member of this Congress that I think the time is here right now when this Congress ought to determine whether or not special services of that character that are rendered to industry, in line with the suggestion of the President himself, should not be paid by the industry that receives the benefit of Government inspections.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire recognition to offer an amendment at this time?

Mr. COLMER. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 13, line 11, after the word "act" insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Salaries, sea-food inspectors: For salaries of sea-food inspectors designated in accordance with the provisions of section 702A of the Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, $40,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Page 17, line 16, after the word "agency" strike out the sum "$18,000,000" and insert "$19,710,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries: For three Board members of the National Labor Relations Board and other personal services of the Board in the District of Columbia and elsewhere necessary in performing the duties authorized by law, $3,063,100.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma: Page 42, line 7, and page 43, line 19, strike out all of title III "National Labor Relations Board" beginning with line 7 on page 42 and ending on line 19 on page 43.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is rather premature at this time. The House Committee on Education and Labor, as we all know, is about ready to report a bill. Nobody knows, I take it, just what that bill will contain nor how much money should be appropriated. I suggest to you that the law under which we are operating now has caused us more confusion and more trouble than perhaps any other law that was ever passed by this Congress. I want to read some remarks I placed in the RECORD on June 14, 1946, giving some factual information:

Senator WAGNER, the author of the bill, stated in 1935:

"The enactment of this measure will clarify the industrial atmosphere and reduce the likelihood of another conflagration of strife."

Eleven years later, we are now experiencing the bitterest labor strife in history.

Senator WAGNER further stated 11 years ago that:

"There is not a scintilla of truth in the propaganda that this bill will create a labor dictatorship."

Now a few labor bosses are dictating to industry, to the Government, and to 130,000,000 American citizens. John L. Lewis was successful in accomplishing practically everything for which he precipitated the coal strike.

Senator WAGNER, speaking further in 1935, of the National Labor Relations Act, said:

"This bill is designed to promote industrial peace."

Apparently it has had the opposite effect.

Let us see what the Wagner Act has done. During the past 11 years—

Now almost 12—

there have been more than 37,000 work stoppages—three times as many as there were the 11 years before the passage of the act by Congress in 1935. The number of workers involved in the work stoppages for the past 11 years is almost 17,000,000, again approximately 3 times the number for a like period before the passage of this act. Hence, roughly speaking, there have been three times as many idle, time wasted, and production lost since, as compared with a similar period before the Wagner Act—National Labor Relations Act was passed in 1935.

Consider these facts: In January 1946 there were 325 new work stoppages, with a carry-over of 175 strikes from the month before, both together involving 1,750,000 workers, and 19,200,000 man-days lost. In February 1946, 260 new work stoppages were added to the 200 carried over from January involving 1,450,000 workers and 21,500,000 man-days lost.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude by saying that there is no doubt but that there will be some kind of labor legislation passed by this Congress to remedy the evils that exist and to stop the activities of the labor racketeers. I suggest that this appropriation is premature.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, very briefly we on this subcommittee cannot act as a legislative committee. If the Congress in its wisdom later decides that this shall be taken out of the picture, the Committee on Appropriations can bring in a rescission bill and take away this sum of money. With all due respect for my fine colleague from Oklahoma, I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No one will accuse me, I think, of holding any special brief for the National Labor Relations Board, but may I say that for us to abolish the National Labor Relations Board in this way at this time I think would be a definite mistake. I feel confident from what I heard from members of the House Committee on Education and Labor when I appeared before them and when I have talked with them individually that the House is going to have an opportunity to consider what it wants to do with respect to the National Labor Relations Board and the Wagner Act. To abolish it by denying all appropriations in this way I think would be a very great mistake. Let us leave the NLRB to the time when we consider the recommendations of the Labor Committee. Last year the Board received $4,069,000, and with the increases in pay it is anticipated that the Board will have in this current year $4,481,000. The 1948 budget estimate came in for $7,984,000. The committee is recommending in this bill $4,033,700, which constitutes a reduction in the budget estimates of $3,950,000. Certainly the committee has recommended a very sizable reduction in the budget request. I believe we should allow that at this time in order that the Board may proceed until the House has full opportunity to consider what it wants to do in a legislative way. We would be open to justifiable criticism if we were to abolish the NLRB in this manner and with no more debate or consideration than can be given here today.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I do not believe I would be trespassing on anyone's rights when I say there has been no such suggestion in the committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 42, line 11, strike out the sum "$8,063,100" and insert "$6,157,000."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the status of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE]?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is in the nature of a perfecting amendment. The Schwabe amendment will be held in abeyance until the Committee has had an opportunity to pass upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and other amendments to this section close in 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] would amend his request to limit the time to 10 minutes on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I believe that can be settled very easily. There are only a few Members interested in speaking.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I shall be very happy to do it that way.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] be limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be allotted to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order that the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that the motion is not in order at this time. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may proceed.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I was quite amused awhile ago when we were taking the last teller vote. One of my good friends on the other side of the aisle made the remark that union cards in the Republican steamrollers' union had just been issued today.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my present proposed amendment is to increase the amount shown on line 11, page 42, for the annual appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board to the amount of the budget estimate. The majority of the committee have seen fit in this instance to cut the amount proposed by the Bureau of the Budget 50 percent and to the tune of $3,950,300, in the face of the fact that there have been numerous undue delays in the handling of

cases by the National Labor Relations Board due to insufficient personnel, with the result that in many instances parties have been unable to obtain NLRB collective-bargaining elections, or, rather, elections to determine who is the correct collective-bargaining agent in behalf of employees. The further result is that we play right into the hands of the Communists who, after the employees have been waiting for months upon months upon months for remedial action, then are able to say, "You see, we're getting nowhere, let us go out on strike." This is not the orderly way to handle industrial labor relations in this country. This is one of the results we cause when we cut the amount in this budget estimate for NLRB appropriations to the extent of 50 percent. The estimate is being cut 50 percent in the face of the fact that it is impossible, according to the testimony, for the National Labor Relations Board to handle cases under present conditions and under their present appropriation, since in the first 6 months of the present fiscal year the amount of case intake has increased 65 percent over the corresponding period of the previous year.

This in face of the fact that the staff of the National Labor Relations Board has been decreased 25 percent below that which they had at the close of the last fiscal year. Therefore, I fail to see how we are going to eliminate industrial strife and trouble in this great country of ours if we continue as we have here today, to cut appropriations such as this item to the tune of 50 percent, for the legitimate and absolutely necessary activities of the Labor Department. One of the most important, as you all know, is the National Labor Relations Board. I trust that you will vote for this amendment.

Under the permission which I expect to obtain later when we go back into a session of the House, I insert at this point an article by Thomas L. Stokes entitled "Reckless Ax Wielding":

RECKLESS AX WIELDING

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

In its avid quest for economy, Republican leadership in the House continues to exhibit what appears to be something short of wisdom.

There seems little contribution to the public welfare in whacking off 40 percent of the budget for regular operating expenses of the Labor Department submitted by President Truman, or in cutting almost in half the amount he recommended for the National Labor Relations Board, created by the Wagner Act to protect labor's right of collective bargaining. These are among economies of the second major supply bill laid before the House by its Appropriations Committee.

The wholesale economy in this particular field is surprising. For it was during a GOP administration that the Labor Department was created 34 years ago this month. Formerly there had been a Department of Commerce and Labor. The bill for a separate Labor Department was the last signed by President Taft, father of the present Ohio Senator, before he retired from office on March 4, 1913.

Since its creation the Department's functions have been broadened and enlarged, through both Republican and Democratic administrations, as the Nation has grown, as the labor population has increased, and as the people have recognized the need of improving conditions among workers, organized and unorganized.

This Department, like others, has a general function inherent in our system of government, aside from specific administrative functions. This is to serve as a sort of watchdog on behalf of the people, in this instance of the great mass of workers who keep our industries going.

In carrying out this function, the Labor Department continually inquires into matters affecting labor—working condition safety precautions, employment prospects, protection of women workers, education of workers, and the like. It gathers pertinent information and makes it available to States, organizations of all sorts, and the various public media.

The proposed appropriations cut affects this vital function in various ways. For one illustration, it abolished the Division of Labor Standards, a relatively small agency which had a part in this function. It shifted its components elsewhere on a restricted basis where it did not eliminate them entirely.

The importance of any Federal department is that it and its agencies take the over-all look. Through the facts it can make available it can be helpful in improving local conditions, particularly where local agencies either lack the facts or, for reasons obvious to any newspaper reporter, hesitate to move in. The Federal Government carries prestige and is less susceptible to local influences of one sort and another which often stop action.

The House Appropriations bill, for example, does away with the industrial safety and sanitation service of the Division of Labor Standards, which requires only a few people. In defense, the committee said industrial safety and sanitation is a State matter and explained that safety and sanitation "are being constantly appraised by insurance companies and by private organizations."

But any newspaper reporter knows how private interests can influence local agencies and State legislatures and not only suppress information but prevent action. It is a common experience that reporters constantly go to a Government agency to dig up facts which, when published, open the eyes of people in a local community and force action.

This is a service of Federal Government with which the layman is not so familiar, though he enjoys its benefits. Such service is especially valuable for labor, since it still does not have complete protection in its work and its work conditions.

It seems false economy to withdraw or curtail so severely the many useful functions affected by the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: On page 42, line 11, strike out "$3,063,100" and insert "$2,050,000."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, it is very evident that my amendment if adopted may save the NLRB. I feel quite certain that when Congress amends the NLRA there will be much less work for the NLRB.

My amendment provides for a cut from $3,063,100 to $2,050,000, a cut of a little more than a million dollars. That leaves ample money, I am sure for this item. It leaves $5,000 more than the appropriation for 1941 and $335,000 more than the appropriation for 1944.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] would be to further reduce the amount below the amount suggested by the committee $1,015,100. If you will read the report, you will observe that the report itself indicates there was a sharp division on the committee with reference to the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board. That division is clearly manifested here now. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] wanted to give them no appropriation at all. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] wanted to cut it another million dollars. The strident, bold, bad chairman of the committee had to step into the situation when the vote was taken in order to get for the National Labor Relations Board the amount of money carried in this estimate. I think also the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

I do not see how we can expect to consider the amendment that has just been offered or the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE]. We cannot legislate on an appropriation bill in this manner. Somebody may say, "Well, you just did it. You knocked out the provision for the Division of Labor Standards in the Labor Department." I would fully expect somebody to rise and say that. The difference is just this: The National Labor Relations Board is the creature of the Congress by enactment of organic legislation. It is an act of Congress. I have always taken the position on every one of these bills that it is not the prerogative or the function of the Appropriations Committee to try to emasculate or do away with existing law.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman and my colleagues, who have been so patient during this afternoon, that I hope, with all deference to my friend from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] and my friend from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], who have rendered such splendid service on this subcommittee, that both of their proposals will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in an effort to intimidate, bulldoze and bully the Congress of the United States into continuing a program of extravagance, duplication and waste the bureaucrats of the Treasury Department and the Customs have launched a campaign of deceit, misrep-

resentation and falsehood to achieve their ends.

Not satisfied to receive $3,500,000 more than they have for 1947, nor to carry out the express intent of the House of Representatives as given in the report which accompanied the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, the Bureau of Customs in an effort to obtain publicity for pressure purposes has sent dismissal notices to the most vital personnel in Customs service.

Bureaucrats will hold their jobs and their prerogatives at the risk of encouraging smuggling.

They will dismiss port employees yet spend $259,000 for traveling expenses.

They will dismiss port employees yet spend millions to set up new bureaus in foreign countries.

They will dismiss port employees yet spend $250,000 for telephone calls and telegrams.

They will dismiss port employees yet spend $400,000 to transport household effects of Bureau personnel from place to place, and other transportation items.

They will dismiss port employees yet spend $271,000 to do repair work on buildings and property that will draw construction materials away from the Government housing program.

They will dismiss port employees yet spend $55,000 for an Information Exchange.

They will dismiss port employees yet spend $305,000 for stationery, tires and such automobile accessories, rope, box openers, and such miscellaneous expenses.

They will dismiss port employees yet spend $350,000 to purchase desks, filing cabinets and such trappings of bureaucracy.

They will dismiss port employees yet spend $558,000 to hire temporary day labor and other part-time employees.

They will not carry out the will of Congress to cut down administrative expenses and retain port employees. They were given sufficient money to retain these port employees and to hire a few new ones.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand there are any further amendments.

Mr. ROONEY. We have no further amendments on this side.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, Mr. Chairman, then I ask unanimous consent that title IV, title V, and title VI of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, this will not preclude me from making a pro forma amendment and taking about 2 minutes, will it?

Mr. KEEFE. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this afternoon I spoke about the ill-advised and unjustified Treasury Department cuts. I referred to the loss of revenues and the sources of loss. I now submit actual samples of tax evaders who might in the future escape detection if the investigative staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue should be reduced; and I ask unanimous consent that this be made a part of my previous remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is becoming increasingly apparent that there is a Nation-wide plot on the part of bureaucrats, left-wingers, and New Dealers to sabotage the work of the Appropriations Committee. I think the American people should be placed on guard against it.

It is utterly essential if we are to maintain our free enterprise system that the budget be reduced. The American people voted for this reduction on November 5 and the Republican Congress is determined to carry out their mandate.

But an insidious campaign of misrepresentation, deceit, and falsehood is being conducted to the effect that we are scuttling essential public services. It is being applied to the two bills already reported and I am convinced it is to be applied against every bill as it comes up.

A striking case in point is the propaganda that the Customs Service is being forced to discharge members of its ports patrols and throw our ports open to smugglers.

The facts are that this Service was given $3,165,000 more than it had for the current fiscal year. It sought $6,500,000 more. Its original figures were recognized as being padded by both the Treasury and the Budget Bureau.

It can hire at least 400 more employees than it now has and yet it is announcing large reductions in force with the deliberate object of deceiving the people.

Our committee also caught the service in a shocking effort at deceit in the matter of mileage allowances sought.

It so happens that this particular appropriation bill was passed by a unanimous vote of the House.

It is a well-nigh intolerable situation when the bureaucrats, faced with an end of their heyday, use their offices to sabotage a Congress which is struggling to restore sanity to our Government. And I may as well say to them that we Republicans are determined to do our job and if the administrators cannot give efficient service on the appropriations granted, then we manifestly need new administrators.

This particular administrator, instead of being hurt, will have $32,500,000 to spend next year, including $300,000 for telephone calls.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I wonder if the Chairman's attention has been called to the real words which were spoken by Mr. John C. Tulloch, who has been mentioned here today by the gentleman from New York as the collector of the port at Ogdensburg, when he said this:

With 156 Federal agencies in Washington they should forget patronage for a while and economize there instead of taking off the patrols.

Those are the words, Mr. Chairman, of the collector of the port up in Ogdensburg.

Mr. TABER. He should read the bill and be honest with the people and quit playing to the galleries and falsifying everything in connection with this situation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who have worked with the distinguished gentleman who has just spoken, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, day in and day out and year in and year out do not doubt for one moment the gentleman's utter sincerity. He started out seriously about this business of economy. His intentions were good. The only obstacle was that the gentleman and other leaders of his party were talking in theory apart from a practical application of their theories or was it promises?

It was very easy for this House to pass a resolution that we were going to reduce $6,000,000,000, but what is the score today? For a goodly number of years the gentleman and his party have been telling the country what they were going to do, what they would do. Well, that easy saddle of pleasant vaticination has become the hard seat of responsibility. The question now is, and in 1948, I assure you, will be—what have you done? What is the score to date? When we vote on this bill today we will have considered a little more than 40 percent and acted upon a little more than 40 percent of the President's budget. With what result? We will have made an actual reduction of less than 1 percent.

Of course, the distinguished gentleman now blames the bureaucrats, as we have just heard. Well, for 9 years here I have heard the woes of the world blamed on the bureaucrats. The bureaucrats did not write these Republican appropriation bills. Forty percent of $37,500,000,000, the President's budget is exactly $15,000,000,000. The Treasury-Post Office bill contained $13,265,000,000 in the budget request. What did we appropriate? We cut it actually $97,000,000. Of course, there was that bogus claim of an $800,000,000 cut in tax refunds, but when you pass this tax bill tomorrow you are not only going to have to reappropriate that $800,000,000, but you will have to add another billion dollars to it to make tax refunds.

What is the score in this bill which appropriates $1,785,000,000? We have heard today a lot about economy cutting of the heads of a few bureaucrats here and there. My distinguished friend from Wisconsin has assumed the role of a martyr to economy, a big bad wolf. The gentleman is really not a big bad wolf, not very.

If you look at the totals in this bill, you will find that, even if you consider that they have cut this hospital item completely out, the cut is only 4½ percent below the budget. Not counting the hospital cut, it is only 1½ percent. I think a Democratic committee might have cut more.

In appropriating 40 percent of the President's budget there has actually

been a reduction of less than 1 percent. If we grant all the claims, the $800,000,000 phony on tax reduction, the $50,000,000 item for hospital construction, which at least two distinguished majority members of this subcommittee, including the chairman, have said was no cut at all—well, is it or is it not—but granting that is a real cut, granting all economy claims, they have cut only a fraction over 6 percent.

What does that mean? We have considered a little more than $15,000,000,000 of the President's budget. This leaves $22,500,000,000 yet to be considered. Of that amount 80 percent is for the Army and the Navy and the veterans. Unless you slash national defense and veterans, where are you going to save your $6,000,000,000? The truth is, you are meeting your responsibilities face to face, and strained though the acquaintance may be, you may as well get acquainted with your responsibilities, and not try to cram an unsound tax reduction down our throats on the theory that great economies are to be effected before we know how much our expenditures will be, before we know what our foreign commitments will be. What's the rush on tax reduction? Mr. Chairman, what are my Republican friends afraid of? Their promises or performances? Or both?

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. If what the gentleman says is true, why are we wasting so much time today?

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Do I understand the gentleman to reply that we have not cut enough?

Mr. GORE. I certainly do, if taxes are to be slashed $3,840,000,000. What did we do to the Post Office Department? You made a smaller cut than the Democratic committee did last year. Where is this vaunted Republican economy drive? It is completely bogged down. What are you going to do about it?

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

Mr. GORE. I will always yield to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Has the gentleman, since he has been on the floor in connection with these bills, offered to cut appropriations?

Mr. GORE. I offered an amendment today to try to correct the finagling in your budget bookkeeping.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 10 and 11 in the debate on the Treasury Department and Post Office Appropriation Act contains certain statements concerning the Coast Guard and its administration which cannot be supported by the facts. The unjustified inferences resulting from those statements should be brought into the open and subjected to the clear light of the true facts relating thereto.

Mr. CANFIELD, on page 1875 of the RECORD, states that—

> The Coast Guard is attempting to build itself up into a full and complete replacement for the independent Navy.

The only apparent basis for this remark is that the Coast Guard in its budget for 1948 originally asked for approximately $232,000,000. As we all know, during the wartime period from 1939 through 1945, developments in technical fields, including air transportation and communication, were startlingly rapid. Postwar commercial and military conditions cannot be compared with or brought back to 1939. During the war the Coast Guard played a large, active part in development of facilities for safe sea and air navigation. This year the Coast Guard recognized that the country's need for safe transport was vastly different than before the war.

As is well known, this country has been participating in a Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization in determining requirements, standards, allocation of routes, safety services, and so forth, covering international transport. Also there is an established Air Coordinating Committee comprising the heads of the executive departments concerned, which has an over-all responsibility for this country's program relative to air transport. Both of these agencies have stated to the Treasury Department the need for modern and adequate navigational service and rescue facilities outside the United States. In preparing its budgetary program for the fiscal year 1948, the Coast Guard would have been burying its head in the sand and derelict in its duty if it did not present estimates of the cost of the necessary ships, planes, and stations required to meet the country's needs for safe transport. Estimates were prepared on a considered basis related to the prospective volume of military and commercial sea and air transport and the use of modern technical developments to provide adequate safety. We all have read of many recent instances in which our citizens and our international neighbors, have lost their lives in transport disasters. Were it not for the navigation and rescue facilities, inadequate though they have been, probably many more lives would have been lost. We all know, further, of specific cases in which the Coast Guard can be credited with the saving of lives outside of the continental limits of the United States. The Coast Guard believes, just as you and I do, that these lives are valuable. I do not think that in these terms, the Coast Guard's program can be termed "grandiose."

Whether or not this Congress intends the Coast Guard to provide navigational aids and rescue services beyond continental limits of the United States is, of course, a matter for this Congress to decide. Until the decision has been made in the negative, the Coast Guard should not be scathingly censured for presenting estimates of the cost of such services. In fact, the Coast Guard would have been subject to severe criticism if it did not present such estimates. It is emphasized that the original budget proposal of the Coast Guard was based in every instance on properly carrying out statutory functions, or new functions resulting from developments during the war—functions which other Government agencies requested and urged the Coast Guard to continue—functions which the Coast Guard could not itself determine were unnecessary—functions which have not yet been shown to be unnecessary for the proper continuance of our Government.

Mr. CANFIELD on the same page states:

> Some of my colleagues will, a little later, give you specific examples of the waste, the extravagance, and the grandiose schemes of the Coast Guard.

Despite the great number of words used to censure this service, which has always willingly and efficiently performed all tasks assigned to it, the nearest approach to specific examples of waste are vague statements concerning high ranking officers and a completely unsupportable inference that Coast Guard headquarters is deliberately operated with practically all commissioned officers. It is emphasized that, despite the sweeping derogatory statements about waste and extravagance, not one specific instance attributable to the Coast Guard is cited. Gentlemen, if specific instances had been found, I am sure you will agree that they would have been brought to our attention in no uncertain manner by the gentlemen who saw fit to make these vilifying statements about the Coast Guard.

Mr. CANFIELD further states:

> We hope to cause a reduction in the great and disproportionate numbers of high ranking officers whose rank was created admittedly to keep pace with Navy protocol.

No explanation is given as to how this number of high ranking officers is disproportionate. If reference is made to the second table on page 586 of the hearings it will be seen that the only great disproportion appears in the rank of lieutenant commander. The reason for this, as explained by the table on page 583 of the hearings, is the absorption into the Service of 676 personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, whose duties are such that it is clearly necessary that they have commissioned status, and the position of the great majority of these officers in the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation was such that it is fair and appropriate that they should have the rank of lieutenant commander or above. This is practically the entire reason for any disproportion as it appears in the break-down of officers by rank at the

present time. Workable plans have been made by the Coast Guard to bring these proportions to whatever Congress decides they should be as soon as possible without injustice to these officers who have, since the beginning of the war, been absorbed into the Coast Guard.

Mr. ROBERTSON on page 1879 states that—

> There would be one officer for every six enlisted men.

No reference is made to the footnote to the table on page 587 of the hearings which makes it clear that if the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation officers, who admittedly and necessarily work without an enlisted force, were eliminated from the computation the ratio would have been 1 to 8. Furthermore it is to be noted that the figures used include over 700 warrant officers—officers who have been appointed from the ranks. If they were also eliminated, the ratio would be 1 officer to 12 enlisted men. This ratio of commissioned officers to enlisted men is a fair one to compare with similar ratios in other services. The more or less standard ratio in the Navy, for example, has been 1 commissioned officer to 10 enlisted men.

Mr. ROBERTSON on page 1879 further states:

> Captain Richmond, Chief of the Planning and Control Staff, admits that when they have to reduce personnel in the Coast Guard, they let the enlisted men go and keep the admirals.

A careful perusal of the testimony in the hearing reveals that, not only was such a statement not made, but that no statement was made from which such an inference could be drawn. The number of admirals in the Coast Guard today is less than half what it was 2 years ago. During demobilization hundreds of officers in the Coast Guard were reduced in rank, and other hundreds who had been temporarily commissioned from warrant or enlisted status had to revert to their permanent position in the Service. It is clear that any insinuation that the Coast Guard is not striving to achieve a well-balanced workable officer structure which is comparable to that maintained before the war cannot be justified.

Mr. DIRKSEN on page 1927 of the RECORD makes much of the fact that the Coast Guard is asking for three times as many captains and commanders as were in service in 1940, and states:

> Would you not say that the adjective "grandiose" is rather properly applied when an agency reaches out for that kind of an expansion program.

This presents a very simple problem in arithmetic. If you refer to the table on page 579 of the hearings you can readily see that the number of commissioned officers in 1940 has more than quadrupled in 1947, which is the same number as was requested for 1948. Now note, gentlemen, that the Coast Guard is not asking for four times as many captains or four times as many commanders, which the ratio of expansion indicates it should have. It is asking, as Mr. DIRKSEN points out, for only three times as many. I ask you, gentlemen, where is there anything scheming or grandiose about this? Or where is there any evidence of disproportionate numbers of officers in the higher ranks?

Mention was made of the number of flag officers requested. The table on pages 585 and 586 of the hearings shows clearly what the cost of flag officers in the Coast Guard is and will be. The Commandant of the Service is, as he stated in his testimony before the committee, convinced that greater efficiency will result to the Government if flag rank is authorized for each commander of a Coast Guard district and for certain other responsible positions in the service, and that the very small additional expense is well justified. There is no intention on his part to exceed normal percentages for flag officers in a military service, and the Coast Guard will adjust itself accordingly just as soon as an indication of the will of Congress on this matter is expressed in legislation.

Mr. ROBERTSON on page 1879 states:

> In the Commandant's headquarters in Washington there are eight officers for every enlisted man.

Gentlemen, allow me to quote from the appropriation bill itself beginning on the second line of that part of the bill which deals with the Coast Guard:

> *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay any enlisted man of the Coast Guard while detailed for duty at Coast Guard headquarters if such detail increases above thirty the total number of enlisted men detailed to such duty at any time.

I merely need ask how the administration of this busy agency of the Government is to be carried out at its headquarters unless officers who understand Service functions are brought in to do it. Mr. ROBERTSON did not see fit to point out that his committee provided for some 700 civilians who do the work at headquarters which, to a large extent, could be performed by enlisted men if the Congress had not annually placed a limitation on the number of enlisted men who may be stationed in Washington; this limitation has been repeated annually in the appropriation act for the past 30 years.

Mr. ROBERTSON further states:

> Added altogether we have a sordid story of bureaucratic expansion at its worst.

If there is anything sordid about the expansion of the Coast Guard, it certainly does not appear in the RECORD. Reference is made in the RECORD to Coast Guard air bases and their proximity to Navy air bases. In many instances a Coast Guard air station was the first one in the vicinity; other air stations were established by Congress at later dates; so the proximity to other air stations cannot be attributed to the Coast Guard in all cases. Congress in 1916 provided for the establishment of 10 Coast Guard air stations along the coasts of the United States. Since that time Congress has provided for one additional air station. Nothing can be seen in this history of the growth of the Coast Guard that can be considered unreasonable or "sordid."

In the course of the discussion statements were made to the effect that the Coast Guard was not intended to be a "blue water" organization or to function as a military or naval organization. How can this be reconciled with statutes which require the Coast Guard to conduct the International Ice Patrol, to enforce the Whaling Treaty Act, to provide medical aid to deep-sea fishermen, to remove derelicts on the high seas, and, finally, to enforce all United States laws on the high seas and the navigable waters of the United States. The Coast Guard is, by statute, a part of the land and naval forces at all times, and as such has always been required to maintain its equipment in a state of military readiness to function with the Navy in time of war or in time of national emergency, and this requirement of military readiness must be given constant attention in any training program that the Coast Guard maintains. The record of this Service in World War II bears irrefutable evidence that the Coast Guard was properly trained as a military service, and the wisdom of such training cannot be questioned.

Make no mistake, gentlemen, when you cut the Coast Guard you are cutting one of the national defense forces of the United States; while it is very small in comparison to the Navy, it is an efficient organization which gives military training to thousands of young Americans yearly, and at the same time gives valuable service to the Government; it certainly seems short-sighted to cut this branch of our national defense force on the one hand while we are considering compulsory military training on the other. Why do we not realize that we have a service here that provides military training and useful service to the Government at the same time?

It seems entirely unjustified that a service which functioned throughout the war with the Navy on every ocean in which combat vessels were engaged in operations should be accused of "sordid expansion," "disproportionate numbers of high-ranking officers," "wastes, extravagance, and grandiose schemes," because it is requesting that the internal organization of the service approximate that of the Navy even though it be on a ratio of about one twenty-fifth in size. It appears that the Coast Guard has been severely criticized for requesting that it be given funds to carry out functions which other departments and agencies of the Government believe are necessary, and for requesting that its internal organization be similar to that of other military organizations of the land and naval forces of the United States. It appears to be a most unjust criticism of the Coast Guard to brand its request for approximate equality in officer percentages with the peacetime Navy as unreasonable expansion when it was called upon during the war to serve side by side with that organization and will undoubtedly be called on again in case of any war or national emergency to operate in the same manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, hope springs eternal in the human breast, it is said, and it is particularly true in the case of those afflicted with many of the so-called incurable diseases.

I call attention to the fact that there is a little hospital in my home county of Chautauqua located at an elevation of about 1,600 feet that has made perhaps more progress toward the cure of tuberculosis than any other institution known in the country. Of course, they are dealing almost entirely with the application of this drug known as streptomycin.

My purpose in taking the floor is to call to your attention some newspaper articles and to give you some idea of the miraculous—and I use that word advisedly—miraculous work being done there in curing tuberculosis cases that are very far advanced. The Government must provide this streptomycin to help this institution and many others like it which are going to take up this type of study, investigation, and cure.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of January 28, 1947]

REMARKABLE RESULTS OF NEW TUBERCULOSIS TREATMENT EXPLAINED—DOCTORS HERE LEARN OF WORK OF DR. RATHBUN WITH STREPTOMYCIN AT CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY'S SANATORIUM; STILL IN EXPERIMENTAL STAGE

A new hope for combating mankind's terrible scourge, tuberculosis, rests with the miracle drug streptomycin.

This was the word that spread rapidly among Buffalo's medical profession after a demonstration Monday evening of the remarkable results achieved in 4½ months of experimentation by Dr. Walter L. Rathbun at Newton Memorial Hospital at Cassadaga, Chautauqua County's tuberculosis sanatorium.

While it was emphasized that the treatment is still in the experimental stage, the accomplishments have been so impressive as to draw comments of "amazing, miraculous, momentous" from physicians who have worked in the tuberculosis field for half a century and more. Streptomycin is a drug developed from soil fungus.

The results of the treatment were presented in preliminary form by Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang, assistant to Dr. Rathbun (who was unable to attend because of illness), to 20 Buffalo physicians and tuberculosis specialists at a private dinner in the Buffalo Club arranged by Dr. Albert H. Garvin.

FORTY-ONE CASES SHOW IMPROVEMENT

Dr. Liang pointed out that 41 cases have been treated during these 4½ months and all have shown general improvement. In fact, only three cases continue to show the presence of active tubercle bacilli. The others have shown sputum negative, urine negative and generally diminishing tuberculosis.

Most spectacular of the cases described was that of a Navy veteran of World War I, who entered Newton Hospital last September at the point of death. He was suffering from tuberculosis in nearly every part of the body, including the meninges, or covering of the brain. The disease was so widely disseminated that physicians held no hope for his recovery.

He had been in a coma for 19 hours when streptomycin was injected intramuscularly.

"He regained consciousness," reported Dr. Liang, "and he is still with us today. He has gained 28 pounds and he is up and around and taking a new interest in life. Now he has shown up negative in three successive tests for tuberculosis bacilli."

REMARKABLE RECOVERIES

In X-ray plate after X-ray plate, Dr. Liang pointed out remarkable improvements from the disease in 1 week, 4 weeks, 2 months. He cited lung cases and grave bone cases, where tissues had healed and bone structures were being restored following the use of streptomycin.

Each patient receives two grams of the drug daily for the first 4 days, Dr. Liang explained. Then for a month he receives one gram daily in two injections. Starting with the second month, the dose is reduced to half a gram daily, depending on the individual patient's conditions.

Difficulties, Dr. Liang pointed out, were the scarcity of the drug; the high price and the inability of the manufacturers to produce uniform quality. Variations in the potency of the streptomycin from lot to lot affected results, he said.

The drug costs $4.80 a gram. While that appears to be extremely high, it is considerably less than the price when the drug first appeared on the market, $20 a gram.

DR. GARVIN VISITED HOSPITAL

Asked about research with streptomycin at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., Dr. Liang pointed out that experiments there had been conducted before a dosage of the drug had been established and before manufacturers had developed present methods of achieving purity.

Dr. Garvin, who is president of the Tuberculosis Association of Buffalo and Erie County, Inc., visited the hospital at Cassadaga a week ago and studied the treatment first-hand with Dr. Rathbun, the hospital superintendent. The two have been friends for more than 40 years.

"What I have seen is to me a modern miracle," Dr. Garvin said. "I saw a 9-month-old baby with tuberculosis who was sent down from Jamestown to die. That baby was perfectly normal in 8 days.

"In 40 years of contact with tuberculosis, I've never seen anything like it."

Dr. Nelson G. Russell, chairman of the Advisory Board of Health, reported good results in eight cases receiving the streptomycin treatment at the J. N. Adam Memorial Hospital, Perrysburg, under Dr. Horace Lo Grasso, superintendent.

"I saw an improvement in 1 week in a supposedly hopeless case that would have required many months of treatment without streptomycin," he declared. "This is one of the medical events of our lives."

FINAL PROOF STILL LACKING

One note of caution was sounded by Dr. A. H. Aaron, chairman of the X-ray committee of the Tuberculosis Association of Buffalo and Erie County, Inc. After questioning Dr. Liang, he pointed out to a News reporter that final proof is still lacking that streptomycin actually destroys tubercle bacilli.

The evidence shows, he explained, that the drug inhibits the disease. Whether or not it destroys the bacilli can only be determined by postmortem examination of the tissue, he said.

Dr. Liang, a Chinese doctor who has been working on tuberculosis in this country for several years and has been at Cassadaga 7 months, was accompanied by his wife, Dr. Esther Chang Liang, also a physician, who has been on the staff of the Josephine Goodyear Convalescent Home in Buffalo since last fall but now is working with her husband.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of February 20, 1947]

FORTY-SEVEN PATIENTS GET STREPTOMYCIN AT NEWTON MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

(By Lance Zavitz)

High in the windswept hills of Chautauqua County is a sanatorium on which the eyes of the medical world are focused because of the promising results achieved in the use of streptomycin as a treatment for tuberculosis.

The sanatorium is Newton Memorial Hospital, Chautauqua County's institution for the treatment of this disease, an institution built with funds provided from the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Mary Newton of Fredonia and maintained by county funds.

A bronze plaque above a fireplace in the reception room reads: "In appreciation of the splendid generosity of Elizabeth Mary Newton of Fredonia, N. Y., who by provision in her will made possible the erection of this group of buildings to be known forever as Newton Memorial Hospital for the treatment of tuberculosis. Dedicated to the memory of her two sons, Albert L. Newton and Henry J. Newton, 1919."

FIVE BUILDINGS IN HOSPITAL

Located atop the ridge which divides the northwestern portion of Chautauqua County from the southeastern district, Newton Memorial Hospital, is 1,600 feet higher than Buffalo and is reached by a swift climb from Cassadaga.

It has accommodations for 185 patients, including 60 children. The hospital consists of five buildings—an administration building, infirmary, and separate buildings for men, women, and children.

In this quiet rural setting, Dr. Walter L. Rathbun, hospital superintendent, assisted by Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang and his wife, Dr. Esther Chang Liang, mission-trained Chinese doctors, is employing one of the newest methods of treating tuberculosis and obtaining results which physicians with long experience in the treatment of the disease to date have termed "marvelous." It is not yet, however, a substitute for the conventional methods employed up to now.

Dr. Liang and his wife are graduates of Chee Loo University, operated in the capital of Shantung Province, China, by the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions.

CAME TO UNITED STATES TWO AND ONE-HALF YEARS AGO

Dr. Liang was an associate in medicine at that university and several other medical colleges in China. He came to the United States 2½ years ago and spent a year with Dr. J. Burns Amberson in the Chest Service, Columbia University Division, Bellevue Hospital, and another year on the staff of the State Hospital for Incipient Tuberculosis at Raybrook.

Dr. Albert H. Garvin, president of the Buffalo & Erie County Tuberculosis Association, has been watching the work at Newton Memorial Hospital with close attention. He has been a friend of Dr. Rathbun, head of the hospital, since their graduation from medical school. Both are impressed with Dr. Liang's ability to carry on the experiments. During the war he performed more than 3,000 surgical operations with the Jap-infested jungle for an operating room.

Dr. Esther Liang, generally referred to at the hospital by her maiden name, Dr. Chang, to distinguish her from her husband, has been in the United States only 6 months.

RESULTS WERE SURPRISING

She was resident physician of the Josephine Goodyear Convalescent Home, Williamsville, until a few weeks ago, when she went to Newton Memorial Hospital to aid in the streptomycin work. She is devoting her attention largely to laboratory studies. Dr.

Liang's family is Christian, but Dr. Chang is the first member of her Buddhist family to embrace Christianity.

Decision to try the streptomycin treatment was reached when a Navy veteran was brought to the hospital with tuberculosis in almost every part of his body, including kidneys, lungs, and meninges or brain covering. Dr. Rathbun conferred with Dr. Ralph M. Bruckheimer, Cassadaga health officer and part-time member of the hospital staff, and Dr. Liang. It was decided, in view of the patient's critical condition, that they would be warranted in risking streptomycin treatment. The results were so surprising that its use was extended under the supervision and direction of Dr. Rathbun and Dr. Bruckheimer.

HAD INITIAL DIFFICULTIES

The treatment was started with 41 patients, but is being administered now to 47 patients. It is expected this number will be increased to 60 by the end of next month.

Dr. Rathbun explained that difficulty was experienced at first because the hospital had no funds with which to purchase streptomycin. This difficulty was overcome by the Chautauqua County Tuberculosis & Public Health Association.

The association's executive committee last December 9 voted $5,000 from its Christmas Seal funds to buy streptomycin at Dr. Rathbun's discretion. The appropriation, to which $1,000 has since been added, was to form the basis of a fund to be used only for the purchase of streptomycin for further research and for the treatment of needy patients. The fund is to be known as the Dr. Walter Rathbun Fund, the committee stipulated.

While patients are treated at county expense at Newton Memorial Hospital, the normal county appropriation covers only well-established forms of treatment. Special treatments, such as streptomycin, must be paid for by the patient or from funds provided for that purpose, such as the Dr. Walter Rathbun Fund.

May I inquire of the Chairman whether, as I understand, the Budget Bureau is now considering that very item and that it will come before us in other legislation?

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman and to the other Members that no committee of this Congress could possibly be put together which would be more sympathetic to providing funds for further research in the use of streptomycin in tuberculosis than is this committee. The difficulty with the situation is simply that we have given them the funds that are needed for research in the field of tuberculosis. Very late in the hearings the representatives of the National Tuberculosis Society came to my office and presented the situation that confronted them with respect to streptomycin. We discussed the matter in the field, and the Public Health Service is going to submit a budget. When it comes up, this committee will give them the money to carry on this research in the use of streptomycin.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Replying to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who on the one hand votes for all amendments to appropriation bills and against economy and on the other hand complaints about Republicans not cutting enough, I have this to say, the budget will be balanced. Expenses will be cut, whether you like it or not. We are going to cut taxes, no matter what you say. We are going to keep our campaign pledges. If the Army and Navy budgets need to be cut, our defenses will not be hurt by that cut. We are going to cut expenses wherever necessary. We have the votes and we are going to do exactly as we promised last November—something new after 14 years of the New Deal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] offered amendments to pages 3, 4, and 5 of the bill to restore to the bill certain funds for the Veterans' Placement Service under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. By all the acts of this House, we have obligated ourselves to the cause of the servicemen. We should have kept these funds in the bill. I am convinced when this bill goes to the Senate the funds will be put in there. There is no reason why we should not do it here. When we go back into the House I am going to offer a motion to recommit, which I hope will accomplish that purpose.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. HENDRICKS moves to recommit the bill H. R. 2700 to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report it back forthwith with amendments as follows:

On page 3, lines 3 and 4, strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert "600); $474,950, of which $21,510 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and of which $1,000 is for payment of claims pursuant to part II of the Federal Court Claims Act."

On page 3, strike out line 6 and insert "Department, $2,580,440, of which $88,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

Page 3, strike out line 8 and insert the following: "Department, $432,700, of which $50,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944."

Page 5, strike out line 10 and insert the following: "(Public Law 600) $4,372,496 of which $3,472,496 shall."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit, offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 170, nays, 211, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—170

Abernethy	Elliott	Kirwan
Albert	Engle, Calif.	Klein
Allen, La.	Evins	Lane
Almond	Fallon	Lanham
Andrews, Ala.	Fisher	Larcade
Angell	Flannagan	Lea
Barden	Fogarty	Lesinski
Bates, Ky.	Folger	Lodge
Battle	Forand	Lucas
Beckworth	Gary	Lusk
Blatnik	Gathings	Lyle
Bloom	Gordon	Lynch
Boggs, La.	Gore	McCormack
Bonner	Gorski	McMillan, S. C.
Brooks	Granger	Madden
Brown, Ga.	Grant, Ala.	Mahon
Bryson	Gregory	Manasco
Buchanan	Hardy	Mansfield, Mont.
Burleson	Harless, Ariz.	Meade, Md.
Byrne, N. Y.	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Camp	Harrison	Mills
Carroll	Hart	Monroney
Celler	Havenner	Morgan
Chapman	Hays	Morris
Cheif	Hébert	Morrison
Clark	Hedrick	Murdock
Clements	Heffernan	Murray, Tenn.
Colmer	Hendricks	Norman
Combs	Hobbs	Norton
Cooley	Huber	O'Brien
Cooper	Jackson, Wash.	O'Toole
Cox	Jarman	Passman
Cravens	Javits	Patman
Crosser	Johnson, Calif.	Patterson
D'Alesandro	Johnson, Okla.	Peden
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Peterson
Deane	Karsten, Mo.	Pickett
Dingell	Kearney	Poage
Domengeaux	Kee	Powell
Donchue	Kefauver	Preston
Dorn	Kelley	Price, Ill.
Doughton	Kennedy	Priest
Drewry	Keogh	Rabin
Durham	Kilday	Rains
Eberharter	King	

Ramey
Rankin
Rayburn
Rayfiel
Redden
Richards
Riley
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Sabath
Sadowski
Sasscer
Sheppard
Sikes
Smathers
Somers
Spence
Stanley
Stigler
Teague
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tolleifson
Trimble
Van Zandt
Walter
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Williams
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wood
Worley
Zimmerman

NAYS—211

Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, N. Y.
Arends
Arnold
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Banta
Barrett
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Bolton
Bradley, Calif.
Bradley, Mich.
Bramblett
Brehm
Brophy
Buck
Buffett
Burke
Busbey
Butler
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Carson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Clippinger
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Crawford
Crow
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dirksen
Dolliver
Dondero
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Fellows
Fenton
Fletcher
Foote
Fulton
Gallagher
Gamble
Gavin
Gearhart
Gifford
Gillette
Gillie
Goff
Goodwin
Graham
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Jenison
Jenkins, Ohio
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Jones, Ohio
Jonkman
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Keefe
Kerr
Kilburn
Knutsen
Kunkel
Landis
Latham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lewis
Love
McConnell
McCowen
McDonough
McDowell
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillen, Ill.
MacKinnon
Maloney
Martin, Iowa
Mathews
Meade, Ky.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mitchell
Morton
Muhlenberg
Mundt
Murray, Wis.
Nixon
Nodar
Norblad
O'Hara
Owens
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Plocser
Potts
Poulson
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Rich
Rizley
Robertson
Robsion
Rockwell
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scoblick
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Spence
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stigler
Stockman
Stratton
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tibbott
Tolleifson
Towe
Trimble
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
West
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodruff
Worley
Youngblood
Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—51

Bates, Mass.
Bell
Bland
Boykin
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Bulwinkle
Cannon
Chadwick
Courtney
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Delaney
Douglas
Eaton
Engel, Mich.
Feighan
Fernandez
Fuller
Gerlach
Gossett
Grant, Ind.
Harness, Ind.
Hartley
Holifield
Hull
Jackson, Calif.
Jenkins, Pa.
Johnson, Tex.
Jones, N. C.
Jones, Wash.
Judd
Kersten, Wis.
Macy
Mansfield, Tex.
Marcantonio
Mason
Norrell
O'Konski
Pace
Pfeifer
Philbin
Plumley
Price, Fla.
Reed, Ill.
Riehlman
Rivers
Smith, Va.
Vinson
Welch

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Riehlman against.

Mrs. Douglas for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Price of Florida for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Gerlach against.

Mr. Marcantonio for, with Mr. Fuller against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Chadwick against.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Grant of Indiana against.

Mr. Gossett for, with Mr. Jones of Washington against.

Mr. Fernandez for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bates of Massachusetts with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Plumley with Mr. Feighan.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Mason with Mr. Courtney.

Mr. O'Konski with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Bulwinkle.

Mr. Engel of Michigan with Mr. Bland.

Mr. WOLVERTON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 342, nays 40, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—342

Abernethy
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Almond
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Y.
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Auchincloss
Bakewell
Banta
Barden
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beall
Beckworth
Bell
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bennett, Mo.
Bishop
Blackney
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolton
Bonner
Boykin
Bradley, Calif.
Bradley, Mich.
Bramblett
Brehm
Brooks
Brophy
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buck
Buffett
Burke
Burleson
Busbey
Butler
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Canfield
Carson
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Chapman
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Clark
Clason
Clements
Clevenger
Clippinger
Coffin
Cole, Kans.
Cole, Mo.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Crosser
Crow
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
D'Alesandro
Davis, Ga.
Deane
Devitt
D'Ewart
Dingell
Dirksen
Dolliver
Domengeaux
Dondero
Dorn
Doughton
Drewry
Durham
Elliott
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elsaesser
Elston
Engel, Mich.
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Flannagan
Fletcher
Folger
Foote
Forand
Fulton
Gallagher
Gamble
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gearhart
Gifford
Gillette
Gillie
Goff
Goodwin
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Graham
Granger
Grant, Ala.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn, N. Y.
Gwynne, Iowa
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Hardy
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Hartley
Hays
Hébert
Hedrick
Herter
Heselton
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Jackson, Wash.
Jarman
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins, Ohio
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson, Ind.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Ohio
Jonkman
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Keefe
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Knutson
Kunkel
Landis
Lanham
Larcade
Latham
Lea
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lewis
Lodge
Love
Lucas
Lyle
McConnell
McCowen
McDonough
McDowell
McGarvey
McGregor
McMahon
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
MacKinnon
Mahon
Maloney
Manasco
Mansfield, Mont.
Martin, Iowa
Mathews
Meade, Ky.
Meade, Md.
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Muhlenberg
Mundt
Murdock
Murray, Tenn.
Murray, Wis.
Nixon
Nodar
Norblad
Norman
O'Brien
O'Hara
Owens
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Peden
Peterson
Phillips, Calif.
Phillips, Tenn.
Pickett
Plocser
Poage
Potts
Poulson
Preston
Priest
Rains
Ramey
Rankin
Redden
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Rich
Richards
Riley
Rizley
Robertson
Robsion
Rockwell
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sadlak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher
Sasscer
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scoblick
Scott, Hardie
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheppard
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Maine
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Spence
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stigler
Stockman
Stratton
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tibbott
Tolleifson
Towe
Trimble
Twyman
Vail
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Walter
Weichel
West
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodruff
Worley
Youngblood
Zimmerman

NAYS—40

Albert
Blatnik
Bloom
Buchanan
Carroll
Celler
Donohue
Eberharter
Fogarty
Havenner
Heffernan
Hendricks
Hobbs
Huber
Johnson, Okla.
Karsten, Mo.
Kefauver
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kirwan
Klein
Lane
Lesinski
Lusk
Lynch
McCormack
Madden
Miller, Calif.
Morgan
Norton
O'Toole
Powell
Price, Ill.
Rabin
Rayfiel
Rooney
Sadowski
Smith, Ohio
Somers

NOT VOTING—50

Bates, Mass.
Bland
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Bulwinkle
Cannon
Chadwick
Courtney
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Delaney
Douglas
Eaton
Feighan
Fernandez
Fuller
Gerlach
Gossett
Grant, Ind.
Harness, Ind.
Holifield
Hull
Jackson, Calif.
Jenkins, Pa.
Johnson, Tex.
Jones, N. C.
Jones, Wash.
Judd
Kersten, Wis.
Macy
Mansfield, Tex.
Marcantonio

Mason	Philbin	Rivers
Merrow	Plumley	Sabath
Norrell	Price, Fla.	Smith, Va.
O'Konski	Rayburn	Vinson
Pace	Reed, Ill.	Welch
Pfeifer	Riehlman	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Price of Florida for, with Mrs. Douglas against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Marcantonio against.

Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Sabath against.

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

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Chadwick for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Feighan.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Harness of Indiana with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fernandez.

Mr. Bates of Massachusetts with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.

Mr. Grant of Indiana with Mr. Rivers.

Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Johnson of Texas.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Gossett.

Mr. Riehlman with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Reed of Illinois with Mr. Courtney.

Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. DONOHUE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made today in Committee of the Whole two newspaper articles.

Mr. FELLOWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was granted permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "The British Nationalization of Transport Bill." I am informed by the Public Printer that it exceeds two pages in the RECORD and will cost $177.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may be granted leave of absence on account of official business from Thursday afternoon of this week until April 10: Messrs. BRADLEY of Michigan, POTTS, BRADLEY of California, MALONEY, BURKE, BROPHY, BONNER, DOMENGEAUX, KEOGH, PRICE of Florida, and LARCADE.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include some figures on job placement.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from today's Washington News by Frederick Woltman entitled "Red Front Outfit Here Today To Lobby Against Greek Aid."

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Lakeville Journal.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and include some newspaper editorials.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON H. R. 2700

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 2700.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Times-Herald this morning, captioned "Looks like poor economy" and that it may be made part of my remarks regarding the impact of appropriation cuts upon the Customs Service.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] may revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole this afternoon, and, if he so desires, to include any other data and material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD concerning the United States Employment Service and national security.

SMALL-BUSINESS UNIT IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE MOST WORTH-WHILE STEP

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has been granted permission to address the House later this afternoon. Due to the lateness of the hour he does not wish to take the time of the House, but I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I was much interested in an item appearing in the public press regarding the announcement by the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Attorney General, of the reestablishment of a Small-Business Unit in the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. This announcement followed very closely upon the President's address to the Congress on the State of the Nation. Members of the Congress will recall that second on the list of President Truman's major economic policies which he believed the Government should pursue during 1947 was "restriction of monopoly and unfair business practices, assistance to small business, and the promotion of the free competitive system of private enterprise."

On inquiry, I am informed that the reestablishment of the Small Business Unit was designed for the dual purpose of conforming with this declared policy of the President and of meeting the increasing demands from small businessmen upon the Department of Justice for relief against existing conditions throughout industry.

ATTORNEY GENERAL CLARK COMMENDED

Many of my colleagues here in the House may recall that in the early years of the war, the Small Business section of the Department of Justice received commendation from the Members of Congress in both House and Senate, for the effective work that that section was doing on behalf of this great segment of American enterprise, commonly called Small Business. It was the thought of the Antitrust Division that after the war was over and the various regulations and controls were lifted by the elimination of the various war agencies, the difficulties confronting small business would be largely eliminated. This has not, however, proved to be the case. Consequently, Attorney General Clark and Assistant Attorney General Berge, in charge of the Antitrust Division, have felt the necessity for the reestablishment of a unit devoted exclusively to ministering to the needs of those who feel the pinch of concentrated wealth and power.

The Antitrust Division necessarily has on its staff men whose extensive service has given them a broad understanding of the workings not only of business but also of the various departments and agencies of Government. The entire work of the Antitrust Division is devoted to the study and understanding of problems of business. Its sole reason for being is to protect business against monopoly, restraints of trade, and other unfair business practices. Members of the Antitrust Division, therefore, are singularly aware of the many types of difficulties with which a small business may be faced. They are unusually equipped to work out a solution to a small businessman's difficulties and to work it out with as little delay as possible.

WILL NOT DUPLICATE WORK OF OTHER AGENCIES

I am familiar with the work on behalf of small business which is being conducted by other departments and agencies of Government. I am familiar, too, with the suggestion that has been made

that perhaps the work of the Small Business Unit of the Department of Justice duplicates or overlaps the activities of these other agencies. A study of their respective activities, however, convinces me that this is not the case. In fact, no other agency is equipped, or could be expected, to render the type of service offered by the Antitrust Division because such a service is distinctly a part of that Division's function of enforcing the antitrust laws.

Most of the complaints of small businessmen which reach the attention of the Small Business Unit of the Department of Justice involve situations which, if uncorrected, would ripen into major antitrust violations. By looking into these situations as they arise and by nipping them in the bud the Department of Justice is actually saving the taxpayers a considerable amount of money which would otherwise have to be spent in instituting antitrust suits. For this reason the Small Business Unit seems to me to effect an economy which should receive the support of the House.

ENFORCEMENT OF ANTITRUST LAWS PAYS DIVIDENDS

We hear much in these days of governmental economy. It seems to me that no one can quarrel with the fact that a very conscientious effort must be made on the part of all in the Government to reduce expenditures in the maximum amount consistent with the national policy as determined by the Congress.

Nevertheless, when we are dealing with law enforcement it seems to me that economy must be subservient to the public interest in obtaining respect and obedience to law. This policy is particularly true in the case of enforcing a law of such paramount importance as that of the Sherman Antitrust Act. Chief Justice Hughes, whom we should remember was the Republican nominee for the Presidency in 1916 and Chief Justice of the United States, called the Sherman Act the American businessman's charter of freedom. No effort should be spared to protect the charter.

I suppose that there are some who advocate a reduction in the budget for the enforcement of the antitrust laws who do so because they do not believe in those laws. I daresay, however, that the vast majority are simply unaware of the consequences of cutting. It certainly is not true that by effecting a reduction of 10 or 20 percent in appropriations for antitrust enforcement that you will be squeezing out the water. In antitrust enforcement we get only what we pay for. The effectiveness of the law is in direct proportion to the amount of funds for enforcement that we vote.

Without hesitation many of us have willingly voted sums that are astronomical as compared with the $2,500,000 requested for antitrust enforcement in the coming fiscal year. These sums have been appropriated for what, I am sure, are very worthy projects such as land reclamation, conservation of national resources, bridge building, care of Alaskan Indians and all the countless other services that we conceive to be the duty of the Federal Government. But of what avail are expenditures for these worthy purposes if we are to neglect the guiding principle upon which our entire economic life is based: the preservation and promotion of free competitive enterprise.

I shall not attempt to recite the extent and degree to which concentration of economic power in this country has increased nor the added momentum which it received as a result of the war effort. These facts have been set forth in innumerable reports during the past 6 or 8 years. Notable are the studies of the Temporary National Economic Committee and, more recently, the report of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to the Senate Committee on Small Business entitled, "Economic Concentration of Word War II" and, finally, the Staff Report to the Monopoly Subcommittee of the House Committee on Small Business. The record is perfectly clear.

At the same time, an optimistic note is introduced by reason of the recent increase in the number of small businesses. If these businesses are to survive we must have adequate antitrust enforcement. In addition, we must render positive assistance to small business.

In a limited way the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is attempting to do its part through the Small Business Unit. I am told that the total number of the men on the staff of that Unit is six. Its recent reestablishment is a good omen. It should receive the support of the entire Congress.

RELIEF FOR GREECE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution which would provide the relief which the people of Greece so urgently need, and at the same time preserve the integrity and prestige of the United Nations.

I am most certainly in favor of relief for Greece, and there can be no doubt that a most unhealthy political and economic situation exists in Greece today. No one can read the recent report of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization without being acutely aware of the suffering of the Greek people. Funds for food, clothing, and for the rehabilitation of her war-torn economy must be forthcoming. In fact, relief should be given to the hungry peoples in many parts of the world—in Italy, Poland, China, Hungary, Yugoslavia, as well as Greece. The United States, the richest country in the world, has a Christian duty to provide a large share of this relief.

At the same time, the United States has other obligations. We are a member of the United Nations, and that Organization was created under the leadership of the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt—it was nurtured by his dying breath. The Government of the United States has the sacred obligation of working within the framework of the United Nations in solving international political and economic problems which fall within its jurisdiction. If the United Nations is weak, we have the duty of helping make it strong. If the UN does not work effectively, we have the duty of helping streamline it and making it function properly. We have the responsibility of protecting it and building it up as an instrument of peace. Above all, we have the moral obligation of refraining from taking any action which would tend to weaken it.

The United Nations was created to prevent war and aggression, and to lay a firm foundation for world peace. As an instrument of peace it reflects the hopes and aspirations of all humanity. I well remember how elated my Army buddies and I were when the delegates at the San Francisco Conference agreed upon and signed the United Nations Charter. We believed that at last we were going to be allowed to lay away our uniforms forever.

Now we see the entire United Nations structure in the greatest jeopardy. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs is now considering a bill, H. R. 2616, which would provide military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey without consultation with the United Nations. It will, if it is adopted, mean unilateral action on the part of the United States and complete bypassing and ignoring of the United Nations. This bill is based upon the assumption that the Greek problem is an American problem only, when in fact it is a world problem. As a world problem, it falls squarely within the jurisdiction of the United Nations.

My chief objection to the provisions of this bill is the probable effect it would have upon the future of the United Nations. In my opinion, this effort to bypass the international organization is a cruel blow to its prestige, and is taking the heart out of its high aims. We will, if we pass such a bill, be setting a dangerous precedent for future unilateral action by the United States and other great powers. Walter Lippmann pointed this out in the March 22, 1947, issue of the Washington Post when he said:

> If the pattern of our conduct in this affair becomes a precedent we shall have cut a hole in the Charter which it will be very difficult to repair. * * * Suppose that in Greece later, or in some other wracked and hungry land, there comes into power by elections a government of the extreme left. * * * What happens then is that government calls upon the Soviet Union for aid, asks it to equip and train its armies, to supervise its budget, to plan and direct its economy. What under the "Truman doctrine" do we do if the Soviet Government says that there is an emergency, that it has been invited to intervene, that the United Nations is not in a position to extend the kind of help required?

Let us not forget that it was unilateral actions on the part of the great powers which weakened the League of Nations, and eventually destroyed it. In my opinion, the inevitable consequences of such a policy will not only undermine the whole structure of the United Nations, but will divide the world into two hostile camps and destroy the very foundations upon which the nations of the world are attempting to build a stable and enduring peace.

On the other hand, international action in solving the Greek crisis will have

the effect of strengthening the United Nations. It seems to me that it is time for the Congress to stop and weigh carefully the consequences of the Truman doctrine. I, for one, believe that relief which Greece so sorely needs should be administered by a United Nations mission such as has been proposed in the report of the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization. I insist that if there are border violations of Greek territory, or if Greece is in danger from outside, then it is the duty of the Security Council to protect Greece. I am also of the opinion that if the real issue in the Greek crisis turns out to be not Russian expansion, but the oil of the Middle East, then the United Nations should expose this hoax. If Greece is in danger, let the United Nations tell us the facts and recommend action to be taken. Let the United States follow such recommendations. Let the United States give aid to Greece through consultation and agreement with other members of the United Nations, and let them share in the project and shoulder some of the responsibility.

The bill which I have introduced contains the following major provisions:

First. The Government of the United States is requested to take immediate steps toward calling an emergency session of the Security Council to cope with the dangerous and explosive situation in Greece, Turkey, Palestine, and the entire Middle East.

Second, it would authorize a contribution by the United States of $250,000,000 for Greek relief and rehabilitation. This money would go into an international fund for Greece, with recommendations that other states should also contribute according to quotas fixed by the UN. Pending the creation of this fund, an advance of $100,000,000 by the RFC is authorized.

And, third, the bill would provide for United Nations supervision of the distribution of all supplies in Greece. The distribution would be administered by appropriate international agencies under the control of the Secretary General. Such supplies would be made available to Greece on the condition that they be used without discrimination on account of race, creed, or political belief, and providing that the press and radio would be permitted to observe and report fully regarding the distribution of all supplies.

I am convinced that this is the only logical approach to the problem of Greece, the Near East, or any other international problem of similar nature. Such a bill would provide relief for Greece and at the same time protect and strengthen the United Nations. It will also eliminate any doubts and fears as to the motives of the United States. I do not want it to be said 20 years from now that the United States contributed to the destruction of the United Nations.

The Congress has a great decision to make. We must decide whether our foreign policy is to be based upon the principles of the United Nations, the good-neighbor policy, and the ideals of Franklin Roosevelt, or whether we are to follow the unilateral road of power politics which may eventually lead to war. America must choose between the internationalism of Wendell Willkie and Franklin Roosevelt and the short-sighted nationalism contained in the bill now being considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I realize that it is becoming increasingly unpopular to believe in the ideals of our late President, or to suggest that his path was the right one. But I now want to go on record before the Congress as standing with Franklin Delano Roosevelt when he said:

> The structure of world peace cannot be the work of one man or one party or one nation. It cannot be an American peace or a British or Russian or Chinese peace. It cannot be a peace of large nations nor of small nations. It must be a peace which rests on the cooperative effort of the whole world.

I fear that the dream of the United Nations is fading fast. It is with the hope of saving it, and the Roosevelt ideal of world peace, that I submit this joint resolution for consideration by the Congress.

PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas the postwar adjustment in the Near East and Middle East areas has given rise to a number of interrelated situations which endanger the peace and foster suspicion and distrust among members of the United Nations, including armed conflicts in Greece and Palestine, disputes over the control of the Dardanelles, and problems of access by the various nations of the world to the critical oil resources of these areas on an equitable basis; and

Whereas the people of the United States have renounced war and the use of armed force in the solution of international disputes and have joined with other peace-loving nations in the United Nations in order to promote and secure the peace through international cooperation; and

Whereas there is and will be hunger, privation, and suffering in Greece if assistance is not promptly provided, and the Government of the United States desires to assist in the furnishing of such assistance to Greece for humanitarian reasons and in order to promote international well-being; and

Whereas administration of such assistance by the United Nations will promote international confidence and minimize suspicion and conflict among the nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) the United States shall initiate a request for an emergency meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations to consider, investigate, and take appropriate action looking toward the resolution of those situations in the Near East and Middle East areas which are endangering the peace, and (b) United States representatives at the several constituent organizations of the United Nations now in session request such organizations as have jurisdiction over any of the aforesaid situations to expedite consideration and action upon such situations pending the convening of the emergency meeting of the General Assembly.

SEC. 2. The United States representatives at the appropriate constituent organizations of the United Nations are hereby authorized and directed to initiate proposals looking toward the establishment of a fund for the relief and rehabilitation of Greece in accordance with the following terms and provisions:

(a) The said fund shall be subscribed by voluntary contributions of the member nations (but the United Nations may recommend to the member nations quotas based on equitable considerations);

(b) The said fund shall be controlled and administered by appropriate organizations and officials of the United Nations;

(c) The said fund shall be used only for the provision of supplies for the relief and rehabilitation of the civilian economy of Greece (including incidental administrative, transportation, technical, and other necessary services); but no part of said fund shall be used for the provision of military material, supplies, or services;

(d) No assistance shall be provided through this fund unless the Greek Government has given assurance satisfactory to the Secretary General of the United Nations that: (1) The supplies made available under this fund as well as similar supplies made available locally will be distributed among the people of Greece without discrimination as to race, creed, or political belief; (2) representatives of the United Nations and of the governments which have contributed to the said fund and representatives of the press and radio of the countries which have contributed to said fund will be permitted to observe freely and report fully regarding the distribution and use of said supplies; and (3) upon request of the Secretary General of the United Nations the Greek Government will furnish promptly information concerning the production, distribution, importation, and exportation of any supplies which affect the relief and rehabilitation needs of Greece.

(e) The Secretary General of the United Nations or the appropriate organizations of the United Nations shall submit quarterly to the nations contributing to the said fund reports of expenditures and activities pursuant to said fund.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President upon the establishment of the fund described in section 2, a sum of not exceeding $250,000,000 to provide the United States contribution to such fund. Any advances made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to section 4 shall be charged against any appropriation made under this authorization and shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SEC. 4. Pending the establishment of the fund described in section 2, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed until such time as an appropriation is made pursuant to section 3 to make an advance of $100,000,000 to the President for the purpose of providing supplies for the relief and rehabilitation of Greece. The administration of such relief and rehabilitation shall be carried out by appropriate organizations of the United Nations. For this purpose the President shall transfer the aforesaid advance to the Secretary General of the United Nations or to such constituent organizations as the Secretary General may direct, in such amounts as the President shall determine to be appropriate, upon the receipt of assurance satisfactory to the President that the terms and conditions specified in subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 2 will be complied with.

SEC. 5. The authority of the President under sections 3 and 4 may, to the extent the President so directs, be exercised by the Secretary of State.

(Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include the text of a resolution which he introduced today.)

JURISDICTION OF THE COURTS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2157, entitled "An act to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes," with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I have cleared this through the majority leader and the minority leader. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the minority leader, does not happen to be in the Chamber at the moment, but he spoke to me as well as to the Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair might advise the House that the minority leader advised the Chair that he was agreeable to this procedure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Michigan had cleared this matter with the majority and minority leaders. I want him to know that I have such confidence in him that if he had not done so, but assured me that this was the course of action to take, I would have acceded to his request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MICHENER, GWYNNE of Iowa, GOODWIN, CELLER, and WALTER.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] just received unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial appearing in a Washington newspaper today. I wish to make the observation that all the money figures quoted in that editorial are in error with the exception of one.

THE CONSUMER IS THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR IN ANY FOOD PROBLEM

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years a group of Republican Congressmen has been conducting an independent study and investigation of the food and agricultural situation in the United States. As early as the Seventy-eighth Congress the value of the work this group was doing was recognized by the Republican leadership of the House, and it was designated the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee. To me fell the honor—and with it, may I say, many hours and weeks of hard labor—of being made chairman of that committee.

Since its inception that group, whose membership is almost equally divided between representatives of consumer and producer districts, has been the outstanding public exponent of the doctrine of full and unrestricted production of food commodities as the answer to not only wartime shortages but to the long-range welfare of American agriculture and health and happiness of the people of this Nation. At times it seemed that this committee was the only exponent of this sound and humanitarian doctrine.

Time after time the committee has denounced as unwise, unworkable, and inherently evil the economy of scarcity in food production which was foisted on this country by Henry Wallace and his cohorts and which has remained even throughout the war years the greatest single reason for the scarcities of sugar, meat, fats, and oils, and other basic commodities which have plagued the American housewives.

The committee has not confined itself to mere criticisms of the fallacious policy of reducing food production so as to maintain a high price for that which was grown. It has taken the constructive viewpoint that some better answer than limitation of production could and must be found. After studying the situation the committee reached the conclusion that underconsumption, not overproduction, was the basis of our agricultural difficulties. As a result of its studies, the committee prepared a bill expressing in legislative form the philosophy of abundant production. The purpose of this bill was to establish a philosophy of abundance as a national policy and to create in the Department of Agriculture as a separate and distinct unit an organization which should devote its entire time and attention to the problem of the scientific development of processing, marketing, and distribution of food and agricultural products.

This legislation was introduced in the House on March 28, 1946, by Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, a member of this committee, and then the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture. To Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, who had long studied this problem, this bill appeared to be the answer for which they had been looking. The goal it sought to attain was the goal toward which the special marketing committee of the House Committee on Agriculture also had been working for 2 years. The result was that the combined products and findings of these two committees, and of the many independent studies which had been made by individual Members of Congress and different organizations, were combined into the Hope-Flannagan bill of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture and adopted unanimously by both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Following the adoption Congressman FLANNAGAN, then chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, predicted that it would "accomplish more for American agriculture than any other piece of legislation ever enacted."

The policies and intent of that legislation, which is now Public Law 733, are plain. It authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to set up and establish within the Department of Agriculture a special, semi-independent unit or branch for the purpose of servicing and developing the private marketing system in the United States. This Department was also to perfect and carry out plans to apply scientific research to food and agriculture utilization as it has in the past been applied to agricultural production. A fundamental and very important function of this Department would be to improve the nutritional level of the people of the United States and to develop new and wider markets for the agricultural products of this country. Into this bureau or branch were to be concentrated all the functions and activities of the Department relating to marketing, research, development, regulation, and servicing.

From time to time since the enactment of this law and its approval by the President, I have had occasion to point out on the floor of this House and to the Republican membership of the House in the Food Study Committee's bulletins which were sent to them regularly during the recent recess of Congress, that the Department of Agriculture did not appear to be moving to carry out the intent of this legislation as rapidly and as willingly as many of us thought should be done; nor indeed as willingly as the Department's spokesmen indicated would be done when hearings were held on the bill by the Committee on Agriculture.

Strange as it may seem to Members of Congress, who after years of full personal experience with it have almost unanimously come to the conclusion that the doctrine of scarcity is a failure, there are still within the Department of Agriculture a sizable and an important group of officials who cling tenaciously to the theory of acreage and production restrictions, and seem unwilling to accept the enacted policy of Congress that the welfare of the people of this country is to be promoted best by a scientific increase in food consumption rather than by a dictatorial decrease in food production.

These officials are important enough in the Department both in numbers and in the positions they occupy to have succeeded thus far in completely avoiding the establishment of a marketing research branch and program in the Department pursuant to Public Law 733, and have effectively nullified the declared policy and intention of the Congress.

It is now 7 months since Public Law 733 was approved by the President. Even prior to its approval, in the months when it was being considered by the Congress and during which the hearings were being held, the Department knew that its adoption was almost certain, it expressed its willingness and desire to work with the Congress in effectuating the policies of the legislation, and it had those several months within which to begin to put into operation the plan for carrying out this legislation. In spite of the time that has elapsed, the Department of Agriculture has not as yet taken one single constructive step toward realining its own organization in keeping with the announced intent and principle of this legislation. Such marketing functions as the Department now has are scattered willy-nilly and without rhyme or reason throughout its various planning, production, and action units. No separate branch or unit can take the lead and the responsibility for establishing a marketing research, servicing, and regulating organization, and such has not as yet been established in the Department; nor are there any present plans for the establishing of such a unit.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the Wallace disciples favoring restriction of production are still sufficiently in con-

trol of the Department of Agriculture to dictate the policies of that important branch of the Federal Government. It is also increasingly clear that the Department of Agriculture, as now constituted, has no intention of carrying out or putting into effect the clear intent of Congress as expressed in the Hope-Flannagan Marketing Research Act, Public Law 733, Seventy-ninth Congress.

I am advised that the Department of Agriculture has now under consideration or soon to be considered by the Committee on Appropriations a request for several millions of dollars of appropriations to be expended on some of its pet projects which it believes it will be able to bring in under the authorization of Public Law 733.

I hope my esteemed colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations and the Members of the House who voted for the Hope-Flannagan bill with such high hopes for the benefit it was to confer on the country, will agree with me that not one single cent of the funds authorized in that act should be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture until it has put into operation clearly, willingly and effectively the kind of organization and the policies which the Congress enunciated in that law.

There are some valuable marketing research programs now under way in one or two branches of the department—particularly in the fields of the transportation, storage, and wholesale marketing of perishable commodities. Money should be appropriated to continue and even to expand these valuable activities.

But as to the bulk of funds for the establishment and operation of the great marketing research agency, an organization of which Members of Congress and the soundest agricultural thinkers of this country have been dreaming for years—let us say to the schemers in the Department of Agriculture, "Gentlemen, the Congress has outlined for you the blueprints of an economy of plenty for this country. It has told you as explicitly as it knows how exactly what it wants you to do and how it wants you to go about doing it. You have responded with delays and evasions—with words that signify nothing. The task before you is of such transcendent importance to the people of America that we believe it is better not started at all than started in a manner that foredooms it to frustration, disappointment, and failure. Until you condescend to put into effect the law Congress has written we will give you not one cent of money to squander on another of your semiannual reorganizations of your interlocking bureaus and branches."

The Department may claim that it cannot set up the organization before it receives an appropriation, but this claim is without merit. There are already in existence in the Department marketing, research, and servicing and regulatory activities which are now spending annually some $10,000,000, and which can and should be transferred immediately to this new semi-independent marketing, research, and development branch. These functions and activities could and should form the nucleus of the new marketing-research program directed by the Congress. The administrative set-up could be completed for all immediate purposes by the appointment of one competent, outstanding man to head the new bureau and bring together under his guidance the counsel and cooperation of all Federal, State, and private organizations engaged in this tremendously important program.

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

QUESTIONS TO OUR STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I note from the newspapers that our Navy is sending some of its ships to the Dardanelles. Why is the Navy sending these ships to the Dardanelles now? Secretary of State Marshall, one of the great military strategists of all times, is now sitting in Moscow in a peace conference, and our Navy Department sees fit to send ships—battleships, aircraft carriers—down to the Dardanelles. How do you suppose that situation looks to the Russians? I remember so well when the Japanese Ambassador was here in Washington in December 1941, supposedly negotiating a peace with Secretary of State Hull at the same time that Japanese aircraft carriers were closing in on Pearl Harbor. Mr. Speaker, the right to declare war resides in the Congress of the United States, and the time has come for Congress to tell our War and Navy Departments and our President, Mr. Truman, that only the Congress has that power. I personally do not like and I resent the waste involved for the American taxpayer for these belligerent, nonsensical, foolish displays of military power in the Mediterranean when we have a perfectly competent Secretary of State in Moscow. Mr. Marshall does not need a Navy to be running around loose in the Mediterranean in order to back up his points.

One of the things that troubles me, Mr. Speaker, about our President's request is the provision that he be permitted at his discretion to send military advisers and personnel to Greece and Turkey. Mr. Speaker, the President himself in this Chamber stated that Greece is one aspect of the global situation. If we agree to grant the President the power to send an American military mission to Greece and Turkey, are we not also by implication committing ourselves to grant similar power to the President to send military personnel to any country in the world which requests it?

Mr. Speaker, let us consider that thought just a little bit. If our President obtains the power to send a military staff anywhere in the world—to intervene in any civil conflict anywhere in the world or to bolster up some rotten, corrupt government by force of American arms anywhere in the world—have we not in effect transferred the power to declare war from the Congress of the United States to the President of the United States? I ask this House to analyze what is involved in the grant of military powers that the President has requested. Do our Army and Navy now consider that the whole world has turned into another Central America and that they can intervene as we did in the twenties in the international affairs of every nation everywhere in the world with our armed forces? Constitutionally, is this a valid grant of powers to the President? Suppose that 5 months from now the Government of Iran requests that we send in 50,000 American troops. Suppose that 1 year from now the British ask us to send a quarter of a million men to India. Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the Chinese Government 1 year from now asks us to send a half-million men to China. Suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the President of the United States and our Chiefs of Staff determine that they have the authority to send our men anywhere that they choose throughout the world—what kind of situation are we in? I want to know before I vote on the request of the President what exactly is involved in this extraordinary request for authority from the Congress to send military advisers and personnel.

I know that the request states that our men are to be advisers—nothing but advisers. But what is advice? Why cannot the advice be given here in Washington? Why do our military men have to be in Greece in order to advise the Greek Government? Does advice cover the practical fact that our military men expect to plan, direct, and give orders for the operation of the present Greek Army in the civil war now raging in that nation? I want to know what in actual fact is intended under the word advice, and the Members of this House, I believe, want to know whether the President of the United States expects that we will grant authority to him to send military advisers anywhere in the world that he sees fit to send them.

Mr. Speaker, if we send advisers, and the advisers then inform our Chiefs of Staff that the present Greek Army is politically unreliable and that American troops are needed, what do we then do? After all, the British are now maintaining 10,000 troops in Greece, and previously have been maintaining more men. What have the British casualties been in the present civil war in Greece? I think that the Congress has a right to know what the British casualties have been up to now in Greece. How many casualties—American casualties—can we budget for the next 2 years in Greece? If some Ohio boy is killed on a military mission in Greece, I want to be able to tell his mother why Congress voted to send him there. So far, I do not believe that any American mother will be satisfied with the explanation that we had to sustain a corrupt, venal, undemocratic Greek monarch in order to keep the Greek people from turning to communism. I do not think that the answer that the British said it was important for us to do it will satisfy anyone who loses his son in Greece. Frankly, the American people understand why hungry people should be fed, why naked people should be clothed. They are ready to support appropriations for relief, but they are not ready to commit themselves to another world-wide war to protect the British Empire, to maintain monarchy, to bribe every scoundrel throughout the

world to keep screaming against communism.

Mr. Speaker, I submit here on the floor of the House these questions to our State Department:

First. What do the words "adviser" and "advice" cover?

Second. Will our advisers direct the activities of the Greek Army?

Third. What have been the British casualties in Greece in the last 2 years?

Fourth. If we grant this power requested by the President, do we by implication grant authority to send American military missions anywhere in the world at the discretion of the President?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for the balance of this week, on account of official business.

To Mrs. DOUGLAS (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for Tuesday, March 25, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 736. An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 875. An act to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 918. An act to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the Selective Service records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, deputy representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution amending the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942 to provide for the consideration of any claim decided by the General Claims Commission in which the United States filed a petition for rehearing.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 26, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

487. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of institutions and organizations, nonprofit and eligible, who have requested donations from the Navy Department under the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 649 (79th Cong., 2d sess.), approved August 7, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

488. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 182); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

489. A letter from the President, Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to bring about uniformity and coordination in the allocation of field and departmental positions under the grades of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 161. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1, to reduce individual income-tax payments; without amendment (Rept. No. 181). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1621. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France in 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports; with amendment (Rept. No. 182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1176. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Kempton Bailey; without amendment (Rept. No. 183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1318. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn; without amendment (Rept. No. 184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2763. A bill to prohibit the use by the United States of Nazi scientists and other Nazi experts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2764. A bill to provide for recognition of the State of Georgia as a community-property State for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2765. A bill to amend section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 2766. A bill to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2767. A bill to provide for the setting aside of convictions of Federal offenders who have been placed on probation and have fully complied with the conditions of their probation; to the Commi tee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2768. A bill to create an Evacuation Claims Commission under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, and to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2769. A bill to extend the period during which certain members of the armed forces of the United States captured by the enemy during World War II were covered by national service life insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2770. A bill to allow costs against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 2771. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building thereon for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2772. A bill to require payment by the United States before taking possession of any estate in land; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2773. A bill to amend the Plant Quarantine Act approved August 20, 1912, as amended, by adding thereto a new section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 2774. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Navy, and the United States Maritime Commission to dispose of certain materials to the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 2775. A bill to provide for the conservation of fish and wildlife on the Klamath Reservation, in Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 2776. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2777. A bill to provide that employees under the Sergeant at Arms of the House of

Representatives who handle money shall be bonded; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 2778. A bill to provide for the periodic auditing by the Comptroller General of the accounts of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 2779. A bill to provide loans to veterans attending school under the provisions of section VIII of Veterans' Regulation 1 (a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 2780. A bill to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TABER:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution initiating a request by the United States for an emergency meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations to consider, investigate, and take appropriate action looking toward the resolution of, those situations in the Near East and Middle East areas which are endangering the peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to invite General MacArthur to visit the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging the use of certain land and the transfer of certain buildings at the Tooele Ordnance Depot at Tooele, Utah, to the State department of public welfare; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2781. A bill for the relief of the Alabama Flake Graphite Co., a corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2782. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Armbruster, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOFF:

H. R. 2783. A bill for the relief of Joseph MacGuffie and Eugene Rohrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2784. A bill for the relief of William H. Fagerstrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 2785. A bill for the relief of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 2786. A bill for the relief of Carl W. Sundstrum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 2787. A bill for the relief of Mrs. G. Wilden Eaddy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2788. A bill for the relief of Philip Sumampow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM (by request):

H. R. 2789. A bill for the relief of Vito Antonio Piccinnino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

250. By Mr. CHURCH: Petition of Fred Brown Whitney, of Waukegan, Ill., with reference to nonintervention in Greece, and other matters; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

251. By Mr. LARCADE: Petition of Mrs. N. J. Amy, president, and members of the Eunice, La., WCTU, requesting passage of Senate bill 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

252. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of the Lions Club, the Progress Club, and the Business and Professional Women's Club, of the village of Roseville, Ohio, for appropriations to complete the Roseville flood-control project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

253. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of 136 citizens of Lowell, Mass., asking for immediate passage of House Concurrent Resolution 4; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

254. Also, petition of city of Lowell, Mass., in favor of continuance of rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

255. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the board of supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of House bill 857; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

256. Also, petition of Doroteo G. Soriano, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to arrears in pay and additional benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In the name of Jesus Christ, who was never in a hurry, we pray, O God, that Thou wilt slow us down, for we know that we live too fast. If we are to burn ourselves out, may it be in causes worth dying for. With all of eternity before us, make us take time to live—time to get acquainted with Thee, time to enjoy Thy blessings, and time to know each other. Deliver us from wasting time and teach us how to use it wisely and well.

We ask these things in the lovely name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Tuesday, March 25, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2157) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MICHENER, Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa, Mr. GOODWIN, Mr. CELLER, and Mr. WALTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1344. An act to admit the American-owned ferry *Crosline* to American registry and to permit its use in coastwise trade;

H. R. 2700. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution amending the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942 to provide for the consideration of any claim decided by the General Claims Commission in which the United States filed a petition for rehearing;

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry; and

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution making an appropriation for expenses incident to the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate this afternoon to fulfill a commitment which I made long before I undertook my duties here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing and Rents of the Committee on Banking and Currency may meet this afternoon at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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