

deal with strike situations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

295. Also, petition of the Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, of Miami, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

296. Also, petition of John Riner, president, group 9, SS. Cyril and Methodius of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, Johnstown, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for a full congressional investigation of the whole Czechoslovak question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 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:

When we are honestly perplexed and have to do something, and are not sure what to do, we need Thy help, O God. In our choices let us not ask, "Will it work?" but, rather, "Is it right?" In this prayer we reach up to Thee. May we find that Thou art reaching down to us, and may we believe that when we are willing to listen Thou wilt speak. We wait upon Thee, O God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Monday, March 31, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, April 1, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1621) 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, 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, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Prior to the call of the roll, may the Chair say that the Foreign Relations Committee presents the request that it be permitted to sit the remainder of the day. Without objection, that order will be made. The Chair hears no objection.

(At this point Mr. BARKLEY yielded to Mr. WILEY, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. MYERS, respectively, each of whom, as in legislative session, presented matters of routine business, which appear elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appropriate headings.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I renew my point of order that there is not a quorum present.

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

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

Aiken	Hayden	O'Connor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Joland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cain	Langer	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Sparkman
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eaton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Col. Samuel N.

Karrick, Corps of Engineers, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nomination of Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey to be Director of the Office of Selective Service Records. It is a unanimous report of that committee. It may be necessary later in the day to ask unanimous consent that the nomination be taken up for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following routine business was transacted:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 27)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency amounting to \$20,000, fiscal year 1947, in the form of an amendment as contained in House Document No. 101, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior to make a resurvey of the needs of the armed forces in Hawaii with the view to returning to the Territorial government all public lands, especially park and beach areas, and to private owners all private lands now under process of condemnation proceedings, where such lands are not immediately needed for military or naval purposes

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior of the United States of America, be, and they are hereby, requested to make a resurvey of the needs of the armed forces in Hawaii with a view to returning to the territorial government all public lands, particularly beach areas and areas suitable for public parks, and to private owners all private lands now under process of condemnation proceedings, where such lands are not immediately needed for military or naval purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 10

"To the President of the United States, Congress of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, and the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas there is only one United States district judge for the third judicial division (Anchorage), Territory of Alaska, and

"Whereas the population of said division has tremendously increased during the past 5 years, to the point where it is now the most populous division in Alaska; and

"Whereas the judicial duties in said division have expanded beyond the capacity of any one judge, and now require and demand the establishment of a second judgeship in said division to meet the need; and

"Whereas Valdez, Alaska, is the most centrally located municipality in the third judicial division:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist urges and recommends that legislation be enacted to provide for two United States district judges instead of only one, for the third judicial division, Territory of Alaska, and that said additional district judge be located at Valdez, Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 14, 1947.

"Passed by the senate February 26, 1947."

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"To the President of the United States, Congress of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, United States Forest Service, Commissioner of Public Roads and Public Roads Administration, and to the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas there are 20,800,000 acres of reserve forest lands in Alaska comprising a major portion of shorelands in southeastern Alaska and embodying large potential resources; and

"Whereas for the past 8 years practically no new road construction has been performed in such forest areas; and

"Whereas funds for new road construction in such national forests allotted to the Public Roads Administration are proportionately less than for similar areas in the United States proper; and

"Whereas numerous road construction, reconstruction, and rehabilitation projects are required in many localities in Tongass National Forest, including roads in and near Juneau, Ketchikan, Sitka, Wrangell and Douglas, Hoonah, Klawock, Kake, and in Chugach National Forest, including roads in the vicinity of and near Seward, Cordova, Coopers Landing, and Turnagin Arm; and

"Whereas such roads would contribute materially to the settlement, growth, and prosperity of Alaska as a whole; and

"Whereas such roads are necessary to promote an orderly growth and development of that portion of Alaska held under national forest reserve:

"Now, therefore, it is requested that road funds allotted the Public Roads Administration for new construction in Alaska be materially increased; that such road funds be allocated on the basis of an equitable distribution to the forest areas in Alaska as compared to forest areas in other parts of the United States, and that sufficient new construction moneys, in addition thereto, be allocated to construct, reconstruct, and rehabilitate pressing road projects in the na-

tional-forest area in Alaska specifically enumerated in paragraph five above.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate February 17, 1947.

"Passed by the house February 27, 1947."

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"To the President of the United States, Congress of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, United States Forest Service, Commissioner of Public Roads and Public Roads Administration, and to the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in eighteenth session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas the Public Roads Administration has already constructed approximately 3 miles of road in Chugach National Forest along the southern shore of Orca Inlet, in the vicinity of the city of Cordova; and

"Whereas such road is incomplete and does not serve its full and most useful purpose; and

"Whereas this road should be extended to tidal areas, salmon cannery, crab cannery, and residence areas in and near Cordova; and

"Whereas such road would traverse the forest area which would furnish lumber, ties, and piling, and would offer possibility of light agricultural development; and

"Whereas such road would open numerous small bays and inlets and would provide safe mooring for small vessels and satisfactory housing locations; and

"Whereas such road would provide access to what is known as Boswell Bay region, which has numerous opportunities and locations for camping and recreation, ocean-beach vacationing, small truck farming, and residence sites; and

"Whereas such road would connect the existing CAA installations at Strawberry Point to the present Cordova road system: Now therefore,

"It is requested that an extension of the above-named road for a distance of approximately 9.6 miles to Point Whiteshed be authorized and that funds therefor be specifically allocated from Public Roads and National Forest Service funds for such work in the Territory of Alaska and that construction of this project be undertaken at the earliest possible date.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the senate, February 19, 1947.

"Passed by the house, March 3, 1947."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by approximately 600 residents of the city of Clinton, Tenn., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP TO HONOR GOLD-STAR MOTHERS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution I have received from Buffalo County Post, No. 52, the American Legion, of Kearney, Nebr. It is signed by my good friend, Commander Joe B. Elliott, Jr., recommending that a commemorative postage stamp be issued by the Post Office Department of the United States each year honoring the Gold Star Mothers of the wars in which the United States has participated.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas World War II has been brought to a successful conclusion by the combined he-

roic efforts of the young men and women of the United States of America who suffered, bled, and died on the far-flung battle fronts of the world; and

Whereas those who were members of the armed forces of the United States during this great conflict are fully aware of and recognize that those who remained at home were largely responsible for the heroic efforts made on the battlefield, and that they, too, suffered equally with those who participated actively in the fighting, to include sweethearts, wives, and mothers, and that many of these mothers now suffer the agonies of the loss of sons, who have ceased to suffer and have gone to their great reward; that these heroic mothers should be especially honored throughout the coming years and should not be forgotten: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it be recommended to the Congress of the United States that a commemorative postage stamp be issued by the Post Office Department of the United States each year honoring the Gold Star Mothers of our wars; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators representing Nebraska, to the Congressmen representing the State of Nebraska, to the Department of Nebraska of the American Legion and to the national organization of the American Legion.

Dated this 9th day of January 1947.

BUFFALO COUNTY POST, No. 52, THE AMERICAN LEGION, KEARNEY, NEBR.

By JOE B. ELLIOTT, Jr., Commander.

Attest:

[SEAL]

E. A. SNOWDEN, Adjutant.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1010. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Patrick Alfred Of Bear; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. CAIN (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. DWORSEK) introduced Senate bill 1011, to provide for the education of children on Federal reservations and other federally owned property not subject to State or local taxation and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LANGER introduced the following bills, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appear under a separate heading:

S. 1012. A bill for the relief of George Abromopoulos; and

S. 1013. A bill for the relief of Harris Mohammed Ali.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1014. A bill to provide for the disposition of internal revenue collections on articles produced in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUCK:

S. 1015. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, to reduce the interest rate on postal-savings deposits to 1 percent per annum; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. 1016. A bill to authorize and direct the removal of certain stone piers in West Executive Avenue at Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 1017. A bill providing for the temporary continuation of rent control, transferring rent control to the Housing Expediter, providing for the creation of local advisory boards on rent control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1018. A bill to authorize the heads of executive departments and independent establishments of the United States Government to grant employees leaves of absence for research and study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1019. A bill to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1020. A bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference, jointly with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], a bill to provide for the education of children on Federal reservations and on federally owned property and in areas overburdened with war-incurred enrollments. Identical bills already have been introduced in the House.

This bill represents the thinking of the various Federal agencies concerned with these problems, and was written following a series of conferences between representatives of the agencies and representatives of the United States Office of Education. Its purposes are:

(a) To provide orderly payment under the administration of the United States Commissioner of Education of sums now payable and to be payable in the future by various Federal agencies for the education of children residing on federally owned, tax-exempt property;

(b) To provide a formula for the payment of Federal funds for federally owned property now making in-lieu-of-taxes payments in instances where those payments do not equal the actual cost of educating children residing on those properties; and

(c) To provide assistance for areas which are still overburdened with war-incurred enrollments.

The bill has the usual safeguards to assure that there shall be no Federal supervision or control over State or local school systems, and to provide for administration through the Commissioner of Education and through existing educational agencies on State and local levels. The bill also contains adequate safeguards in the expenditure of any funds to become available to implement the act, by specifying that State, local, and other Federal contributions shall be deducted in determining any grants to be made.

Those of us who have joined as sponsors of this measure have introduced it for reasons we conceive to be valid and sound. We believe the Federal Government must continue to recognize its responsibility for contributing to the cost of the education of children residing on federally owned property. In several instances in the past, in acts providing funds for several Federal agencies, Congress has acknowledged its responsibility

to contribute toward the education of children on various Federal projects. In my own State school districts have received funds from the Bureau of Reclamation, from the Navy Department, and even from private contractors on Government projects. This bill is designed to provide for the orderly payment of any Federal funds to become available under its terms, through one instead of through several channels. The provisions under this title of the bill may very well be considered as a continuing policy and program.

Other sections of the bill provide for assistance in the education of children in areas where emergent situations created by the war impact continue to exist. These provisions are temporary in character. They provide a stopgap until certain Federal properties can be returned to local tax rolls. They permit States and local districts the necessary time to adjust their affairs against the date when the temporary sections of the proposed act will expire. In short, the bill establishes a fair formula to assist States and local school districts which are burdened beyond their normal means by conditions not of their creation. None of us wishes to spend Federal funds indiscriminately, and all of us are convinced this measure will afford relief in those situations which are actually deserving of Federal assistance.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1011) to provide for the education of children on Federal reservations and other federally owned property not subject to State or local taxation and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAIN (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. DWORSHAK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

GEORGE ABROMOPOULIS AND HARRIS MOHAMMED ALI

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference two bills. I call this matter particularly to the attention of the representatives of the New York Daily News and the Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C. One of the bills is for the relief of George Abromopoulos, a resident of the United States for more than 30 years, whom the Government is now trying to deport, and the other bill is for the relief of Harris Mohammed Ali.

There being no objection, the bills were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1012. A bill for the relief of George Abromopoulos; and

S. 1013. A bill for the relief of Harris Mohammed Ali.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1621) 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, 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, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

STATEMENT BY J. EDGAR HOOVER ON THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM (S. DOC. NO. 26)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on March 26, the Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, testified before the House of Representatives Un-American Affairs Committee on the subject of meeting the menace of Communism.

His statement, as usual, was a masterpiece of clarity, of straight-thinking, straight-shooting, and factual analysis. Mr. Hoover reported on the strength of the Communist Party, on ways and means of defining Communists and fellow travelers, on infiltration of communism into radio, motion pictures, and government and what America should do about it.

Mr. Hoover's basic suggestion was that pitiless light of publicity be used to expose continually the plotting of the Red Fascists. I feel that every Senator should have on hand copies of Mr. Hoover's speech. It has already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but at this time I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoover's statement be made a Senate document in order to insure its ready availability to all my colleagues and to constituents to whom they may care to send it.

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

CONSIDERATION OF INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the regular meetings of the Committee on Public Lands are on the first and third Mondays of the month. However, in view of the fact that the committee is holding a regular meeting out of order on Thursday next, at which time, among other things, the nominations for the Commission on Indian Claims will be presented, I thought Members of the Senate would like to know that we are having the nominees before the committee on next Thursday, at 10:30 a. m.

THE SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS FOR MOVING GRAIN

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, numerous articles have recently appeared in the newspapers regarding the rise in the price of wheat. There has been a feeling by some that there has been hoarding on the part of farmers. We in North Dakota have constantly endeavored to secure a more equitable proportion of the box cars assigned for use in the Northwest so as to be able to dispose of our grain. In spite of our pleas, at the present time the Great Northern Railway has only 59.6 percent of its ownership of cars on its line, and the Northern Pacific has only 64.7 per cent. In North Dakota we have 90,196,000 bushels of wheat that the farmers and grain elevators want to market. There is only one way that the market price of wheat can be leveled off and that is to make more cars available for the farmers of the Northwest.

BUDGET PROBLEMS OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—ARTICLE BY JAMES MARLOW

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I recently read an article from the Plain Speaker, of Hazleton, Pa., by James Marlow, Associated Press writer, entitled "Vets Administration Proves To Be a Big Job." This article, Mr. President, is written about as objectively as anything controversial could possibly be written. Mr. Marlow, the author, is noted for the dispassionate, objective, factual tenor of his articles, which are often masterpieces of clarity, even when discussing the most complicated and technical legislative matters.

I cite Mr. Marlow's reputation because in this instance he writes on a very touchy subject, insofar as this body is concerned. He is discussing the budget problems of the Veterans' Administration, the effect of a "penny-wise, pound-foolish" policy of economy in dealing with our obligations to that group of our veterans which, foremost among all veterans, deserves our genuine cooperation, that is, the veterans disabled in action, or suffering from service-connected illnesses.

This article reports that some Members of Congress did not like General Bradley's insistence that the Veterans' Administration budget was rock-bottom. It gives this quotation from General Bradley's testimony:

I am not trying to build this up. I did not ask for this job. I only took it because I was asked to do so and I am trying to do the best I can until I can be replaced, which I hope will be as soon as possible, because it is a thankless job no matter how done, and I am just trying to make the best of it and doing the best I can to carry out what I think the Congress intended.

Mr. President, I commend to the attention of the Senate this article, including excerpts it carries of a letter to General Bradley from the administrator of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Topeka, Kans., who warned that the fine corps of physicians which the Veterans' Administration has recruited will disintegrate if the doctors are now led to believe that in caring for our veterans penny pinching is to become the criterion in the operation of our veterans' hospitals.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article by James Marlow.

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

VETS ADMINISTRATION PROVES TO BE BIG JOB (By James Marlow)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—Running the Veterans' Administration is a big job, and a tough one.

Because it's tough and getting bigger, President Truman more than a year ago borrowed Gen. Omar Bradley from the Army to run VA.

How does he like the job? Apparently, not much. He wants to get back to the Army as soon as he can.

But before listening to what he says about it, here are some of the VA problems.

The VA operates the veterans' hospitals, educates and trains them, gives them loans to buy homes, and handles their insurance.

There are billions of details mixed up in that.

At this time there are 18,300,000 veterans of World War II and other wars eligible for veterans' benefits of one kind or another.

VA is paying for the schooling of 1,700,000 veterans now in 10,000 separate schools and colleges.

Another 720,000 are training in 358,000 job-training places.

In January alone VA received 12,927,522 separate pieces of mail; its 4,000 contact representatives held 2,394,786 personal conferences with veterans in VA offices; they answered 955,840 telephone calls for information; they prepared 443,733 pieces of correspondence; and they assisted veterans in filling out 928,727 application forms for benefits.

General Bradley went up to Congress to ask the House Appropriations Committee for more money to keep the VA going.

The chairman, Representative TABER, New York, Republican, is very economy-minded and has been very eager to cut down the number of Government employees.

Mindful of this, General Bradley had sent out a telegram to all VA branches to keep down expenses and not hire any more people.

He read TABER a letter from one of the doctors running a veterans hospital, saying his people were in panic because of this order.

The general read the letter. TABER didn't like it. He told Bradley.

He was almost of the opinion that Bradley resented the idea of any cuts in the VA.

Bradley told him that wasn't his attitude, and then he cut loose with both barrels on TABER. The general said:

"I am not trying to build this up. I did not ask for this job. I only took it because I was asked to do so and I am trying to do the best I can until I can be replaced, which I hope will be as soon as possible, because it is a thankless job no matter how done, and I am just trying to make the best of it and doing the best I can to carry out what I think the Congress intended."

The letter he had read was a scorcher. It was from Dr. Karl A. Menninger, who's running the VA hospital at Topeka, Kans.

After relating his great trouble in getting doctors to work for the Government at all, he said the doctors now are saying:

"It is time for us to get out of this and into private practice and let the VA revert to the mediocre type of medical care it used to have."

Then Dr. Menninger told Bradley in the letter:

"We all realize that this is not your idea but that your hand is being forced and that certain Members of Congress think that this is just a political item.

"But they should know that there are many who are not politicians and not disposed to submit to political maneuvers. I came into this thing because I saw the possibility of developing a great thing for the veterans and the Nation.

"But I and many others like me will drop it like a hot cake if penny-wise, pound-foolish politics are forced upon it.

"I have read this letter to the administrative staff of my hospital and received their unanimous endorsement as to its accuracy and faithful representation of the local situation."

LAST MESSAGES OF DOOMED CENTRALIA COAL MINERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an Associated Press article which was printed on the front page of the Washington Post this

morning entitled "In Face of Death—Last Letters of Miners Pathetic."

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

IN FACE OF DEATH—LAST LETTERS OF MINERS PATHETIC

CENTRALIA, ILL., March 31.—The final words of 13 miners who scrawled in darkness on pages torn from a foreman's time book were published today.

The notes were in the clothing of the last group of the Expansion's 111 victims who were found Saturday morning. They had lived a possible 15 hours after the blast.

A notice on the rock face above their bodies advised rescue workers "look in everybody's pockets. We all have notes. Give them to our wives."

Names of the writers were withheld.

LOOKS LIKE THE END

"To MY WIFE: It looks like the end for me. I love you, honey, more than life itself. If I don't make it, please do the best you can and always remember and love me, honey. You are the sweetest wife in the world. Good-by, honey and Dickey," one note said.

Another, addressed to two boys:

"Be good boys. Please your father. O Lord help me."

Others:

"DEAR WIFE: Please take care of the children. Leave all to my wife. Love."

"Good-by. Give ——— family (sum of money). Put tombstone on all graves."

"MY DEAR WIFE: Good-by. Name baby Joe, so you can have a Joe. Love all. Dad."

"DEAR MOTHER AND SISTERS AND BROTHERS: I am fine at 5:30 p. m. It looks better, getting some air. ——— is in bad shape, moaning and going on. Take care of mother. Tell ——— I forgive her. See about security insurance. We won't all get out. We found a place in the air a little. The smoke was bad. God bless you all. Your loving son."

"Everyone going; all are gone but Joe Ballantini, Fred Gutzler, Ned Jackson of the joy (refers to machine) is here. Don't know about the others."

"DEAR SWEETHEART AND SONS: It's now 6 o'clock. ——— is feeling pretty low, but, honey, if I don't make it, sell the house and go live with your folks. Your mom and dad will take care of you and the boys. Please pray for me and join the church for me. Tell dad to quit the mine and take care of mom, not like this. Well, baby, and my loving boys, good-by as I am feeling weak. Lots of love."

"DEAR WIFE AND SONS: Well, hon, it looks like this is the end. Please tell mom and dad I still love them. Please get the baby baptized and sent ——— to the Catholic school. Well, I love you all and please take care of them and raise them a good Christian. I love them. Love to all of you."

HOME—POEM BY WILLIAM MCKINLEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Home," written by William McKinley, of Convent, N. J., which appears in the Appendix.]

TO STRENGTHEN, NOT WEAKEN, THE UN—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To Strengthen, Not Weaken, the UN," from the Philadelphia Inquirer, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM FOR IRELAND—LETTER FROM THE ANTI-PARTITION OF IRELAND LEAGUE OF PHILADELPHIA

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an open letter

to Hon. Clement R. Attlee, Prime Minister of England, from the Anti-Partition of Ireland League of Philadelphia, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON FORMER GOVERNOR EARLE'S STATEMENT ON THE ATOMIC BOMB

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Knoxville (Ky.) Journal of March 27, 1947, commenting on the statement by former Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, concerning Russia's knowledge of and ability to manufacture atomic bombs, which appears in the Appendix.]

RETURN OF ATOMIC ENERGY TO THE MILITARY—STATEMENT BY LOUIS E. STARR

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Grant Dillman, published in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of March 27, 1947, dealing with a statement by Louis E. Starr, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, proposing that control of atomic energy be returned to the military, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE—EDITORIAL FROM LOWELL (MASS.) SUN

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Electoral College" published in the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of March 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE—ADDRESS BY CHRIS J. AGRAFIOTIS

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Chris J. Agrafiotis, on March 25, 1947, on the occasion of the one hundred and twenty-sixth anniversary of Greek independence, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARRAN BEFORE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE

[Mr. DWORSHAK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator McCARRAN before the national convention of the Izaak Walton League of America, at Chicago, Ill., on March 28, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE MIAMI HERALD

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Can Spread of Communism Be Halted by Yankee Dollars?" by John S. Knight, published in the Miami Herald for March 9, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TURKEY AND GREECE—ARTICLE BY EDGAR M. WAHLBERG

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Turkey and Greece," by Rev. Edgar M. Wahlberg, published in the March 21, 1947, issue of the Community News, of Dearborn, Mich., which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be relieved from attendance on the Senate the week beginning April 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ives in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with certain instructions, the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be Chairman and the nominations of members of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the nomination of Carroll L. Wilson to be General Manager of the Commission.

The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], under the unanimous consent and agreement of last evening, is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me in order that I may straighten out the RECORD of yesterday?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a discussion between the Senator from Tennessee and myself yesterday, on page 2881 of the RECORD, near the bottom of column 1, in which the Senator from Tennessee, referring to Mr. Lilienthal, said:

None of his associates so testified, none of his friends, no public officer of any kind, Democrat or Republican. None of them testified, but he had three Communist witnesses.

Then the Senator from Tennessee named Mr. Hart, Mr. Frantz, and Mr. Cameron. At or near that point I rose and said to the Senator:

I simply wish to keep the RECORD straight. The three men to whom the Senator from Tennessee referred a moment ago as coming before the committee and testifying for Mr. Lilienthal—Mr. Hart, Mr. Cameron, and Mr. Frantz—appeared after the repeated insistence of the Senator from Tennessee.

The Senator from Tennessee then said:

Oh, no, Mr. President; no insistence on my part will be found in the record. I kept on making fun of the committee for not bringing the Communists along. I "took on" a little with the Senator; but they are not my witnesses.

I wish to correct one statement which I made yesterday. I do not believe that Mr. Cameron's appearance was requested by the Senator from Tennessee. To that extent I wish to correct my statement of yesterday. The fact is that Mr. Cameron called my office and said that he had been mentioned in the testimony, and wished to appear with reference to the mention of his name.

However, I wish to call attention to page 256 of the hearings before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, about the middle of the page, toward the end of a statement made by the senior Senator from Tennessee, as follows:

I also asked this committee, as I remember, and, in case I have not, I will repeat the request here. I think Mr. Henry C. Hart, in the interest of truth, ought to be sum-

moned before this committee, so that everybody's doubt is removed.

I then asked:

Do you have any idea where his address is?

I quote from page 408 of the record:

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the chairman and this committee, time and again, to subpoena, for their own satisfaction—not as my witness because I do not know him—for their own satisfaction I have asked them to subpoena Mr. Hart. He is in the State of Wisconsin attending school up there. You can find him there any time and he has not been subpoenaed.

I now refer to page 560 of the record. The woman referred to was not mentioned in the Senator's statement of yesterday, but she was summoned here because it was alleged that she was a Communist in TVA. I read from page 560:

Senator McKELLAR. May I ask the committee at this time to subpoena forthwith Muriel Spear Borah Williams as a witness, for the reason that she stated to Mr. Starnes, of the Dies committee, on July 28, 1940, that she knew who the Communists were in the TVA but refused to name them, but admitting, however, that she was a Communist.

I read from page 561 of the hearings:

Senator McKELLAR. All right, sir; and I also want the committee to subpoena John Marshall Frantz, executive assistant to the Assistant Administrator of the Federal Housing Authority here in Washington. He is the John Marshall Frantz which this young man is putting up with, I believe. Is he not the same man?

I now read from page 747 of the committee record:

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, before we begin, I have been trying for several days to get Mrs. Williams—Mrs. Muriel Williams, of Atlanta, Ga.—before the committee, and I have not been able to get her. She has not been summoned yet. She says she will come if the committee wants her.

I read further from page 747:

Senator McKELLAR. I am sure she will come if you have a subpoena telegraphed to her. Can you do that?

The CHAIRMAN. We certainly can, but we did not get her address until either Friday afternoon or Saturday. I expected her here this morning, in view of that report I got from the office.

Senator McKELLAR. If you will just tell your secretary to telegraph her, I am sure she will be here tomorrow morning. I would like her to be here.

I now read from page 753 of the committee record:

Senator McKELLAR. They could not have understood that from us, because we were doing everything, calling on your secretary almost every hour on Saturday and Friday, to get Mrs. Williams here. There was not any misunderstanding, because we could not get in touch with Mrs. Williams.

I place these excerpts in the RECORD because there has been some misunderstanding. I am sure that yesterday the Senator from Tennessee had forgotten that it was at his insistence that the alleged Communists were brought before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, Mr. President; I had not forgotten anything. I thank the Senator for calling attention to the fact

that I constantly worked on the committee to have someone from the TVA here to testify for their man. He was associated with Communists down there. The question of their aims had arisen a number of times, and I urged the committee to bring them before it. They were not my witnesses. They were examined by the committee before they were examined by me. Ordinarily when I introduce witnesses I bring them before the committee.

The Senator has correctly read the record as to what occurred. I constantly chided the chairman of the committee, who is one of the finest men I know, to bring before the committee the Communist friends of Mr. Lillenthal from the TVA.

One of them was an open and notorious Communist who had resigned. Some were Communists who had been testified to as being Communists time and time again. I thought they ought to be before the Committee, since their chief, Mr. Lillenthal, went down to Birmingham and made a speech sponsoring a Communist-front organization. He even had some of his colleagues act as sponsors. I am not sure about both of his colleagues on the TVA Board. I do not think he persuaded Dr. H. A. Morgan, but he did get Mr. Pope and I think he got Mr. Clapp to sponsor the Communist-front organization known as the Southern Conference on Human Welfare. I must have asked about these Communist witnesses even oftener than has been suggested, because it was constantly in my mind to have them as witnesses.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to proceed to discuss something else, since we discussed this matter yesterday; but I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In order completely to clear the record, Mr. President, I read again, in view of the record which I have just read, from the statement of yesterday in the middle column of page 2882 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following:

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; no insistence on my part will be found in the record. I kept on making fun of the committee for not bringing the Communists along. I did that. I "took on" a little with the Senator; but they are not my witnesses. I never brought a Communist witness into any controversy in my life.

I merely want the record to show that statement clearly.

Mr. McKELLAR. That record is exactly correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I heard the discussion yesterday. One of the observations which the Senator from Iowa made was that the committee had relied entirely on the President of the United States with reference to FBI reports on the nominees. As I recall the statement of the Senator, it was that the President said there was nothing in the files derogatory to these men. I am interested

in this aspect: Did the chairman of the committee ask for the FBI reports?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Why were they not obtained?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Because the FBI is not authorized to turn over to a Senator or House committee the records of their investigations if they have any.

Mr. WHERRY. I have served on the Committee on the Judiciary for nearly 4 years. It has always been my understanding that when the committee requested FBI reports it was done through the Attorney General, and that the reports which were requested were furnished to the committee. They sent a man up with the report. That has been done time and time again.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. As is well known to every Member of the Senate, judicial appointments constitute a special exception to the rule, and always have.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean to tell me that the Atomic Energy Committee was denied the right to look into the files of the FBI?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is a committee of the Senate, and I know of no committee of the Senate, other than the Committee on the Judiciary, in connection with judicial appointments, that has been accorded the right to have access to FBI reports.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the committee subpoena the reports?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It did not.

Mr. WHERRY. The committee has the power of subpoena?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It has.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why did not the committee subpoena the reports?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Because it ran up against the well-known fact that it did not have a right to subpoena those reports, as the law has been interpreted and as the rulings of the Attorney General have been repeatedly given.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Iowa that I should like to see it done. I should like to see the chairman of the committee subpoena those FBI reports, and see if the subpoena is turned down. I do not know what the precedent has been, but it is my opinion that if the committee, which has the power of subpoena, were to subpoena those records the committee would not be denied. I do not see how it could be denied. If it should be denied, then it is time for Congress to assert itself. I am not saying anything about what the committee did, but I think that the membership of the committee, passing on the qualifications of these nominees, should have in its possession every record it desires; and I think that if the right is denied the time has come when the situation should be corrected by legislation, so that a committee of the standing of the one involved, with subpoena power, could have FBI records any time they were desired.

Certainly a Senator who is called upon to advise and consent to a nomination should have every right that any employee of the FBI has to look over those records. That ought to be the right of the Senate. So I ask the distinguished

Senator from Iowa why it would not be feasible and why it would not be the right thing to do, to subpoena those records and ascertain what is in the reports. If we rely upon the statement of the President, even though he be honorable and honest, he might go through the reports and not find something that the Senator or I might find. I think it is essential that we have the reports from the beginning to end, so that members of the committee can read them and make up their minds what the committee should report to the Senate. I cannot understand why any tradition or custom should prevail that would deny the committee the right to see the entire FBI reports on these men.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not take too long.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall try not to do so. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that aside from the Judiciary Committee, I doubt whether he has ever sat upon a committee of the Senate that has been able to subpoena an FBI report. I will say further, in answer to his question, that the FBI never made any investigation of any of the appointed members or the general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission. So there is no FBI report.

Mr. STEWART rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall complete my answer to the Senator's question at a later date.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wanted to make the same statement that the Senator from Iowa has just made; that is, that there has been no investigation by the FBI. I think that is the important thing. There has been no investigation of any of the members of the Commission on Atomic Energy, conducted by the FBI. The President's letter says, as I understand, that there is nothing derogatory in the files concerning these men. That is negative testimony. Any lawyer knows that such testimony is of no value. If a witness is asked if he heard a certain statement made by someone present at the scene of a crime, and if he says, "If he said that, I did not hear him say it," that is negative testimony. It is not worth a dime.

The Senate is charged with the responsibility of advising and consenting to the confirmation of these nominees, of giving its consent to the appointment of men whom the President recommends and whom, indeed, the President has named as members of the Atomic Energy Commission. It reminds me of playing what used to be called blind man's buff—pinning the tail on the donkey, with a handkerchief tied around one's eyes. It is difficult to find the proper place to stick the pin; maybe he will hit it and maybe he will miss it. It is a shot in the dark. This is negative testimony.

We have a right to have an FBI investigation, and not a "spot" check. Pulling something out of a file and saying "There is nothing derogatory" means nothing. There may be in the file a newspaper clipping, or something from the iniquitous PM to the effect that a man has not bought a new hat for Easter. Perhaps it is derogatory; perhaps it is not. It is negative testimony, and it is not worth anything. Since when have these nominees become so holy that the Senate cannot put its hands on them? They are no better than Federal judges, who are investigated by the FBI. Why can we not have an investigation? Why are not we entitled to have made an FBI investigation which will go to the roots of this matter? Under the law an FBI investigation is made of even the janitor who fires the furnace of the Commission; yet we are told that it is impossible to have the FBI make an investigation of the five nominees. Mr. President, the records of these gentlemen seem to be a sacred cow that cannot be touched. I think the FBI should make a real investigation of this matter, so that we may have it for our information, rather than be compelled to rely upon newspaper clippings which may have been put in the file and be told, "This is the record so far." Mr. President, even if we required the production of such newspaper-clipping files, they would have little value, for they are negative testimony; they mean nothing. I should like to have produced something with positive meaning.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, let me say, if the senior Senator from Tennessee will yield to me for that purpose, that I believe the Senator from Nebraska misunderstood the discussion of yesterday with respect to the President's letter. I rose yesterday after the Senator from Tennessee had read a letter or message which I thought indicated, or at least created the impression, that there was something insidious in the files of the investigating agencies, and that we should get hold of those files and uncover the insidious material which was in them. I rose at that time, saying that we had the assurance of the President of the United States that there was nothing derogatory in those files.

I also say that there was no investigation by the FBI of any of the members of the Commission or of the General Manager.

I also say to the Senator that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has the power, as has been repeatedly stated on this floor, to use the facilities, the personnel, the equipment, and whatever else is authorized under the language of the act, of the departments and agencies of Government, but the Senate section of that joint committee does not have such power. That distinction is one which we must keep in mind. It is clear that the Senate section of the joint committee does not have that authority. If the Congress wishes to give the Senate section that power, I think it is a power which could well be used. But it was not in existence, and we have no power or authority to demand an investigation or

to demand from the FBI the results of an investigation.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to read at this point subparagraph (d) of section 15 of the so-called atomic-energy legislation:

The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof—

Mr. President, it would only be necessary to have the joint committee appoint the Senate section a subcommittee to do what I think the Senate section of the joint committee should have done—in short, to do what, Mr. President?—

is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

All in the world that it was necessary to do was to have the members of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which was set up to inquire into the qualifications of these so-called nominees, ask the joint committee to appoint them as a subcommittee to do the thing I am asking the Senator to do today; namely, to subpoena those records so that a subcommittee can go through those files from beginning to end and see whether there is in the FBI reports anything which would be of interest to us in either confirming or rejecting these nominations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Iowa the fact that even in the case of the Judiciary Committee at the time when the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was chairman, when the FBI refused to let us see the record in certain cases, the Senate Judiciary Committee simply announced, "All right, gentlemen; there will be no confirmation until we get it." It did not take them long to produce it after that. Strangely enough, Mr. President, when that record was produced, although both Senators from the State concerned had recommended the confirmation of the nomination of that judge, and although every one of the members of the Judiciary Committee except one had voted for confirmation of the nomination, yet after we saw the record, one of the Senators from that State withdrew his endorsement, and subsequently upon this floor every Republican Senator but one, acting on the basis of that FBI report, refused to vote for confirmation of that nomination for Federal judge, and some of the Senators on the other side of the aisle—Democrats—also refused to vote for confirmation.

So, Mr. President, I think it is of the most vital importance that we obtain an FBI report. As I have said, we have a simple remedy: If they will not show it to us, let us refuse to confirm anyone for

the position. Let us do that until the record is produced.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, let me say again that there was no FBI investigation.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I ask the chairman of the Senate section of the joint committee why an FBI investigation should not be made? If the Senator's position is that because no FBI investigation has been made, the Senator and his associates on the committee are not going to ask for the records, then I say that this nomination most certainly should be sent back to the committee until there is a chance to have an FBI investigation made. That is my view, if the position just stated by the Senator from Iowa is the position the committee is going to take. Certainly if five nominees for any position should ever be investigated by the FBI, these five nominees should be. I say to the chairman now that if there is no investigation by the FBI, then certainly we should require that one be made before we pass on these nominations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to resume the speech which I began yesterday. Before doing so, I desire to thank the various Senators who have interrupted, because I think the material developed in the course of the interruptions shows how necessary it is that the desired information from the FBI be made available. There is no reason in the world why it cannot be obtained, either by calling a meeting of the joint committee, if the Senate members do not have the power, or by following the advice of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and simply saying there will be no confirmation until the information is furnished. That should be done, Mr. President.

At this time I desire to discuss for a few minutes Mr. Lillienthal's political doctrine. Although he said he had no politics and was not a Democrat or a Republican—or even a Communist—yet his political doctrine is set out in a number of places in the record and also in one of his books. I wish to read it:

Our Government and every government—

Just think of this doctrine, Mr. President, for a moment—

is and must be a government of men, not a government of laws.

Mr. President, he does not bear allegiance to the Constitution of the United States or to the Federal laws which have been passed, not even to those concerning the matter with which he is dealing, as I shall point out a little later. He says the Government is a government of men, and that, so far as his activities are concerned, he administers the law. He first announced that doctrine years and years ago—if I remember correctly, in 1926. He has held to it ever since. He practiced it in Tennessee, as I have stated, and he paid no attention to the Federal

laws governing certain subjects in the TVA. He paid no attention to the United States civil-service laws; he paid no attention to the United States retirement laws; he established a civil-service system of his own; he established a retirement law of his own; he had something to do with flood control; he established a system of flood control and selected his own manager; he disregarded the laws of the United States—paid no attention to them.

Lastly, he established an accounting system of his own.

Mr. Lillenthal does not work under law; he does not believe in law; he believes in a government by men, and he has practiced what he has preached; he has practiced it down in Tennessee.

Incidentally, he practiced it in Illinois and Wisconsin before he went to Tennessee. He disregarded the law. He took an oath in Wisconsin, when appointed to office there, that he was engaged on no other business, whereas his main business, conducted in Chicago, was directly opposite to what his business in Wisconsin was.

He does not believe in law. Look at his writings. By the way, while I am on that subject, I shall digress here long enough to call the attention of Senators to something Mr. Lillenthal wrote. I believe it is generally understood that Senators are Members of Congress. We have something to do with the Congress. We are one body—one branch of the Congress. What does Mr. Lillenthal say about us? He did not make any exception in favor of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], or my good friend on the other side of the aisle the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], or my good friend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], or my good friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I shall read what he thought about the Senate. I read from his book, which has been greatly advertised, *Democracy on the March*. I read from page 190:

More hazardous to democracy than such a dream of a ruling elite of managers and technicians, but not unrelated to it, is the growing contempt of "politics" and of Congress.

Mr. President, I differ with this distinguished author, this distinguished nominee whom we have not yet confirmed, that there is a growing contempt for the Congress. This is his formal writing. He prepared a book, in which he says he has a contempt for the Congress. I do not agree with Mr. Lillenthal that there is a growing contempt for Congress, and I doubt if there is a Senator present who agrees with him. If there are any, I should like to have them hold up their hands. I see no hands held up.

This man, whose nomination for probably one of the most important offices in all the world, must be confirmed by the Senate, if he is to function, wrote a book, which was published in 1944, I believe, in which he says there is a growing contempt of politics and of the Congress.

This is nothing new or surprising from defeatists about democracy, and from reac-

tionary forces generally. But to find this depreciation of politics spreading among progressives and especially among those who are administrators and technicians is a sign of great danger. The strongest expression of disgust and impatience with politics and with Congress—

Mr. President, I am sorry for some of my friends who voted for this man's confirmation in Senate section of the joint committee. I see but two of them present. How proud they must be that they voted for the confirmation of the nomination of a man for this great office, who expresses such contempt for them as Members of the Congress.

The strongest expressions of disgust and impatience with politics and with Congress I have ever heard have come recently from men of great executive or technical ability in Government service and in business who tried to get an urgent war job done quickly, only to be delayed and even frustrated by what they describe as "political pressure," by exhausting congressional committee hearings, and endless conferences with legislators.

Do Senators know what Lillenthal will say when this is brought out, as it is now being brought out? He will say that he treated it exactly as he treated—let me recall who brought it out in the committee a few days ago—the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the latter our distinguished President pro tempore. Disregarding the committee and the Congress, and rambling on, as he frequently does, with his eyes down, he told them that he had taken over the business of atomic energy, and that he did not need the military. They had left on the first of January, when he took charge, and he saw no reason for the military in this activity, as I remember his testimony; and I think I recall it with a fair degree of accuracy. He did not want the military in it.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], excellent man that he is, said that did not suit him. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] instantly took Mr. Lillenthal to task, and in less than 5 minutes Mr. Lillenthal had taken all that back—he thought the military ought to be at least invited to come around and look at them sometime. He fumbled around as to whether they had any rights. He did not think they had any rights, but they might come and look and see what he and his associates were doing—disregarding Congress.

I wish to say to Senators who will vote to confirm Mr. Lillenthal's nomination, after his making that sort of a statement indicating disrespect for Congress, they will regret it but once in their lives, and that will be so long as they live on this earth. They will regret having voted to confirm a man who expresses openly, even if somewhat enigmatically, his utter disrespect for Congress.

It is the easiest thing in the world to tell what a man thinks by inference from what he says. Lillenthal says what other people are doing. Yes, but he is giving publicity to it, and as we who were familiar with the proceedings before the committee know—I was not a member of the committee, of course, but I was present at the committee meetings frequently—Mr. Lillenthal is a past grand advertiser for himself, and he thought, at

the time he wrote this book, that it was a mighty good thing to criticize the Congress, inferentially, that it would add to the sale of his book; and I have no doubt it did.

We have heard much about this book recently. The pages from which I have read are 190 and 191. The Senators who voted in the committee to confirm his nomination and who will vote to confirm it in the Senate, in my judgment will do themselves a very great injustice, and do their constituents a very great injustice, because no man should be appointed to this great office who has such disrespect for Congress that he writes a book and in a round-about way, tells how he disrespects the Congress.

I want to say another thing about Mr. Lillenthal at this point. So long as he was the head of the Tennessee Valley Authority it was a government of men and not of law, except laws announced by himself. He believed in a government of men and not of law. He disregarded all the laws of the United States, unless they fell within his program of a government by men.

He is already undertaking now to do exactly the same thing in the Atomic Energy Commission. While he is not yet really a member of it, he has absolute control of the Atomic Energy Commission; and he is going to keep it, because he has got his two men, and so far as the record shows, the only two men that he recommended, Dr. Bacher and Mr. Wamack; which gives him a majority of the Commission. Depend upon it, Senators, his nomination, that is if confirmed, he is going to run the Commission without regard to the laws of the United States, but solely as he has done with the TVA, on the theory that this is a government of men and not of law.

Mr. President, if it is desired to turn over the control of atomic energy to Mr. Lillenthal, a man who holds this body and the entire Congress in disrespect, as set forth in the book he has written, all that is necessary is to vote to confirm his nomination. But if Senators still believe in law and order, if they still believe that no one man has the right under this great Government to override the law, if they still believe in a republican form of government, or in a democratic form of government, they will vote against his confirmation. No matter what may be said, no matter how fine the other members of the Commission may be, no matter who they may be, Mr. Lillenthal, for the specific purpose of his control of atomic energy, will use them, just as he took charge of poor old man Morgan in Knoxville when he was at the head of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Do Senators want that repeated? If so, they will vote for his confirmation. If Senators want this body treated with disrespect, they will vote for him; that is the way to do it. If Senators want to promote such a man to a higher office than he has ever held before, and higher than most other offices under the Government, or under any other government, they will vote for Mr. Lillenthal, and he will certainly be the man they want. If Senators have no respect for their colleagues, if they have no respect for this body, if they

have no respect for the history of this great institution, the United States Senate, whose roll has been adorned by some of the greatest names the world has known, they will go along and vote for Mr. Lillenthal at this time. But if they have respect for it, I am here to plead with them, and to plead with them most earnestly, not to vote to confirm his nomination.

Mr. President, I now come to my next reason for thinking these nominations should be recommitted. Mr. Lillenthal, although actually in the position of any other man who does not hold office, has already appointed certain men to serve the Commission. Mr. Lillenthal, himself, has been recommended by the President but he is not an official of the Government until he is confirmed by the Senate.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield, though I want to say to my friend, and I call his attention to it in the hope that he will change his attitude, that last Friday when I very respectfully asked the Senator to yield to me, he declined to do so, in a most vociferous and disrespectful manner, though he yielded to everyone sitting right around him who asked him to yield. I am merely calling it to the Senator's attention, because of my love and respect for his father. I hope it will have a good effect on him. I hope his conduct in the Senate will improve and that he will yield to Senators when they respectfully ask him to do so. I now yield to him under those circumstances.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank my distinguished colleague from Tennessee. I certainly desire to apologize to him if inadvertently I did not yield to him last Friday. I recall that I had a number of interruptions, and I declined to yield to a number of Senators, in order that I might proceed and finish the remarks, which I was not able to do.

Mr. McKELLAR. The RECORD will not show that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want to assure my colleague from Tennessee that I had not picked him out especially, not to yield to him; but I do wish to call the Senators attention to the fact—

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator would have been in good company, because the newspapers, by direction of Mr. Lillenthal, have all been jumping on me for 2 or 3 months because I did not agree with the Senator on the marvelous qualities of Mr. Lillenthal for this office. So I am not holding the Senator responsible, any more than I am holding the newspapers responsible, but I am simply telling him, as I am telling the newspapers, it is not a very kind thing to do to a man who is holding public office and trying to discharge his duties properly. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Thanking the Senator again, I merely wish to keep the RECORD straight. The Senator has indicated that Mr. Lillenthal is acting more or less without authority in his capacity as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, but I most respectfully call the attention of the Senator to the constitutional provision which gives the Presi-

dent of the United States power to make interim appointments. The appointment of Mr. Lillenthal and the other members of the Commission were made under that provision of the Constitution of the United States, and under authority of the law of Congress. Certainly my able colleague from Tennessee does not mean to indicate that Mr. Lillenthal has assumed duties and powers more or less by a coup d'état, which he has no authority under law to assume.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, strange as that may appear, I do think that Mr. Lillenthal is not entitled to hold and conduct this office indefinitely. He was appointed. The interim period to which the Constitution refers was that period between the 12th of October when he was appointed and the 3d day of January, when the Congress met. His position now is exceedingly indefinite. I do not think he has any right, and especially I do not think he has a right to fill up his office with Communist appointees while his nomination is being discussed here in the Senate.

That brings me to my next proposal, as to why this matter should be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. Lillenthal has already appointed to the Commission three well-known Communists and is now arranging for the appointment of a fourth. He has appointed three well-known Communists as a part of his official family at the Atomic Energy Commission. I shall give their names to the Senate. By the way, he has not only appointed them, but he has passed a law in their favor to begin with, under some claim of right; that is, he has fixed their salaries at a higher level than the civil-service law permits officers of the Atomic Energy Commission to receive.

This is my eighth point. Mr. Lillenthal has appointed Communist Herbert S. Marks to be general counsel, at a salary of \$14,000 a year; Communist Richard O. Niehoff, to be assistant general manager, at a salary of \$10,000 a year; and Communist James Thomas Ramey, at a salary unstated. I believe he is going to permit Mr. Ramey to receive his salary under civil service, but the other two men, Mr. Marks and Mr. Niehoff, are too important for that, and in a moment I shall show the Senate why they are so important. Mr. Lillenthal has passed a separate law for them, and a little later I shall give the Senate the reason why he did so.

All three of these men were taken from the TVA before the Atomic Energy Commission was legally formed, and it is perfectly evident that the Communists are going to have control of the Atomic Energy Commission under Lillenthal, just as they have had control of the Tennessee Valley Authority under Lillenthal.

Joseph Volpe was appointed, too, but this is to be said for Mr. Volpe that there is no evidence to show that he is a well-known Communist. However, his brother is one, but whether communism runs in the family I am not now in a position to say. I do not know whether communism runs in a family or not.

However, Mr. Volpe is a member of Mr. Lillenthal's cabinet.

All of these matters should be gone into fully by the committee.

I next come to my ninth reason why Mr. Lillenthal's nomination should not be confirmed. This and other reasons assigned by me are in addition to those presented by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Listen to this ninth reason. Mr. L. B. Bolt, Jr., was a witness before the committee. He was a former principal attorney for the TVA at a salary of \$7,500 a year, under Mr. Volpe. I will say in passing that the record shows that Mr. Bolt was appointed as a young lawyer many years ago in the TVA. He was promoted eight times, if I remember the number of times correctly, and then it was found he was not a Communist, and Mr. Lillenthal had him kicked out. I received a telegram from Mr. Bolt, who lives in Knoxville, Tenn., where he is practicing law. He is one of the finest men we have in the State. The telegram in part is as follows:

From my personal knowledge, based on actually seeing the drafts, observing him work on it, and frank admissions, James T. Ramey prepared the original draft of the Murray Missouri Valley Authority bill. Later Ramey made several trips to Washington to work with Herbert S. Marks, now general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission—

At \$14,000 a year—

on redrafts of the Murray MVA (Missouri Valley Authority) bill. Ramey frankly admitted to me the purpose of these trips, which was on TVA time and (at TVA) expense.

That is not all, Mr. President. This is my tenth point—and I still quote from the telegram sent me by Mr. Bolt:

In like manner, Ramey also admitted to me working with Herbert S. Marks in Washington in assistance to draft the McMahon Atomic Energy Commission bill. TVA travel vouchers should show these trips, although the real purpose may not be revealed.

Senators, what are we getting into? It looks almost like there was a very unfair situation in Tennessee. Mr. Lillenthal claims to be a lawyer, but I believe the record shows that he never in his life tried a case. He said he had something to do once with a case which the distinguished lawyer of Chicago, Mr. Donald Richberg, had charge of; but the record does not show that Mr. Lillenthal ever practiced law. After Mr. Lillenthal graduated he served in Mr. Donald Richberg's office for about 6 months or a year, perhaps a little longer, and then he went into the research business for the utilities organization out there known as the Commerce Clearing House but belonging to the utilities. That is all the experience Mr. Lillenthal ever had as a lawyer. He has never had any experience as an atomic scientist, because, as I stated yesterday, the first thing Mr. Lillenthal ever knew about atomic energy was after Hiroshima. He admitted that on the

stand, and there cannot be any question about it. Why should he be singled out for this great position under these circumstances? It seems to me, Mr. President, it is a great mistake so to single him out.

I come now to my eleventh point. I want to call attention to another thing in connection with TVA. I wonder how long it will be before Mr. James C. Swidler, general counsel of the Tennessee Valley Authority, will be taken over by the Atomic Energy Commission? Mr. Swidler has admitted in writing:

Ramey's first major assignment in the legal department in the agricultural and fertilizer field was the drafting of legislation providing for a national fertilizer policy and program and participating in the formulation of TVA policy. . . . In carrying out this assignment, he drafted the original Hill bill, S. 2035, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and assumed major responsibility for the drafting of the Hill-Bankhead-Flannagan bill, S. 882, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

What I have just read appears on pages 26 and 27 of a written statement filed by Joseph Swidler in the appeal of L. B. Bolt, Jr., and James H. Eldridge on July 16, 1946.

These questions should be examined into by all means. Are we going to let a great organization like that be controlled by Communists? Mr. Ramey and Mr. Marks are both Communists. Neither one of them appeared before the committee.

I am sure that the chairman of the committee will recall that I had a great deal to say laughingly—and sometimes probably a little more seriously—about their not coming before the committee. Why did not Mr. Marks, instead of having a half a dozen so-called distinguished men testify for him, himself appear and let the committee see him, if he was to be general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission? Why did he not appear before the committee? What reason was ever given for Mr. Marks having half a dozen Representatives and other notables testify in his behalf when his nomination was not before the committee at all? He was appointed by Mr. Lillenthal even before the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal was confirmed. He cannot be lawfully appointed until this body confirms Mr. Lillenthal's nomination. And yet Mr. Lillenthal has appointed three Communists, namely, Mr. Joseph S. Marks, Mr. Ramey, and Mr. Niehoff. He has appointed all three of them, who are Communists, to be attorneys at big salaries.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to reiterate to my able friend from Tennessee that there is nothing in the record, directly or indirectly, which indicates that any of the three men named by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee are Communists or Communist sympathizers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me read something, and we shall see. This is what the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] said. He is a very able Senator, and he made a wonderful impression on this body the other day when he spoke.

On Friday, March 28, 1947, the Senator from Ohio read the report of Maj. Fred B. Rhodes, executive director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. I read from page 2801 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Senator from Ohio was quoting from the report of Mr. Rhodes:

2. Herbert S. Marks, age 39, divorced, general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, previously employed in a legal capacity at TVA and Bonneville from 1935 to 1940. Associated Gas & Electric Corp., New York City, 1940-41. War Production Board, 1941-45. Department of State (special assistant to Secretary), 1945-46. The record discloses that the applicant, Herbert S. Marks, is a strong advocate of state socialism. His integrity has been questioned by a number of people interviewed.

Expediency! Let me interpolate at this point. He did not appear before the committee at all. He had not even been appointed counsel; but someone had half a dozen witnesses come forth and testify in behalf of Mr. Marks. Why in advance? It will be remembered that at that time it was supposed, beyond question, that Mr. Lillenthal's nomination would be confirmed. I think some of the newspapers stated that he would be confirmed by 94 of the 95 Senators. The poor superannuated, worn-out senior Senator from Tennessee was the only Senator expected to vote against him. That was what was said, or the gist of it. I do not mean that those words were used, although some of them were. At any rate, it was expected that his nomination would be overwhelmingly confirmed.

Mr. Rhodes' report further states:

The record discloses that the applicant, Herbert S. Marks, is a strong advocate of state socialism. His integrity has been questioned by a number of people interviewed.

Is it not a fine thing to start this great organization of the Atomic Energy Commission with the unconfirmed, temporary head of the Commission selecting counsel at a salary fixed by him at \$14,000 a year, and placing a man like this in that position? The report further states:

He is said to have followed a policy of expediency in handling his work.

Not only has he been expedient, but his sojourns in various positions have been rather brief. For example, when the heat was turned on him in Tennessee, where he was working for the TVA, he left the TVA. Where did he go? He went out to the State of Washington. I do not see the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] in the Chamber. He made an admirable speech here the other day. Mr. Marks went to the State of Washington and began to work for a Government corporation there. He was transferred. There was apprehension as to what might happen to him if he were kept in the TVA, with all the charges of communism and socialism that were being brought against him.

The record discloses that the applicant, Herbert S. Marks, is a strong advocate of state socialism. His integrity has been questioned by a number of people interviewed.

He is said to have followed a policy of expediency in handling his work.

He found it expedient to go from the Tennessee Valley Authority, where he held a fine position, to the State of Washington. Later he returned to Washington, D. C., and entered the office of the Secretary of State for a little while. I wonder what happened in the State of Washington?

He is believed by many to be completely a self-server.

We have seen examples of that sort. They never think of the public interest. They never think of the other man's position. They are thinking of themselves all the time. They are selfish, self-serving.

He has spoken in the defense of a number of left-wing individuals and groups. He is, or has been, a member of the Lawyers Guild and of the United Federal Workers.

I do not know about the United Federal Workers, but the Lawyers Guild is nothing in the world but a Communist front organization. We have testimony in the record. Let me read from page 239:

Senator McMAHON. Those were the labor meetings held in the labor temple?

Mr. Bolt was the witness, and a splendid witness he made.

Mr. BOLT. No; Communist meetings.

Senator McMAHON. Where?

Mr. BOLT. I don't know. This Muriel S. Williams in her testimony stated and testified before the Dies committee that she had attended Communist meetings with Herbert S. Marks.

Herbert S. Marks is the man, if the testimony given by Mr. Bolt is correct, who wrote the Atomic Energy Act, or he had another Communist write it and send it here.

Are we going to change our Government to a Communist government? I wonder if Russia will have so much influence that she can persuade us to change our splendid Government to a Communist government before she takes it over from us. I am not in favor of it if she does take that position. So long as God gives me the strength to sit in the Senate and vote I shall never vote for any measure which will give Communists control in this country, or for any man who desires Communist control in this country.

Something else was said about Marks. Marks appears in another place in this record, at page 920. Let me read it:

Mr. BARKER. Did you ever attend meetings with him?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Another Communist who was testifying.

Mr. BARKER. And Melvin Siegel?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And you attended meetings with Melvin Siegel?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And Herbert Marks; you know Herbert Marks?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And you attended meetings with Herbert Marks?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Well, you see when you say this meeting business—yes.

Mr. BARKER. You knew Nelson Travis Barr?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Again Mrs. Williams testified that she attended meetings with Mr. Herbert Marks.

Will the Senate confirm the nomination of a man who has such disrespect for the Congress that he writes a book about it and takes such an attitude; such disrespect for Congress that he writes words in his book and then appoints among his first appointments, before he is qualified and his nomination is confirmed by this body, three well-known Communists? I understand that another one is coming here in a few days. I have forgotten his name, but I shall insert it in the RECORD. He is now being passed upon by other Communists to ascertain whether he is eligible.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has been referring to meetings which Mrs. Williams testified she attended with different persons?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, did not Mrs. Williams testify before the Dies committee to this effect? I shall read the question which Mr. Barker asked her.

Mr. BARKER. How about Harry C. Bauer? He is technical librarian for the TVA. Did you attend meetings with him?

And did not Mrs. Williams give this answer?

Now, this business of attending meetings, it is also very general. I don't know what you are reading into the record as to what kind of a meeting, because when I say "meeting" I mean a group gathering of any sort.

I believe the Senator can say in all fairness that when Mrs. Williams testified before the Dies committee that was her statement, and when she said she attended meetings she did not necessarily mean Communist meetings.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; the Senator is mistaken, because she was asked about Communist meetings all the time, and she testified about Communist meetings.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield further, it was in hearings before the Dies committee, was it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am talking about Mrs. Williams testifying before the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Committee. She testified as to the fact that she attended Communist meetings.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator does not take long; yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I refer my able colleague to page 7764 of the record of the Atomic Energy Committee. Here is a question which I asked of Mrs. Williams, the same Mrs. Williams about whom the Senator has been talking:

Senator KNOWLAND. Did you see any policy-making official whatsoever of the TVA at any Communist meeting?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I did not, sir.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Did you ever see any of them at any labor meeting?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Well, the union had a regulation that the policy-making officials were not to be union members. And when people rose to positions of supervisory character,

they automatically were dropped from the roll of the union.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator thinks that is an answer to the statement I read from the hearings I shall not bother about trying to change his mind. I could not change it, anyway. That is a very different situation, and refers to a different time. The Senator forgets that, according to Communist "red tape," Communists are required to deny they are Communists whenever they are questioned.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. When Mr. Hart was testifying before the Committee on Public Works I asked him the direct question, if, as a matter of fact, assuming for the sake of argument, that he had never advocated communism but was still a member of the party, he would deny it under oath, and he said he would deny it, because that is the teaching and doctrine of communism—never admit you are a Communist.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what they all testified in the hearings.

As one of the numerous reasons for recommending these nominations to the committee, Lillenthal in his testimony stated that he "did his damndest"—and I put that in quotation marks—to keep from being appointed to this position.

Mr. President, the evidence is undisputed that he used a large \$60,000 airplane belonging to and operated by the Tennessee Valley Authority. I believe they have four airplane pilots to operate this one plane. Mr. Lillenthal admitted that he went all over the country making speeches to show how much he knew about atomic energy—a lawyer who had never had a case; a man who had never had any scientific training either in college or elsewhere. He admitted he was not a scientist; and yet there he was, flying all over the country in a \$30,000 airplane belonging to the Government, lecturing about atomic energy, concerning which he admitted he never knew a thing until about 2 years ago; and the probability is that he had never thought of it prior to Hiroshima. Mr. President, as you know, the ancients used to make investigations and experiments about splitting the atom. I asked Mr. Lillenthal if he knew about that. If I am not mistaken he said he had never heard of it. I may be mistaken about that, and of course I do not wish to do him an injustice.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to yield in a minute or two.

Mr. President, it now turns out that Lillenthal was never a scientist at all; but he was a writer and was educated as a lawyer, although he never practiced. Yet it is proposed that the Senate confirm his appointment to a position in which it will be necessary that he, as the holder of that office, shall know something about science.

Mr. President, if the Senate confirms his appointment what will happen? Then the Senate will be setting aside the

man who had charge of that work, General Groves. Although the world has been trying to make this discovery for more than 2,000 years, and, as I said yesterday, although Alexander the Great had Macedonian scientists working on splitting the atom in the fourth century B. C., and although General Groves and those who worked under him made the discovery and thus brought great credit not only upon themselves but upon our entire Nation, yet in less than 2 years after it successfully won the greatest war which ever was fought among men, the Government of the United States proposes to turn out General Groves and those under him and appoint a research man who was educated as a lawyer but never practiced, a man who administered the Tennessee Valley Authority wholly improperly. That man is to be appointed in General Groves' place. Why should that be done, Mr. President? I wish to ask all Senators most earnestly how they can decide to vote for the confirmation of such a man. One Senator has said that the Senate should vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal because no one else will take the position. Mr. President, no one ever asked General Groves to take it. Why should he be turned out? Why should the Army be excluded?

Now I wish to refer to another book. As I said yesterday, the United States spent at least \$2,600,000,000 in developing this great discovery. Nevertheless, in less than 2 years from the time when that discovery was made, it is proposed that we select a man—or some of us wish to select a man, I shall put it that way, because I do not think the Senate will ever confirm his nomination; I have too much respect for the Senate to believe that it ever will confirm the nomination of a man who lacks the necessary equipment for that office, as has been shown here—but in less than 2 years after the discovery was made, following attempts to make it, extending over a period of more than 2,000 years, the nominee, Lillenthal, has a plan for having the United States give away that discovery to other nations. It won us the Japanese war; the dropping of two or three such bombs over there brought about the winning of that war for us. But what does Mr. Lillenthal wish to do with it? Here is what he wishes to do with it as disclosed on page 31 of his Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy. However, Mr. President, before reading from the report, I realize that I owe an apology to the Senator from Louisiana for not yielding to him before this.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator very much, but he has passed the point which I wished to discuss.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very sorry. I would not have intentionally done that for anything in the world.

Mr. President, let me read to the Senate what Mr. Lillenthal says we must do about this discovery which cost us \$2,600,000,000. Incidentally, we may have use for this discovery again. But would we have it if we had previously turned it over to Mr. Lillenthal? Let us see what

he says about it. I now read from page 31 of the report to which I have referred:

The following pages contain first a brief summary of the plan we recommend, and then an expansion going into some detail.

Summary of proposed plan—

Listen to this, Mr. President—

The proposal contemplates an international agency conducting all intrinsically dangerous operations in the nuclear field, with individual nations and their citizens free to conduct, under license and a minimum of inspection, all nondangerous, or safe, operations.

Mr. President, that would not be done by our Government; our Government does not propose to sell it. But if Mr. Lillenthal has his way, he will give it away—will give away, in effect, the \$2,600,000,000 which I spoke of yesterday, and which I said gave me a great deal of concern and trouble at the time when we were spending it, for I never hated more to vote for anything in my life. I was one of four Senators and four Members of the House of Representatives who knew something about it then, and it was a well-kept secret. But if I had remotely dreamed or had remotely surmised that after we spent \$2,600,000,000 of the money of the people of the United States in order to make that discovery during the greatest war that ever was fought among men, as soon as it was over this Government would turn that discovery over to Mr. Lillenthal, to let him divide it among the nations of the world as he saw fit, I never would have voted for it, and I never would have asked my friend, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], or my friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], or any other member of the Appropriations Committee at that time to vote for that expenditure. I never would have done so in the world.

But Mr. President, listen to what Lillenthal says he wishes to do with it. Hear what he says about his big ideas. This is Lillenthal talking now—not Marks or Ramey or Niehoff, the three Communists whom he has placed temporarily in charge of atomic energy today—but this is Mr. Lillenthal himself speaking:

The international agency might take any one of several forms, such as a UN commission, or an international corporation or authority.

Mr. President, he seems to like the word "authority" because under an "Authority" he has all authority. I read further:

We shall refer to it as Atomic Development Authority.

Mr. President, the members of the committee treated him wrong when they redrafted the bill which was written by his two Communists. They should not have struck out the word "Authority." I believe they have given a little different name to it now. If it had been known that Mr. Lillenthal's two men, one of them his so-called general counsel, were going to do that, such action would never have been taken.

It will be recalled that we have not made peace with those engaged in the late war. It will be remembered that we loaned vast sums to Russia, England, and

France and have received nothing or practically nothing in return from any of them. We do not know whether we are going to make peace with our enemies or our friends, the principal strife now being between Russia and England.

And here is a man proposing as the head of the Atomic Energy Commission who gets himself appointed in some way on a commission to determine what to do with atomic power and here is the Lillenthal-Acheson plan as reported by themselves.

It will be observed that he does not want to keep the bomb for our own protection and our own security. Oh, no, quite the contrary, he wants to give it, without money and without price, to friends and enemies alike, when he must know of his own knowledge that today we have only one rival and that our security and defense can only be interfered with by one possible nation and that is Russia, and yet this plan gives to Russia and all other nations the same right in it as we have.

The proposal contemplates an international agency conducting all intrinsically dangerous operations in the nuclear field, with individual nations and their citizens free to conduct, under license and a minimum of inspection, all nondangerous or safe operations.

The international agency might take any one of several forms, such as a UN commission or an international corporation or authority. We shall refer to it as Atomic Development Authority. It must have authority to own and lease property, and to carry on mining, manufacturing, research, licensing, inspecting, selling, or any other necessary operations.

The proposal contemplates an international agency with exclusive jurisdiction to conduct all intrinsically dangerous operations in the field. This means all activities relating to raw materials, the construction and operation of production plants, and the conduct of research in explosives. The large field of nondangerous and relatively nondangerous activities would be left in national hands. These would consist of all activities in the field of research, except on explosives, and the construction and operation of nondangerous power-producing piles. National activities in these fields would be subject to moderate controls by the international agency, exercised through licensing, rules, and regulations, collaboration on design, and the like. The international agency would also maintain inspection facilities to assure that illicit operations were not occurring, primarily in the exploitation of raw materials. It would be a further function of the Atomic Development Authority continually to reexamine the boundary between dangerous and nondangerous activities. For it must be recognized that although the field is subject to reasonable division, the dividing line is not sharp and may shift from time to time in either direction.

The development agency itself would be truly international in character. Its staff would be recruited on an international basis. Its functions would be such as to attract a caliber of personnel comparable to our own activities in raw ma-

terials during the war and our own primary production and experimental work. It would be set up as one of the subsidiary agencies of the United Nations, but it would have to be created by a convention or charter establishing its policies, functions, and authority in comprehensive terms.

This matter should be examined into by the committee before these nominations are confirmed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield in order that I may present my views regarding the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator for that purpose, but I do not wish to yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Atken	Hayden	O'Connor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overtton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cain	Langer	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Sparkman
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Downell	McFarland	Tobey
Dwornshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eaton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Murray	
	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

COMMODITY SHORTAGES AND HOUSING ACCOMMODATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 188)

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

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 2992.)

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lillenthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it would contribute greatly to my peace of mind were I able to erase from my memory impressions and judgment on Mr. Lillenthal's methods gained a number of years ago.

It chances that I was intimately connected with the Lillenthal-Morgan controversy which resulted in the latter be-

ing put out of office as chairman of the TVA by President Roosevelt.

I had known Dr. Arthur E. Morgan previous to his connection with TVA. I had known his reputation as an engineer, particularly in connection with the Miami Valley flood control work, which was a splendid undertaking, splendidly carried out. I knew him as the president of Antioch College at Yellow Springs, Ohio. He conceived and carried out in that institution a novel plan of education which combined practical earning of a living with academic and technical studies, and served to bind, into a harmonious whole, living and learning during the learning period instead of leaving the student entirely without living experience, and forcing him to gain it by years of hard knocks after leaving the school for active life.

Dr. Morgan's ability as an engineer, his deep and well-rounded philosophy as an educator and his transparent sincerity as a man remained unquestioned up to the time he took the TVA chairmanship, and it remains unquestioned today.

The other two members of the TVA were Dr. Harcourt Morgan, an agricultural specialist, and Mr. David Lilienthal. The three men did not work well together. Troubles multiplied. In deep mental distress as to what he ought to do, Dr. Arthur Morgan consulted with his friends as to the wisdom of bringing the difficulty out into the public view. I was one of those whom he consulted in the matter. He drove all the way up to Vermont and spent a day with me going over the situation.

As to what the situation was, it developed in some detail on pages 328 to 366 of the hearings, whose record lies on the desks of Senators. I do not know how many Senators have read Dr. Morgan's testimony. I am sure that none of us can vote with the whole situation in mind unless he has read that testimony.

As you read it, it is important to remember this point: That in assessing the value of that testimony we are not concerned with Dr. Morgan's engineering ability or his executive ability. We are not concerned with the question of whether it was altogether easy for his associates to get along with him. We are concerned with but one question. Our sole concern is this: Was and is Dr. Morgan an honest man? To that question there can be but one answer: Dr. Morgan is transparently honest. From the viewpoint of the man with whom he was having trouble, Dr. Morgan was and is naively honest.

Mr. President, if the record recited by Dr. Morgan is true—and I believe it to be true—it is a damning record. The truth of that record has not been contested. Can any Senator read it and feel comfortable in voting for the confirmation of the man whose name is before this body for appointment as the head of the most important commission which our Government has ever set up?

When it became known that I could not vote for Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation many of my friends, men whom I sincerely love and deeply respect, dealt with me and sought to change my purpose. None of them, however, undertook to change that purpose by disproving the grounds on which my action has been

determined. The plea was always based on the great abilities of the candidate, on the long delays in the organization of the Commission, and on the importance to the Nation of having an able administrator get the important work of the Commission going and under way at the earliest possible moment.

There are others who did not know me as well, who have adroitly intimated that my opposition to this appointment is really based on other grounds. It is alleged that I am an opponent of Federal power, and that this is the reason for my opposition. Mr. President, with regard to this allegation, there are two things to be said.

The first is that as I look over those who are supporting Mr. Lilienthal I find among them every natural opponent of Federal power; I find among his opponents no known opponents of Federal power, unless I may myself be so classed.

This brings me to my second point: I am an opponent of federally subsidized power. I have long objected to being taxed to help pay the electric bills of consumers in other parts of the country. I must similarly be opposed to taxing the citizens of other parts of this country to help me pay my own electric power bills.

That is the nature and extent of my opposition to Federal power—opposition to it only if the investment is not self-liquidating over a reasonably long period and so requires taxes for the maintenance of the low rate at which the energy is sold.

Trying to pin a tag of this sort on an opponent of Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation is a familiar and usually effective means of substituting innuendo for argument, where the argument is difficult to sustain. It is not the first time that this has been done. I would call the attention of the Senate to the attitude of the late Senator Norris toward anyone who intimated that the process of fixing atmospheric nitrogen for which the Muscle Shoals plant was built was outmoded, inefficient, and impracticable. Every competent engineer in the country knew that that was not the way to produce the needed nitrates. Yet, whenever that point was made to the good Senator, and he was a good Senator, whose ideals were of the highest, he picked up his rubber stamp and applied it to his inkpad and sealed the forehead of the protestant with the brand of Cain.

As to that seal, the image and superscription thereof was "Tool of the interests." Yet "the tools of the interests" were right and the Senator was wrong, as the event clearly showed.

There was a similar situation in connection with the campaign which resulted in the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

That project was sold to the Congress and the American people as being a yardstick for determining the proper charge which private utilities should make to consumers for electric power. As a matter of fact, it never was and never could be such a yardstick for many reasons, but anyone who pointed out those reasons was charged with being "a tool of the interests" in the mind of the good Senator and of all the supporters of the project.

It was at this point that I had my own first connection with the TVA situation.

I was at the time connected with the American Engineering Council, since dissolved, which was, at the time, the organization through which various engineering societies sought to work with the Federal Government.

In the course of our studies it became clear that it was actually cheaper in the Tennessee Valley to generate electricity from coal than it was to pay the amortization costs of a hydroelectric plant, all the differences being considered on a fair and equitable basis.

Becoming convinced of this, I corresponded with Dr. Arthur E. Morgan on the subject. He being an honest man, made no attempt whatever to prove what could not be proved. He took the ground that there was in this TVA project a great opportunity to see whether it might be possible to raise the standard of living of the inhabitants of a great socially depressed area of our Nation. That was a purpose and a point of view which I could understand. The TVA should have been sold to the Congress and the American people on that basis and honestly operated on that basis. It was not. It was sold under false pretenses.

A few months ago I was invited by Dr. Alvin Hanson to attend a seminar at the Littauer School, Harvard University. The seminar was conducted by Mr. Lilienthal, who gave an excellent and moving description of the social uplift which had come to the region as a result of operations of TVA. In the course of his talk he remarked incidentally and debonairly: "As for the yardstick—of course, that's out." The poor old yardstick had served its purpose, which was that of getting the appropriation for the Authority. It was never intended to have honest application to the price of electric power and was never so used.

For myself, this was a current confirmation of a conviction I held, which is that men's characters do not change unless they undergo a definite religious conversion. That our candidate has gone through such an experience has not been reported or, if reported, has not come to my attention.

I defy any Senator to read Dr. Arthur Morgan's testimony and then say that he would be willing to hire for his own business the candidate whose name we are considering for a position of trust so great that we find difficulty in defining its limits. The candidate is too clever, too slick.

Can any Senator find justification for approving appointment to such a position of a man whom he would not himself hire? That any of us should do so is inconceivable to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to continue for a moment or two with respect to what Mr. Lilienthal is going to do with the bomb. Mr. Lilienthal in his report continues:

The proposal—

That is his proposal—

contemplates an international agency with exclusive jurisdiction to conduct all intrinsically dangerous operations in the field.

Now according to the testimony this discovery has cost us \$2,600,000,000. I read that language again because it is very important.

The proposal contemplates an international agency with exclusive jurisdiction to conduct all intrinsically dangerous operations in the field.

That means, if carried out, that Russia and Great Britain and France and all the other great nations and the smaller nations too, will have the control of the warlike features of the atomic bomb.

This means all activities relating to raw materials, the construction and operation of production plants, and the conduct of research in explosives.

I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to one point. What Mr. Lillenthal is asking for this year is an appropriation of \$500,000,000 to carry on this activity, \$250,000,000 in cash and \$250,000,000 as a credit, making a total of half a billion dollars. What is it for? In part, of course, to distribute the warlike features to all the other nations of the world.

The Senator from New Hampshire is my successor as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I am very happy to serve with him as a member of his committee. I have not talked with him about what the committee is to do; but very frankly I wish to say to him, as well as to the country, that, knowing of Mr. Lillenthal's actions in Tennessee, in Chicago, and in Wisconsin, I would hesitate a long time before turning over to him \$500,000,000 for expenditure in 1 year. Instead of having \$14,000 salaries for three of the leading Communists in the country, there is no telling what his salary list would be, and there is no telling how many Communists there would be in the organization. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that not only am I going slow myself, but I very much hope that my distinguished and able friend from New Hampshire will go slow in appropriating this very large sum—for what?

This means all activities relating to raw materials, the construction and operation of production plants, and the conduct of research in explosives.

We have had all that. We have discovered how to manufacture the atomic bomb. It is proposed to give \$2,600,000,000 worth of research to the other great countries of the world; but we are to continue to make improvements.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator reading from the so-called Acheson-Lillenthal report?

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly am. They have not taken that back yet, have they?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that, regardless of whether Mr. Lillenthal or someone else is the head of this Commission, the principles of the Acheson-Lillenthal report have been officially adopted as the policy of this country, as probably enlarged by the Baruch report. So it would make no difference whether Mr. Lillenthal or someone else

was the head of the Commission. Until that policy is changed, the Commission would be bound by the broad principles announced in that report and in the Baruch proposals, so far as the international handling of atomic energy is concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are a long way from that now. The present act may not remain the law for a great while. I hope it may not. To my mind it gives authority to this Commission which ought not be given to any commission, no matter who the members of the commission might be. I believe that General Marshall is one of the greatest men in the country. He is certainly one of the greatest men in the Army. However, I would not be willing to turn these powers over to a commission headed by General Marshall, however much of an improvement he would be over the present head.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I dispute the statement made by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. The Acheson-Lillenthal report is not the adopted policy of this country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have never heard that it was.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It never has been adopted by this country. The Congress has not adopted it. There may be some approach in it which Mr. Baruch followed in his work.

Mr. McKELLAR. He has resigned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; he is no longer there, and that report is not the policy of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for his interruption. The Senator has described the situation exactly as I understand it.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think it is entirely correct to say that the Acheson-Lillenthal report as such has never been officially adopted as the policy of this country. What I meant to be understood as saying was that the Baruch proposals to the United Nations for the handling internationally of atomic energy have been designated by the President and by the State Department, and officially transmitted to the United Nations as the policy which this country desires to pursue in the international handling of atomic energy. I believe the record is complete on the point that the Baruch proposals were based upon the findings of the committee appointed by the Secretary of State. Mr. Lillenthal was the chairman of a panel appointed under that committee. That was the general, broad foundation upon which the Baruch report and the Baruch proposals were enlarged and based.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I still contend that the Senator from Iowa is totally in error in the statement which he has just made. The Acheson-Lillenthal report was a source of considerable embarrassment to Bernard Baruch, who arrived at his plans independently of

that report. As a matter of fact, Mr. Baruch was kind enough not to make any serious public scandal about it, but the truth is that he was terribly embarrassed by that report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much.

I continue to read from the Acheson-Lillenthal report:

This means all activities relating to raw materials, the construction and operation of production plants, and the conduct of research in explosives—

Listen to this—

The large field of nondangerous and relatively nondangerous activities would be left in national hands.

The underlying purpose of this report, whether those who made it so understood or not, is to place all of the war operations in the hands of an international committee. I think that is the last thing the Senate wants to do. So far as I am concerned I violate no confidence and no promise to anyone, given recently or some time ago, when I say that I am utterly opposed to dividing with all the other countries of the world this great discovery, one of the greatest ever made, at a cost of \$2,600,000,000. If any other country could manufacture atomic bombs, it could drop them on us if conditions were changed. Who knows that they would not do it? Would any Senator want to have an international committee divide the supply of atomic bombs with all the world and take the chance of having them dropped on us in the future? If anyone is in favor of that, either he must be against America or he must believe that there will never be any more bombs dropped in the world. In my judgment there will be bombs dropped in wars of the future.

I shall vote against any such plan as this. I think it is one of the most un-American and unpatriotic proposals that has been made by any public man in a long time.

I continue to read from the Acheson-Lillenthal report:

These would consist of all activities in the field of research (except on explosives) and the construction and operation of nondangerous power-producing piles.

That is to be reserved by this country.

National activities in these fields would be subject to moderate controls by the international agency, exercised through licensing, rules and regulations, collaboration on design, and the like.

The same sort of rules now in effect in the Tennessee Valley Authority, in violation of the laws of our Nation; rules relating to retirement, accounting, civil service, and various other matters, which have been established by Mr. Lillenthal since he has been in charge.

I do not know of anyone in his right mind who would vote for that sort of thing, and yet it is what we would be voting for if we vote to confirm this man's nomination.

I come now to the development agency. That is an international agency. I read further:

The development agency itself would be truly international in character. Its staff would be recruited on an international basis.

Its functions would be such as to attract a caliber of personnel comparable to our own activities in raw materials during the war and our own primary production and experimental work. It would be set up as one of the subsidiary agencies of the United Nations—

Not the United States. Oh, no. It would not be proper for the United States to conduct these activities as to its own problems. We must turn them over to the United Nations—

but it would have to be created by a convention or charter establishing its policies, functions, and authority in comprehensive terms.

Whatever the formal organization, its integration with national structure would of course be one of the major problems. Measures to assure the proper degree of accountability to the United Nations and to individual nations, measures to assure that individual nations would have ample opportunity to be informed of the agency's activities, measures to make the agency responsive to the changing needs of nations—all these would have to be worked out with extraordinary care and ingenuity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all of pages 31, 32, and 33 of the Acheson-Lilienthal report on the International Control of Atomic Energy be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

SECTION III. SECURITY THROUGH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION

In the preceding sections of this report we have outlined the course of our thinking in an endeavor to find a solution to the problems thrust upon the nations of the world by the development of the atomic bomb—the problem of how to obtain security against atomic warfare, and relief from the terrible fear which can do so much to engender the very thing feared.

As a result of our thinking and discussions we have concluded that it would be unrealistic to place reliance on a simple agreement among nations to outlaw the use of atomic weapons in war. We have concluded that an attempt to give body to such a system of agreements through international inspection holds no promise of adequate security.

And so we have turned from mere policing and inspection by an international authority to a program of affirmative action, of aggressive development by such a body. This plan we believe holds hope for the solution of the problem of the atomic bomb. We are even sustained by the hope that it may contain seeds which will in time grow into that cooperation between nations which may bring an end to all war.

The program we propose will undoubtedly arouse skepticism when it is first considered. It did among us, but thought and discussion have converted us.

It may seem too idealistic. It seems time we endeavor to bring some of our expressed ideals into being.

It may seem too radical, too advanced, too much beyond human experience. All these terms apply with peculiar fitness to the atomic bomb.

In considering the plan, as inevitable doubts arise as to its acceptability, one should ask oneself, "What are the alternatives?" We have, and we find no tolerable answer.

The following pages contain first a brief summary of the plan we recommend, and then an expansion going into some detail.

Summary of proposed plan: The proposal contemplates an international agency conducting all intrinsically dangerous operations in the nuclear field, with individual nations and their citizens free to conduct, under license and a minimum of inspection, all nondangerous, or safe, operations.

The international agency might take any one of several forms, such as a UN commission, or an international corporation or authority. We shall refer to it as Atomic Development Authority. It must have authority to own and lease property, and to carry on mining, manufacturing, research, licensing, inspecting, selling, or any other necessary operations.

This chapter is not an attempt to write a corporate charter for such an international agency. It is the aim, rather, to show that such a charter can be written in workable terms, and that the nature of the organization and its functions will have decisive consequences for world security. We are satisfied that the differences between national and international operations can be exploited to make the problem of atomic energy manageable. This idea, we think, can become as familiar as the fact that the differences between individual enterprise and corporate enterprise have important consequences in the conduct of business.

If we are to do anything constructive in relation to atomic energy it must inevitably be novel and immensely difficult. We think that the weeks that we have spent in analysis of the problem have made it appear somewhat less difficult and somewhat less novel. A succession of such processes will be necessary, each building on the preceding analysis, before even the major ramifications of the problem can be understood and the major questions partially answered. What is chiefly important now is to describe the right course of action in terms sufficiently practical and valid to show that the further exploration is worth while.

The proposal contemplates an international agency with exclusive jurisdiction to conduct all intrinsically dangerous operations in the field. This means all activities relating to raw materials, the construction and operation of production plants, and the conduct of research in explosives. The large field of nondangerous and relatively nondangerous activities would be left in national hands. These would consist of all activities in the field of research (except on explosives) and the construction and operation of nondangerous power-producing piles. National activities in these fields would be subject to moderate controls by the international agency, exercised through licensing, rules and regulations, collaboration on design, and the like. The international agency would also maintain inspection facilities to assure that illicit operations were not occurring, primarily in the exploitation of raw materials. It would be a further function of the Atomic Development Authority continually to reexamine the boundary between dangerous and nondangerous activities. For it must be recognized that although the field is subject to reasonable division, the dividing line is not sharp and may shift from time to time in either direction.

The development agency itself would be truly international in character. Its staff would be recruited on an international basis. Its functions would be such as to attract a caliber of personnel comparable to our own activities in raw materials during the war and our own primary production and experimental work. It would be set up as one of the subsidiary agencies of the United Nations, but it would have to be created by a convention or charter establishing its policies, functions, and authority in comprehensive terms.

Whatever the formal organization, its integration with national structure would, of course, be one of the major problems.

Measures to assure the proper degree of accountability to the United Nations and to individual nations, measures to assure that individual nations would have ample opportunity to be informed of the agency's activities, measures to make the agency responsive to the changing needs of nations—all these would have to be worked out with extraordinary care and ingenuity. But certainly our experience with business and Government institutions, national and international, would afford a wealth of guidance in the development of such measures.

In the actual conduct of its operations the development organization would at all times be governed by a dual purpose, the promotion of the beneficial use of atomic energy and the maintenance of security. We believe that much can be done in a convention or charter to make these purposes concrete and explicit, to draw the line between the dangerous and the nondangerous, to establish the principles determining the location of stock piles and plants so that a strategic balance may be maintained among nations, to establish fair and equitable financial policies so that the contributions of nations to, and their receipt of benefits from the organization will be justly apportioned. The most careful and ingenious definitions will be required in order to accomplish these purposes.

In what follows we shall attempt to develop and expand the foregoing statement of essentials.

We can best visualize the Atomic Development Authority in terms of the answer to these concrete questions:

1. What will be the functions of the agency; what are the things that it will do?
2. What kind of organization is necessary to carry out these functions?
3. How will the organization be related to the United Nations and the individual nations that it will represent?
4. What policies will guide the agency in determining its manifold actions?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday quite a to-do was made about Mr. John Lord O'Brian. If I am mistaken, I should like to have some Senator on the other side correct me. It was stated that Mr. John Lord O'Brian appeared as a witness for Mr. Lilienthal. If he did, the record does not show it. Mr. John Lord O'Brian appeared as a witness for the future appointee of Mr. Lilienthal. Mr. O'Brian was what might be called an interested witness, to some extent. He looked like a very fine man, and I have no doubt he is a fine man. But Mr. O'Brian reminds me of my old lawyer days. Mr. O'Brian is either a very fine lawyer or a very fine collector, one or the other. He is interested in the Tennessee Valley Authority. He did not testify for Mr. Lilienthal; he testified for Communist Marks.

That is the most remarkable thing I ever heard of—a man of Irish extraction testifying for a Communist. I do not believe I ever saw such an instance before. I do not recall ever having seen one before.

Why was Mr. O'Brian here? I shall refer to him for a moment. At page 22 of the record it is shown that John Lord O'Brian was appointed by Mr. Lilienthal on a board of advisers to recommend the appointment of a general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In his testimony for Mr. Marks, Mr. O'Brian referred to "kidding" Marks. This is another way of bringing out facts by humor. He referred to the fact that

he "kidded" Mr. Marks about the "revolution" that was to come. The real reason why Mr. John Lord O'Brian has been so much in favor of Mr. Marks is that Mr. O'Brian enjoys very fine fees through the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have some very unusual-looking documents in my hand that I want to put into the RECORD. Mr. O'Brian is a good lawyer. I do not know what his politics may be. Why was it necessary for the TVA, with all the legal force it had, to employ him? The TVA had Mr. Swidler, a great lawyer who used to work for Mr. Lillenthal for \$17.50 a week, and a number of other lawyers. Why did they have to enter into agreements like the ones I hold in my hand? I wonder if Senators can see what kind of documents they are? If they will look, they will see these are photostatic copies. One of them reads as follows:

John Lord O'Brian, in account with the Tennessee Valley Authority: To services rendered as consultant and special counsel in connection with cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; *George Ashwander et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, ancillary proceeding; and *Georgia Power Company v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, for the period up to and including June 30, 1937, under contract No. TVA 16,876, dated June 9, 1937, \$25,000.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. Before my friend from Michigan came to the Senate he had the reputation of being one of the great lawyers of his State. He was an active lawyer and tried cases in the courts. I am just wondering if a fee like that, for services beginning June 9, 1937, to and including June 30, 1937, would not be a pretty fair fee. I am asking the Senator. He was going to interrupt me, but I wish to ask him that question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I was not going to pass upon the amount of the fee. Naturally, it would depend upon the nature of the services.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. But I shall have to admit that in 1937 a \$25,000 fee for that service would have been a considerable fee. I was on the bench at that time, and my salary for the whole year was \$15,500.

I wish to ask the able Senator who would have had authority or who did have authority to hire Mr. O'Brian at that time, and by whom was he hired to do that job?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was James Lawrence Fly, the General Counsel. Whether he had authority under the law I cannot say. But I shall read a little later—

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me inquire whether Mr. Marks had a legal position with the TVA at that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my recollection, but I shall examine the record and be certain about it.

Now I wish to call attention to another thing on the first pages:

I hereby certify that the above account is just and correct, and that payment therefor has not been received. This June 23d, 1937.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that the contract went up to June 30, 1937.

That certification was made on the 23d of June. It is signed with a facsimile of Mr. O'Brian's signature, "John Lord O'Brian."

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to get the dates clear in my mind.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall read this document just as it is. There cannot be any mistake about it, because I am reading a photostatic copy:

John Lord O'Brian, in account with Tennessee Valley Authority: To services rendered as consultant and special counsel in connection with the cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power Co. et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; *George Ashwander et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding); and *Georgia Power Co. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, for the period up to and including June 30, 1937, under contract No. TV-16876, dated June 9, 1937, \$25,000.

I hereby certify that the above account is just and correct and that payment therefor has not been received. This June 23, 1937.
JOHN LORD O'BRIAN.

Mr. President, all three of those dates were in 1937—even the one which was furnished. So let me read further; there may be an explanation of it.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not clearly understand the number of days of consultation for which that fee was charged. As I understand, there were only a very few days.

Mr. McKELLAR. This document shows that it was from June 9 to June 30. But surely there must be some mistake about that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That would represent a period of 21 days, and for consultation services over a period of 21 days \$25,000 was charged.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what the document shows on its face in regard to those two cases, at least. I do not know what was done. I know that in the old days when I was a very busy practitioner—and I think I was one of the busiest who ever practiced in my city of Memphis—we did not get any such fees for any such short services, and, in fact, we got very few fees of that size at all. Yet we were very actively engaged in practice. As a matter of fact, there were scarcely any fees of that size at that time.

From the next page, which is also a photostatic copy, I read the following:

John Lord O'Brian, in account with Tennessee Valley Authority: To services rendered as consultant and special counsel in connection with the cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power Co. et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; *George Ashwander et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding); and *Georgia Power Co. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, for the period up to and including June 30, 1938, under supplement to contract No. TV-16876, dated June 30, 1938, \$25,000.

I hereby certify that the above account is just and correct, and that payment therefor has not been received. This October 10, 1938.
JOHN LORD O'BRIAN.

I hereby certify that the above services have been performed and this statement is hereby approved for payment.

JAMES LAWRENCE FLY.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are those two the same fee, or are they two separate fees for two separate services?

Mr. McKELLAR. When I read them, I thought they were the same. I do not clearly understand how it could be otherwise. But I shall read further, and we shall see. I now read the agreement, which is under the same sort of heading:

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN—CONTRACT NO. TV-16876—
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY CONTRACT FOR SERVICES AS CONSULTANT AND SPECIAL COUNSEL

This agreement, made this 9th day of June 1937, between John Lord O'Brian, of Buffalo, N. Y., and Tennessee Valley Authority, hereinafter called "Authority," witnesseth:

Whereas the Board of Directors of the Authority, by resolution dated June 11, 1936, authorized the employment of John Lord O'Brian, attorney, and directed its general counsel to enter into a satisfactory agreement with Mr. O'Brian in the conduct of its constitutional litigation; and

Whereas John Lord O'Brian accepted said employment with the Authority in a consulting capacity and as special counsel, and to date, at the request of the Authority, has attended conferences, studied, prepared, and represented the Authority in preliminary motions and other matters in various Federal courts in the cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power Company et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; *George Ashwander et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding); and *Georgia Power Company v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; and

Whereas the Authority desires to compensate John Lord O'Brian for services performed to date; and

Whereas parties desire a written agreement covering the services herein until the termination of the litigation herein mentioned;

Now, therefore, in consideration of the premises and mutual covenants herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

1. John Lord O'Brian agrees to render legal services to the Authority, including conferences, travel, preparation of briefs, appearances at hearings, arguments in the district courts, circuit courts of appeal, and the United States Supreme Court, and incidental services connected therewith in the cases of *Tennessee Electric Power Company et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; *George Ashwander et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding); and *Georgia Power Company v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, when and as requested by the Authority.

2. The Authority agrees to pay John Lord O'Brian the sum of \$25,000 in full settlement for services performed to the end of the present fiscal year in connection with the litigation herein mentioned.

I am in doubt as to what that means, but that is what it says.

I now read the following:

3. The Authority further agrees to pay John Lord O'Brian upon receipt of properly certified invoices at intervals satisfactory to the parties such amounts as the parties may agree upon as fair and just for services performed after July 1, 1937.

4. When John Lord O'Brian is away from his residence in Buffalo, N. Y., in connection with his services the Authority will pay him, in addition to the above compensation, a subsistence allowance of \$5 per diem and his proper transportation expenses which shall in no event exceed his actual expenses or the cost of travel by rail under such conditions and including such incidentals as are allowed to Government employees under Government travel regulations. This pro-

vision shall include travel previously rendered in connection with services herein described, and shall authorize payments for travel heretofore or hereafter performed in connection with the services provided for by this contract.

5. The term of this contract is the period covered by the litigation herein mentioned.

In witness whereof the parties have hereunto subscribed their names the day and year first above written.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN,

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,

By JOHN B. BLANDFORD, Jr.,

Secretary to the Board.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the various photostat copies of the bills, contracts, and other documents to which I have been referring.

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

John Lord O'Brian, in account with Tennessee Valley Authority; account No. TV-16876: To services rendered as consultant and special counsel in connection with the cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power Co. et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; *George Ashwander et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding), and *Georgia Power Co. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; for the period up to and including June 30, 1937, under contract No. TV-16876, dated June 9, 1937, \$25,000.

I hereby certify that the above account is just and correct, and that payment therefor has not been received. This June 23, 1937.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN.

TVA audit of disbursements. Received June 24, 1937, voucher unit.

John Lord O'Brian, in account with Tennessee Valley Authority: To services rendered as consultant and special counsel in connection with the cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power Co. et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; *George Ashwander et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding), and *Georgia Power Co. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; for the period up to and including June 30, 1938, under supplement to contract No. TV-16876, dated June 30, 1938, \$25,000.

I hereby certify that the above account is just and correct, and that payment therefor has not been received. This October 10, 1938.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN.

I hereby certify that the above services have been performed and this statement is hereby approved for payment.

JAMES LAWRENCE FLY.

TVA audit of disbursements. Received October 11, 1938, voucher section.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN—CONTRACT NO. TV-16876—TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY CONTRACT FOR SERVICES AS CONSULTANT AND SPECIAL COUNSEL

This agreement, made this 9th day of June 1937, between John Lord O'Brian, of Buffalo, N. Y., and Tennessee Valley Authority, hereinafter called Authority, witnesseth:

Whereas, the Board of Directors of the Authority, by resolution dated June 11, 1936, authorized the employment of John Lord O'Brian, attorney, and directed its general counsel to enter into a satisfactory agreement with Mr. O'Brian in the conduct of its constitutional litigation, and

Whereas, John Lord O'Brian accepted said employment with the Authority in a consulting capacity and as special counsel, and to date, at the request of the Authority, has attended conferences, studied, prepared, and represented the Authority in preliminary motions and other matters in various Fed-

eral courts in the cases styled *Tennessee Electric Power Company, et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; *George Ashwander, et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding), and *Georgia Power Company v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; and

Whereas, the Authority desires to compensate John Lord O'Brian for services performed to date, and

Whereas, parties desire a written agreement covering the services herein until the termination of the litigation herein mentioned:

Now, therefore, in consideration of the premises and mutual covenants herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

1. John Lord O'Brian agrees to render legal services to the Authority, including conferences, travel, preparation of briefs, appearances at hearings, arguments in the district courts, circuit courts of appeal, and the United States Supreme Court, and incidental services connected therewith in the cases of *Tennessee Electric Power Company, et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*; *George Ashwander, et al. v. Tennessee Valley Authority* (ancillary proceeding), and *Georgia Power Company v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, when and as requested by the Authority.

2. The Authority agrees to pay John Lord O'Brian the sum of \$25,000 in full settlement for services performed to the end of the present fiscal year in connection with the litigation herein mentioned.

3. The Authority further agrees to pay John Lord O'Brian upon receipt of properly certified invoices at intervals satisfactory to the parties such amounts as the parties may agree upon as fair and just for services performed after July 1, 1937.

4. When John Lord O'Brian is away from his residence in Buffalo, N. Y., in connection with his services the Authority will pay him, in addition to the above compensation, a subsistence allowance of \$5 per diem and his proper transportation expenses which shall in no event exceed his actual expenses or the cost of travel by rail under such conditions and including such incidentals as are allowed to Government employees under Government travel regulations. This provision shall include travel previously rendered in connection with services herein described, and shall authorize payments for travel heretofore or hereafter performed in connection with the services provided for by this contract.

5. The term of this contract is the period covered by the litigation herein mentioned. In witness whereof, the parties have hereunto subscribed their names the day and year first above written.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,

By JOHN B. BLANDFORD, Jr.,

Secretary to the Board.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN—SUPPLEMENTARY CONTRACT NO. TV-16876—TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY CONTRACT FOR SERVICES AS CONSULTANT AND SPECIAL COUNSEL

This agreement, made this 30th day of June 1938, between John Lord O'Brian, of Buffalo, N. Y., and Tennessee Valley Authority, hereinafter called "Authority," witnesseth:

Whereas the parties executed a contract under date of June 9, 1937, for the employment of John Lord O'Brian in a consulting capacity and as special counsel;

Whereas John Lord O'Brian has served the Authority in a consulting capacity and as special counsel continuously and effectively;

Whereas said contract of June 9, 1937, provided for the payment to John Lord O'Brian of "such amounts as the parties may agree upon as fair and just for services performed after July 1, 1937," "upon receipt of properly certified invoices at intervals satisfactory to the parties"; and

Whereas the parties desire to arrange immediately for the compensation of John Lord O'Brian for services performed during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and to continue the terms of the aforesaid contract of June 9, 1937;

Now, therefore, in consideration of the premises and the mutual covenants herein contained, the parties agree as follows:

1. The parties hereby reaffirm the terms and conditions of the contract executed on June 9, 1937, for the purposes therein set forth.

2. The Authority agrees to pay John Lord O'Brian the sum of \$25,000 in payment for services performed to the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, in connection with the litigation specified in the contract of June 9, 1937.

In witness whereof, the parties have hereunto subscribed their names the day and year first above written.

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN,

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,

By JAMES LAWRENCE FLY.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—NOTICE OF ACTION TAKEN BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

To: Gordon R. Clapp, Director of Personnel
From: L. Duane Dunlap, Assistant Secretary
Date: July 26, 1939

Subject: Contract with John Lord O'Brian

The following entry appears in the minutes of a meeting held by the Board of Directors on July 20, 1939:

"There was submitted to the Board for approval a proposed contract with John Lord O'Brian providing payment to Mr. O'Brian the sum of \$25,000 for legal services rendered during the fiscal year 1939, and providing further for the retention of his services for the fiscal year 1940. A true copy of the contract, labeled exhibit 7-20-39a, is filed with the records of the Authority. After examining the provisions of the contract and finding them satisfactory, the Board adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Board of Directors hereby approves and authorizes entry into the contract (Exhibit 7-20-39a) with John Lord O'Brian;

"Further resolved, That the General Manager, or in his absence, the Acting General Manager, be and he is hereby authorized and directed to execute the same for and on behalf of the Authority."

L. DUANE DUNLAP.

(Two vouchers No. 39-24394—Public voucher for purchases and services other than personal—not printed in RECORD.)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to make a very short statement with reference to why Mr. O'Brian was appointed. Mr. Robert H. Jackson, one of the Justices of the United States Supreme Court, was Solicitor General in 1938. He was Solicitor General during a part of the time when Mr. O'Brian was employed by Mr. Lienthal. Mr. Justice Jackson is a very able man and a very fine Justice, and he could have performed that work probably just as well as could Mr. O'Brian, who charged such a large fee. Everyone knows that it is the duty of the Solicitor General of the United States to represent the Government before the Supreme Court. Why did the TVA ignore him entirely, and hire a private attorney?

Who was the Solicitor General in 1937? Mr. President, it was Stanley Reed. He is now a Justice of that Court. Who was the Solicitor General in 1938 when Mr. John Lord O'Brian got his second \$25,000 fee? It was Robert H. Jackson, who also at this time is a Justice of the Supreme Court. Why did

Mr. Lilienthal ignore these two fine lawyers, who now are on the bench of that Court? It is just another instance of refusal by the TVA to follow the regular procedure and to obey the laws of the United States.

Mr. President, as will be seen there is another contract of a similar kind. It is dated a year later—1938. It provides for a similar payment of \$25,000. In the first place, Mr. President, I do not know why a general counsel like James Lawrence Fly, assisted by all the other lawyers serving under him and being paid by the Government should have needed still additional lawyers.

Here is a receipt for that money, too; it shows that \$50,000 was paid in those 2 years. I do not know whether it is still kept up, but the other day, when Mr. Marks came forward—not Mr. Lilienthal, but Mr. Marks—Mr. O'Brien appeared to testify for him. I suppose Mr. Marks was one of the lawyers of the concern at that time, and perhaps it was all right, I do not know, but Lilienthal was in charge of the TVA at the time this contract was made, and it could not have been made without his knowledge and consent. It seems to me that if by any mischance Mr. Lilienthal's nomination should be confirmed, provision should be made and perhaps penalties fixed to guard against such a situation. I do not know whether penalties would do any good or not; he might do as he did in Madison, Wis.

Everyone knows it is the duty of the Solicitor General of the United States to represent the Government before the Supreme Court. I wonder why Mr. Lilienthal and Mr. Fly ignored the Government's representatives. We had a Solicitor General here to try cases before the Supreme Court. Why was it necessary to employ Mr. O'Brien? I do not know how many of these fees may have been paid. The accounts have not been submitted to the Congress, and that was one of the reasons why I introduced a bill several years ago, and succeeded in having it passed by the Senate, although the House did not pass it, requiring that an examination be made of the accounts of the TVA, and requiring the TVA to pay its receipts into the Treasury of the United States, as the Post Office Department does, and as every other department of the Government does. TVA is the only agency of the Government which is exempt from paying its receipts into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Lilienthal is a law unto himself. That corresponds with his well-known maxim that the United States Government, like other governments, is a government of men and not of law.

Mr. Lilienthal is very ignorant about the United States Government, because our Government is a government not only of law, but of the Constitution, as every American should know. I am surprised that Mr. Lilienthal, if he graduated at Harvard, as he said he did, did not know that this is a government of law and the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 2803 of the Record, the history of Herbert S. Marks, as read by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], would indicate that Mr. Marks was employed in a legal capacity at TVA and Bonneville from 1935 to 1940—during that period.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. I note this in the third column at the top of page 2803:

Mr. O'Brien told what Mr. Marks did in that Division. Finally he said, "But I know this man intimately. And any suggestion that he is a Communist or has communistic tendencies, or has subversive tendencies, is just sheer nonsense."

I assume that he was speaking from his experience after obtaining \$50,000 in 2 years as fees, intimating that any man who had any tendency to communism would certainly not want to pay any such fees to a lawyer.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a great deal in what the Senator says, and I thank him.

Who was the Solicitor General in 1937 and what was the matter with him? His name was Stanley Reed, and he is one of the finest men in the United States, now a member of the Supreme Court of the United States. I have known Mr. Reed for many, many years. I knew him when he was connected with one of the Government departments, the Department of Justice, I believe it was. At any rate, I knew him a long time before he was appointed on the Supreme Court. I have always had the highest opinion of him, and I know, as well as I know my name, that if the Tennessee Valley Authority, through its general counsel, had called on Mr. Stanley Reed, Solicitor General of the United States, to represent the TVA in the case referred to, Mr. Reed would have done it. He is an upright, honest, hard-working, fine man, and makes a good Justice. I believe there was some other reason in this matter.

Mr. President, this is the way the man whose nomination as the head of the Atomic Energy Commission we are now asked to confirm acted with the TVA. If he threw away \$25,000 to this friend and that friend and the other friend, there is no telling what would happen if we turned over to him the \$500,000,000 a year he has asked for.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. It does not seem to me, from the record the Senator has read, that the attorney who was paid \$50,000 ever appeared in the Supreme Court on behalf of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Those records do not show, but I assume he must have done it. Mr. O'Brien has a very excellent reputation as a lawyer.

Mr. MOORE. Yes; but it seems to me that in the time that elapsed there would not have been any case in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. One would not have thought so. It simply shows how the TVA was operated.

Mr. MOORE. What was the case? It was a case between the TVA and a power company, was it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was a case between the Tennessee Power Co. and the TVA, and a case between George Ashwander et al., against the TVA, and the Georgia Power Co. against the TVA.

Mr. MOORE. I do not know what the case was, but—

Mr. McKELLAR. There must have been several cases. It certainly shows that the men who conducted that kind of an establishment in Tennessee should not be the head of this so-called world establishment.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator have any further information, or can he give us any further statement, with reference to the number of special attorneys or counsel employed, who were paid fees during the period of time, outside the regular legal staff?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; this is the only one. I would put it this way: I am not consulted about what is done in the Tennessee Valley Authority, or how many employees they have. The Tennessee Valley Authority was organized against me in the beginning, has been against me all the time, and is still against me.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What I had in mind was whether in the hearings, or through the Senator's research and investigation into the matter, he has discovered that other consulting attorneys besides Mr. O'Brien outside the regular staff were hired.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is the only one we found.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. The claim has been made for Mr. Lilienthal that he has great capacity for this administrative job. It would be pertinent, would it not, to inquire about how he handled the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. McKELLAR. How who handled it?

Mr. MOORE. How Mr. Lilienthal handled it, how cheaply he handled it, and how much he did without any authority in the expenditure of the Government's money. It was the Government's money, was it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I will say to the Senator that TVA has made many contracts with power companies. They sell most of their power to power companies. I see present the distinguished Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN]. The Alabama Power Co. buys a great deal of power from the TVA, or did.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have not interrupted the Senator, but I can advise him that I made an inquiry as to how much power of the TVA was at the present time going to private power companies, not only the Alabama Power Co., but other private power companies, and I was advised that of the power developed by TVA

about 15 percent is going on short-term contracts to private power companies.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is not in accordance with what I have been advised. As I understand the facts are these: The Tennessee Valley Authority can sell power to power companies nearby, such as the Georgia Power Co., the Alabama Power Co., and various other power companies, cheaper than those companies could generate the power themselves. Why? It is because the Alabama Power Co., for instance, must pay Federal, State, county and city taxes, and it must pay interest on the bonds representing the money invested in it. But the Tennessee Valley Authority, under the great Mr. Lillenthal, does not have to pay interest except on \$75,000,000 worth of bonds. It pays no interest on the other \$925,000,000 investment. It pays no taxes. It therefore can sell its power, and does sell it, whether properly or not, at a cheaper rate than private power companies can produce it. The other power companies call on the Tennessee Valley Authority. That is why all the power companies favor Lillenthal in this fight. Almost unanimously, the power companies favor Mr. Lillenthal and a number of the other officers. I do not remember them; I shall produce that information a little later. They came to testify for him. The various power companies testified for him.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will recall that the Senate passed an act amending the TVA Act, providing certain payments to States and counties in lieu of taxes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knew that?

Mr. McKELLAR. But not in lieu of Federal taxes. The Tennessee Valley Authority pays a certain tax, of which I do not know the exact amount, to the State of Tennessee. Whether the cities receive any part of it, I do not know. I do not think they do. I think it goes to the State. But it does not pay the United States Government a single, solitary cent. It pays interest on \$75,000,000 only, of the billion dollars now invested. For that reason, it is able, by concealment of its books, by not furnishing them to the Congress as it ought to do for examination by Congress, it is able to sell to power companies at a cheaper rate than the rate at which the power companies are able to manufacture. Therefore all the power companies are strongly in favor of Mr. Lillenthal in this fight. They want his nomination confirmed; not only the Communists but the power companies want it confirmed. That is not all—some of the manufacturing companies want Lillenthal's nomination confirmed. All that is necessary is to read his list of witnesses. Generally, his witnesses were not persons who knew him; although some of them did. One witness I believe testified he had met Mr. Lillenthal but once. He liked him, though, and he was called as a witness. But what Tennesseans, what Iowans, what Chicagoans were brought here to testify for him? What witnesses were

brought here from Wisconsin to testify for him? There is a telegram in the record from Phil La Follette, who was lecturing in Pennsylvania. He did not come to testify; he sent a telegram. I defy anybody to say what that telegram means. He employed Mr. Lillenthal once. Why? Mr. Lillenthal, while an employee of the Commerce Clearing House, of Chicago, was prohibited by law from becoming at the same time a member of the Wisconsin railroad commission; yet he was appointed. He was prohibited by the very law that Mr. La Follette was undertaking to enforce in Wisconsin. Why should the Senate confirm him, especially in view of his statement that I read this morning, denouncing the Congress? He does not believe in the Congress of the United States, yet he seeks confirmation to one of the greatest offices in the world. That exemplifies the doctrine, "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." That is the only basis on which a Senator could vote for Mr. Lillenthal, because he is certainly against the Congress. He shows it. I believe the Senate ought not to confirm his nomination.

Mr. President, I desire to go just a little further. It will be recalled, as I have frequently said today, that the discovery of the process of splitting the atom cost the United States \$2,600,000,000. Mr. Lillenthal wants to give to all the world that secret, obtained at such a cost.

PARTICIPATION BY UNITED NATIONS IN SOLUTION OF GRECIAN AND TURKISH PROBLEM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a brief statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield, with the understanding that I shall have the floor after the Senator concludes his statement.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution; and I request that the clerk read it, and that it lie on the table under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 101), as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States representative to the United Nations organization bring before the United Nations organization immediately, for its immediate consideration, the present problems which have arisen with respect to Greece and Turkey with a view to having said organization take such action with respect to such problems as it may deem necessary for the immediate solution thereof.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to preface what I am about to say with a sincere tribute to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who has performed a most notable service in connection with the establishment of the United Nations organization. I want to compliment him as one of the chief architects in that great movement designed to assure the future peace of the world. He deserves, and has received, world-wide applause for his ability and

leadership. After devoting months of effort to establishing the United Nations organization, I can well understand his misgivings toward the proposal to bypass the United Nations organization and intervene directly in Greece and Turkey by providing military aid, with both implements of war and military missions.

In very clear and unequivocal language, the Charter of the United Nations provides for taking "effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression and other breaches of the peace." This is to be accomplished by collective action and not by unilateral action of any one nation. It is indeed the very basic spirit of the idea upon which the United Nations was built.

After introducing the bill providing for intervention in Greece and Turkey, the Senator from Michigan has proposed a preamble, denying that the United States intended to bypass the United Nations organization. This is merely a lot of pious words and one can imagine that when the officials of other governments read this language they will surely think he "doth protest too much."

The Senator from Michigan now proposes another amendment which will give to the United Nations the right to veto the action taken by the United States Government in extending aid to Greece and Turkey. When the statement is made that this eliminates all question of superseding the United Nations, I submit that this amendment is completely unrealistic. As a practical proposition, a majority of the members of the United Nations have the hope, prospect, and expectation of becoming beneficiaries of American dollars just as is proposed in the case of Greece and Turkey.

These hopeful nations would certainly not oppose the beginning of the new American foreign policy which visualizes an extension of aid to Turkey and Greece on the basis that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures.

I look with anxious astonishment upon this latest proposal which establishes the very unique principle of permitting an organization of foreign nations to veto legislation adopted by the Congress of the United States. The effect of it, of course, is to bypass a Russian veto by setting up a method to veto the veto.

The time has come to call a spade a spade and to deal frankly with the foreign situation that confronts us. The reason we are not willing to submit the question of military intervention in Greece and Turkey to the United Nations is because of the fear, if not the certainty, that Russia will veto such an action, and, because of that fear, we propose to undertake to do ourselves what the United Nations could and should do had it been organized on a basis of majority control.

In taking this independent action, we overlook some important factors of the most vital consequence. First, by taking independent action, we cannot very well

mobilize world opinion against the communism in Russia, which, in essence, is our new foreign policy. Affirmative action taken with majority support in the United Nations would mean that we would have the moral support of many other nations who would favor and support this action. The force of public opinion still remains the greatest force in the world, and we must use every force at our command to assure success of such a global venture in this troubled time.

Secondly, dependence upon military assistance in Greece and Turkey by the United States for resisting communism in those countries would overlook the great power which this country and associated nations could exert through economic sanctions and other measures for retaliation against communistic influence. Under pending proposals we appear in the contradictory position of with one hand dealing out money to Russia and her satellites, which will strengthen communism, and with the other proposing to deal out vast sums to oppose the aggression of communism. Russia owes us many billions for lend-lease. We have loaned her many ships. Only recently the Under Secretary of State appeared before Congress asking for an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to send oil, equipment, and machinery to Russia as a gift. We are even now sending millions to Russia's satellites.

I agree that the time has come to act firmly with Russia, but we cannot ride two horses going in opposite directions. If the veto power given to Russia has made unworkable the existing United Nations organization, then we may as well face the situation frankly, but, at the same time, we must recognize the fact that the United States urged this tragic error. Despite opposition from other nations, it was at the insistence of the delegates of the United States that the veto power was given to Russia, as well as to all the so-called Big Five.

I say the time has come to be realistic and to reorganize the United Nations organization, if such action is necessary to permit it to function. If Russia is an enemy, and persists in being an enemy to free peoples, it is better to have her outside the family than inside the family. If we cannot get along with Russia, what is the use of trying to appease her at the council table as we have done from time to time, thereby strengthening her hand for a future show-down with us?

The first appeasement to Russia was giving her the power to veto any punitive action against her, regardless of whether she is an aggressor or not. I was strongly opposed to this first appeasement. Russia has so far used the veto 11 times and virtually stymied and made impotent the United Nations organization. There is no reason to think she will not continue this course unless her hand is called within the United Nations. Let us not repeat our tragic error with Japan, when, just before the war, we permitted her to purchase in America 10,000,000 tons of scrap metal out of which she manufactured ships, arms, and bullets for the slaughter of thousands of American boys.

As time goes on it appears that the Greek and Turkish crisis is not so serious

as at first it was claimed to be. The 9,000 bandits menacing the Greek Government of 7,000,000 citizens are apparently being brought under control. England is not going to withdraw her troops immediately, as was first stated, and in the meantime America can continue her economic aid to Greece without violating in any way the spirit of the United Nations Charter. England, I am sure, will stay in Greece for a reasonable time, at least, if this country requested her to do so, in view of the fact that she received from us only recently a loan of \$4,000,000,000 and, prior to that, about \$30,000,000,000 in lend-lease. The war of nerves in Turkey appears to have subsided.

If the Greek-Turkish gift—and it will be a gift; not a dollar of it will ever be repaid—is made as a part of the global policy announced by President Truman, we are beginning interventions which will extend all over the world and which will continue for many, many years to come. We should not undertake this alone until we have exhausted every means to associate with us other like-minded nations.

I propose that we request our representative in the United Nations organization to present the problem of Greece and Turkey to this organization for action. It will first go to the assembly of nations composed of 55. If the assembly approves it, then it will go to the Security Council, where it can be nullified by a veto of any one of the Big Five. Let Russia, if she pleases, veto it, and then have a show-down with her, and, if need be, take steps to remove the veto privilege. If this means the retirement of Russia from the United Nations organization, it will be far better that she does so, because if she continues her selfish and obstructive tactics, there is no hope of the United Nations being a real instrument for the preservation of world peace. If we accept alone the terrific obligations of the new global foreign policy, our enormous expenditures in many foreign nations will weaken America, and Russia will get stronger. Today, too, we have possession of the atomic bombs, which give us a source of strength which we will lose if and when these bombs are destroyed, or when other nations obtain the secret. So there is no question in my mind that now is the time for a show-down with Russia within the United Nations organization rather than wait until we have been weakened by excessive drains on our economic system which may result in bankrupting ourselves in the effort to help bankrupt nations. It is far better to have at least the moral support of a majority of the nations of the world in such a gigantic undertaking rather than to go our way alone.

There is one other consideration to which we must give close attention. A foreign policy in America is only as strong as its public support here at home. Millions of our citizens, when they are called upon to make great sacrifice at home in the years to come for expenditures contemplated abroad, would much more willingly assume these burdens provided the machinery of the United Nations were utilized instead of bypassed with ill-advised, independent action on our part.

I am introducing, Mr. President, a Senate resolution providing that our representative in the United Nations be instructed to present for immediate action the question of Greece and Turkey to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Again, I respectfully submit that the last amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan is like going in the back door instead of the front. We have had enough of vetoes, and we do not want to establish another system of vetoes. Let us meet the issue face to face and not attempt to equivocate, because no matter what skillful maneuvering we do now to convince the people that we are not going outside the province of the United Nations, the fact remains that the basic principle of the United Nations was collective action to promote world peace. When we take unilateral action we cannot object then to other nations taking a similar course, which means the ultimate collapse of the United Nations organization.

In plain language, I propose a show-down within the United Nations with Russia and her communistic satellites. If the United Nations organization must be reorganized and strengthened in order to function, let us do so now. As a matter of fact the Truman plan may bring war, or the reorganization of the United Nations organization may bring war, or no plan may bring war, but strong measures within the United Nations organization are more likely to bring Russia to cooperation than an infiltration of American money over the world in an independent crusade against communism.

For myself, I started with the United Nations as the only hope I could see for future world peace. I will continue with it as long as the last vestige of hope exists for this agency to become the world instrument of peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Virginia will be received and lie over under the rule.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. About how long does the Senator expect to speak?

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to make a few remarks on the pending question.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I may yield a little time, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Tennessee may resume the floor when I shall have concluded.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have placed upon the desks of Senators copies of the address which I am about to make, so that Senators may read and reflect upon the trappy, tricky mind of the bureaucrat whose nomination we are considering at the moment. He is typical of all bureaucrats. As will be seen from the record, he is for anything,

against anything, over anything, under anything, and all around it. He is all things to all men. He simply does not recognize the two words "yes" and "no."

The other day in the debate in which I took part with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] on the nature of the liaison between the military and the Atomic Energy Commission, I expressed deep concern over the unsatisfactory attitude maintained by Mr. Lillenthal in the hearings. The Senator from Iowa replied that the matter of military liaison had been discussed with Mr. Lillenthal on two occasions and that the Senator from Iowa had all his doubts set to rest by Mr. Lillenthal.

Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot come to the same optimistic conclusion. I not only have doubts on this point, but they are grave doubts.

When we passed the Atomic Energy Act we favored the position of civilian rather than military development of atomic energy. I see no particular harm in writing that principle into law as a long-range basis on which to act.

But we also made it clear that in the immediate future—the next few years at least—the military aspects of atomic energy are paramount for the security of the country. In these circumstances, the attitude of these new members of the Commission—and of the Chairman, Mr. Lillenthal, in particular—toward military liaison is of the utmost importance.

This must also have been uppermost in the minds of Senators conducting the hearings, because they made a special point of questioning Mr. Lillenthal about the matter. No less than five Senators pressed the point very vigorously, namely, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I have read this testimony carefully and I am not at all satisfied with Mr. Lillenthal's attitude. I cannot agree with the Senator from Iowa that our security is properly protected by the kind of liaison Mr. Lillenthal contemplates.

The testimony on this point was brought out on two successive days. On the first day, January 27, it covers pages 11 to 16, and on the second day, January 28, it is on pages 24 to 27.

If Senators will read those pages carefully they will see an interesting performance. On the first day, Mr. Lillenthal's testimony was quite aggressively against letting the military in on the Commission's proceedings. He took the position that the military should be content to remain on the outside and wait for a hand-out of information from the Commission. I will give his exact words in a moment.

On the second day, Mr. Lillenthal raised the question himself. He had read the previous day's transcript and was clearly a little uneasy in his conscience about the high-handed way in which he dealt with the military. He backtracked quite a bit from his positive views of the day before because I think

he realized that his views did not set well with Senators. He wanted his views to stand well with Senators, because they were the ones who were to pass upon his nomination to be a member of this great Commission.

In the course of this back-tracking he floundered all over in what sounds to me like a maze of evasion. He tried hard to give the impression that he was all for adequate liaison with the military while at the same time he left himself free to do as he pleased.

This is the testimony which the Senator from Iowa says convinces him conclusively that proper liaison will be had. I deny that. I say that Mr. Lillenthal left loopholes to his complete freedom of action which are wider than a barn door. Senators know how wide a barn door can be opened.

The proper way to show this is to read every word of the testimony on those 10 pages, and I am not sure but that I ought to do it that way. Perhaps Senators will do it on their own if I touch upon the high lights.

On page 11 Mr. Lillenthal gives the impression that the military should and will be in on the whole process of developing atomic energy. He makes this statement for public information and then, shrewdly, in the Lillenthal way, says he would like to discuss the matter further with the committee in "executive session."

But Senators do not always fall for such smart tactics. They pressed Mr. Lillenthal on the point. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Colorado sought clear assurances on this military liaison.

The Senator from Michigan said:

Senator VANDENBERG. May I pursue that one step further? Of course, I entirely agree with you that this is contemplated as a civilian operation, but it seemed to me in your answer you drew a rather sharp distinction between the civilian operation and the military application. Do you mean by your answers that men of military background or military experience are not eligible, because of their background, to take part in the civilian operation?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. No; I didn't mean that, Senator. I meant that men in the active service presumably would not be—I don't know whether "eligible" is the word—would not be suitable.

To this Mr. Lillenthal gave an evasive answer. So the Senator from Colorado took up the questioning, and I want to read every word of this colloquy:

Senator MILLIKIN. I would like to pursue that statement a little further. Do I understand that you call in the Military Liaison Committee only when in your judgment a military matter is involved?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. No. That is what I tried to say is not the policy. Because it is our purpose to keep the Military Liaison Committee informed—that isn't exactly the terminology of the law, but it is something of that sort—not simply as to the weaponizing end, but as to the entire enterprise.

Senator MILLIKIN. Let me put it to you this way: Is there any restriction whatever on the military liaison so far as its ability to acquaint itself fully with everything that is going on in the Commission?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. Not at all.

Senator MILLIKIN. There is no such policy? Mr. LILLENTHAL. No such policy is intended. Senator MILLIKIN. No such policy.

Mr. LILLENTHAL. Quite the contrary. What I was trying to bring out was this: You cannot say at any point up to the weapon that anything is "exclusively civilian" or "exclusively military." They are interchangeable. Therefore, the military liaison committee should be informed with respect to the entire operation, from mine to active material.

Senator MILLIKIN. No one will substitute his judgment for that of the Military Liaison Committee as to the field in which it is interested?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. The answer to that is definitely that it is up to the military liaison committee to decide what it regards as an appropriate military field.

Senator MILLIKIN. And there are no impediments which will be put in its way?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. No impediments will be put in its way.

Senator MILLIKIN. I mention that because those of us who were most actively instrumental in getting this law adopted, considered that those matters were inseparable; that there could be no departmentalizing as far as the military liaison and the civilian activity are concerned.

Are we in complete agreement on that?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. We are in complete agreement. It is a matter of fact that they cannot be separated. They are virtually interchangeable.

Senator MILLIKIN. Does the military liaison committee understand that, as far as you believe and have observed?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. I am confident of that; yes.

Senator MILLIKIN. Have they kept themselves fully acquainted with everything that has been going on?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. I am confident that whenever questions were asked they certainly received information.

Senator MILLIKIN. Are they in attendance at all sessions of the Commission?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. No; and we do not contemplate that.

Senator MILLIKIN. Why not?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. I think there is a distinction between these two things. One is the responsibility which the Commissioners have, and the other is the responsibility of liaison with the military liaison committee. There will be many joint sessions, and there will be a great deal of interchange of information. But it would be very difficult for the Commission to feel free to discuss many matters except within a Commission meeting.

Senator MILLIKIN. What would be the difficulty of that? I mean, how can the Military Liaison Committee know what is going on, unless they are actively participating in the discussions with the Commission as the Commission does its business?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. I have difficulty in conceiving of that, Senator. But it would be comparable to the joint committee of the Congress, which has also a continuing responsibility, not simply by which they review matters, but by concurrent consideration of the problems before the Commission.

There will be nothing withheld from the Military Liaison Committee.

Senator MILLIKIN. But you are putting that as a matter within your own judgment and discretion as to what should be put out to the Military Liaison Committee.

I am suggesting to you that possibly the Military Liaison Committee should be privileged to attend all of the sessions of the Commission; and that if you do not permit that, the Military Liaison Committee has no way to protect its own responsibility.

Senator VANDENBERG. Senator, you mean as observers?

Senator MILLIKIN. As observers, of course. I do not mean that they shall vote, but I mean that they shall be present whenever the Commission is meeting.

Are we in agreement or disagreement on that?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No; we are in disagreement on that, I am afraid, Senator. I think that would become very unwieldy.

After some further slipping around the question on Mr. Lilienthal's part, the Senator from Colorado observed:

Senator MILLIKIN. I suggest to you, Mr. Lilienthal, that you have not met the intent of Congress that the Military Liaison Committee should be advised of everything that is going on in the Commission. Your observation, your formula, do not admit of that.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Because they are not present at all meetings of the Commission?

Senator MILLIKIN. That is right. I am not talking about the right to vote. I am not even sure that I am talking about the right of unlimited discussion. But it is the intent of Congress, I suggest, that they should have the right to know everything that is going on in the Commission. And they can't do that unless they are present.

Again Mr. Lilienthal began to fumble around. He wanted to keep the military at arm's length and tell them only what he thought good for them, but here were Senators quite disturbed over that prospect. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] insisted that "it will not be satisfactory if there is anywhere a single closed door to the military liaison or the congressional committee."

Finding himself rather groggy, Mr. Lilienthal rang the bell on this first round with the Senators by stating: "I would personally like to think about it first, because it is a new idea."

Imagine that. A new idea.

Here is a man who is palmed off on us as a great administrator and yet he had not thought through this most important but simple problem of military liaison. Here is a man who is supposed to have had a heavy hand in the Acheson-Lilienthal report dealing with all aspects of atomic development on a world stage. Yet the crucial problem of interim security of this country through complete military liaison is a new idea to him.

I cannot see how any of the members of the committee could vote for him in view of the fact that some of them made such a searching inquiry.

He had to think it over first. Let me tell you why I believe he had to think it over. He did not expect the problem to arise. He thought that because we set up a civilian commission the military was already on the outside and glad enough to take liaison in the form of hand-outs from him.

But the Senators upset him by their persistent and penetrating questions. He saw that they were greatly disturbed by his answers. And he wanted to gain time, to stall and to think up some slick answers. That is why he had to think it over first.

This whole performance is an eye-opener for Senators as to Mr. Lilienthal's character and methods if they will reflect upon the testimony I read.

It is an excellent demonstration of what Dr. Arthur E. Morgan described as Lilienthal's double talk. On page 11 he gave the impression that the military would be in on everything from start to finish. On page 14, he said that would become very unwieldy. When Senators appeared dissatisfied with his answers and plainly said so, Mr. Lilienthal

quickly said he would think it over; it was a new idea to him. He made three definite statements in approximately three pages of testimony.

Now, Mr. President, we come to the second installment of this crucial liaison problem. It comes on the second day of the hearing.

Mr. Lilienthal sweated over his testimony of the day before. It is clear that he worried over the bad impression he made.

At any rate the question of military liaison was so important that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] picked up the point again:

Senator VANDENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if Mr. Lilienthal and I are in any disagreement on the point we discussed yesterday regarding freedom of access of the members of the Military Liaison Committee and the Congressional Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

You will recall, Mr. Lilienthal, that I was insisting that neither this congressional committee nor the Military Committee could hope to confront adequately its total responsibilities if confronted with any locked doors when it came down to see your Atomic Energy Commission.

In reading over the record, it occurred to me that you might have misunderstood perhaps what I had in mind. I am not talking about an arrangement which requires the constant attendance of observers from the Military Liaison Committee or the congressional committee. I am not talking about any situation whereby you cannot proceed without the presence of these observers.

I am simply inquiring whether or not it would be your understanding that these observers can attend at any time, whenever they think they need to attend.

Here is where Mr. Lilienthal begins the further process of evasion and befuddlement. Let me read this reply to Senator VANDENBERG:

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I think what you have said helps on one of the things that troubled me, because my concern relates not to access to information, nor to liaison in any of its forms. It is essentially a question that relates to the administrative possibilities of this set-up. I think it can be worked out completely satisfactorily.

I have been thinking about it. I have consulted my associates. We do not believe we have the complete answer as to how and in what way these objectives can be achieved; but if I may, I should like to go back and trace the matter a few steps, as far as we have been able to think about it. And what you have said helps on one serious administrative point.

Now watch this gem of evasion in the following colloquy:

Mr. LILIENTHAL. As to our objectives, I hope that the record is very clear: That we see this atomic energy as interchangeably useful for peaceful development, industrial development, and so on, and as a weapon of war. That therefore there should never arise any jurisdictional disputes, let us say, as to the right of the military liaison committee to be advised about matters that might technically be described as non-military applications; that such question purely as a legalism should not arise; that there should be complete access to all information, sources of information, personnel, and so on, which in the judgment of the military liaison committee, as well as in our own judgment, those being independently exercised, as to what is a matter of concern to the military.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask a question there? In case of a conflict between your judgment as a Commission member and that of the military liaison committee on matters that they believe to be important to the military security of this country, whose judgment will control in your opinion?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. There would be no conflict, Senator. Because this is what I intended to say and what I would like to make very clear: It is the judgment of the military liaison committee which controls. I merely said our own opinion would be that things should be called to their attention which they, perhaps, on their own initiative, had not regarded as having military significance.

But I hope that is perfectly clear: We are not putting ourselves in the position of saying to the military liaison committee: "This is not military; therefore, it is none of your business." It is to be their judgment which is final as to its relevance. It will, however, be our policy; although we have not had much time to develop this, and it is a difficult thing, but it will be our policy—and that is fixed—to regard virtually everything as having some consequence in military terms.

Now, the question of how to maintain liaison and still operate this enterprise is an administrative question. The Congress has placed great responsibility for the conduct of a complicated and extensive business enterprise on a group of five men, sitting in virtually continuous session. That is the way we have been operating, and that is likely to be the way we shall have to operate.

Decisions come along requiring urgent attention. They sometimes will not await the passage of time. So we find ourselves making decisions or discussing possible future action virtually continuously. That is a unique kind of business management set-up.

And I want to be perfectly frank with you: There is yet to be any evidence that it can be operated successfully; I mean, in experience. I believe it can be done. I should not have attempted it if I did not believe it could be done. But I am sure that if it is done it will require a unique kind of set-up, a kind of managerial set-up that has not yet been developed.

And we should be careful—by "we," I mean everybody who is responsible for the result, and of course that includes the joint committee—not to weight down what is admittedly a difficult managerial set-up with and paraphernalia that can be avoided and still achieve the result.

I think it would clearly present a problem. I do not know what the answer is, but I think it can be worked out. It would present a very great problem if we had to so formalize our commission meetings—that is why I was so pleased at your reaction—that the meetings could be held only at stated times, because otherwise one could not get the full attendance of the liaison groups or even representatives of them.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has not Mr. Lilienthal there clearly weaseled himself out of all he has said before?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. BREWSTER. He said, "I think it would clearly present a problem," and then he said, "But I think it can be worked out."

The answer had been clearly and repeatedly indicated in every question asked by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and other Senators. Their questions clearly indicated what

they thought the answer was. Yet, after 2 days of discussion and debate, Mr. Lillenthal still recognized the problem, but did not know the answer, although he thought it could be worked out.

On the basis of that record, could there be any doubt that if access to the committee meetings were refused by Mr. Lillenthal and his cohorts, there could be no cause for complaint on the part of any Member of the Senate or on the part of anyone else in the United States? Has not he clearly indicated that he is reserving to himself the decision, and that the determination which will be made will be the one made by him, together with those of his colleagues who may agree as to how that shall be achieved?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is correct. Of course, it is very difficult to understand how the Senators who signed the majority report were able to use any part of Mr. Lillenthal's testimony as a basis for a report recommending favorable action on his nomination. It is most difficult to determine the part of Mr. Lillenthal's testimony on which they based their recommendation for favorable action on his nomination or the confidence they have placed in him.

I now continue to read Mr. Lillenthal's testimony:

Well, I do not think that is needed, and I think it is would be fraught with real danger so far as getting the job done is concerned.

As to closed doors and closed files and nonaccess, there are security problems in that connection which we ought to discuss in executive session, and which I anticipate we will be discussing, if I should be confirmed, every week or two with the committee as we go along.

We cannot anticipate them, but there are very grave security problems involved. I think they can be solved. I am not sure quite how. But everyone knows that security is not simply a matter of the good faith or trustworthiness of people; the more people who have certain information the less secure, generally speaking, is the security system.

We have the responsibility if there is a leak. Therefore, we would be derelict in our duty if we did not warn the committee that there is a problem there, and the liaison should be carried on with both bodies in a way to minimize that.

So we want some time to work it out. I think it can be worked out. But there need be no situation where, upon request of the liaison committee or the joint committee, there will be nonaccess.

Now, there also are rather formal provisions for liaison provided here in this law.

Mr. President, stop a moment to reflect on what we find in that incredible passage of slippery language.

First. Mr. Lillenthal will keep the military liaison group "advised."

Second. The military will have the controlling judgment.

Third. Each body will exercise "independent judgment."

Fourth. There will be no conflict.

Fifth. Military questions will be called to the attention of the military—by Mr. Lillenthal, I suppose.

Sixth. This is an administrative question. Think of it—a vital matter going to the entire security of the country will be "an administrative question," with Mr. Lillenthal handling the machinery.

Seventh. Mr. Lillenthal does not want his set-up loaded down "with any para-

phernalia that can be avoided and still achieve the result." He regards this military liaison as nuisance "paraphernalia."

Eighth. After supposedly settling the question, Mr. Lillenthal says, "I think it would clearly present a problem." It is a serious problem, Mr. Lillenthal says, and he wants to warn the committee Senators about it. For 2 days they are so serious about the military aspect that they push Mr. Lillenthal doggedly and in minute detail. But here Mr. Lillenthal warns them there is a problem. He tells the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from Iowa, and all the other members of the committee that there is a problem, so that they will know.

Is not this a most remarkable passage? What was settled there? Absolutely nothing except to leave Mr. Lillenthal wholly free to do as he pleases.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator from New Hampshire should emphasize again at this point, if I may say so, the answer Mr. Lillenthal gave. After saying, "This is a problem"—and he made that statement after 2 days of discussion—he said, "I do not know what the answer is, but I think it can be worked out. We cannot anticipate them, but there are great security problems involved. I think they can be solved, but I am not quite sure how."

Mr. President, it seems to me that at the end of 2 days, Mr. Lillenthal there clearly indicates that although he recognizes there is a problem, he does not know the answer, although everyone else seemed to know that the answer was that the military and congressional groups should be allowed complete freedom of access. But after 2 days of hammering by the Senate committee, Mr. Lillenthal still was ignorant of the answer. In view of that record of his answers, I think no one can be surprised when, if the present nominations of members of the Board are confirmed, it is discovered that it will still take some time to find the answers, that there still is trouble about it, and that the military committee and the congressional committee may well still be hanging around cooling their heels for some time while Mr. Lillenthal is still seeking the answer.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator is entirely correct. Mr. Lillenthal's record, as he has made it during the time I have known him—for 16 years—indicates that he knows how to be the big boss, once he has the power. He is courteous to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and other Senators now, because he seeks that power and seeks confirmation by the Senate. But once he gets that power, again he will show himself in his true light, and will be, as he has always been, a very ruthless administrator. He recognizes this because he concludes this passage with these words:

So we want time to work it out. * * *

There need be no situation where, upon request of the liaison committee * * * there will be nonaccess.

After this there was some further discussion and the matter of military liaison was finally disposed of in the following passage by Mr. Lillenthal:

Mr. LILLENTHAL. Senator, as far as taking them separately is concerned: As to the Military Liaison Committee, I am completely persuaded that although with what time we have to work we have an admittedly difficult problem, that given the kind of good faith we can expect, and some ingenuity, a form of liaison can be devised which will provide real access, which will be really liaison, without running the hazard, that I am really quite concerned about: That we won't get anything done; that we shall have made the procedure so rigid and formal that it would be quite unwieldy to operate.

As to the congressional committee, I should like to have the opportunity to discuss this further. But I am assuming that the committee's staff members who will be assigned to the Commission are not juniors, that they are directly responsible, and that, again, no rigid formula would be adopted that no Commission meeting can be held without the presence of such liaison staff members.

And supplementing that by the assurances, on the part of the Commission, which will be complete and detailed, as to the information about what is going to be discussed, what is pending, and what has been decided, including copies of minutes, I believe a technique can be developed that will do this rather extraordinarily difficult job.

So the answer would be, as I recall the question, that there is no reason at all why this cannot be made to work. And there is every reason to believe, that those objectives of liaison can be reached without any restriction on access, except those that perhaps the committee will agree with us are in the interest of maintenance of security.

Mr. President, all of this is an incredible performance. Here we are with the world in violent agitation. Our entire national security is involved. The atom bomb is the one new element in our security and the one real destructive weapon which can be turned against us if other nations get it or if our military are not in on all atomic development.

Mr. Lillenthal, who, it is proposed, should be put in charge of this great new Commission, blows hot and cold and all degrees of temperature in between. The military is to be in; it is to be out; it is to have the last word; it is only to be kept advised; it may recommend; it may request; it is a piece of nuisance "paraphernalia"; and finally Mr. Lillenthal has to work the whole thing out because it is an "administrative" question—merely a business of Mr. Lillenthal working out a formula to give the military a little peek as circumstances allow.

This is what the Senator from Iowa says is clear and satisfactory to him. I have a very deep affection for the Senator from Iowa, but I cannot agree with him.

Mr. President, it is not clear and satisfactory to me. I do not believe it will be clear and satisfactory to other Senators who are concerned with the security of their country in these perilous times. I do not believe it will be simple to the people of this country when they understand the issue, and I think that any Senator who votes for Mr. Lillenthal will live to see the day he will regret it, and regret it very deeply.

What I want to know is, does the military get in on atomic development

from start to finish, as Mr. Lillenthal first declared? Or, are they on the outside to be kept advised only as Mr. Lillenthal also said?

Just as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] stated, I do not expect the military to operate as commissioners on Mr. Lillenthal's board. But I do expect military representatives will be present to know what is going on.

I do not want them on the outside waiting for a Lillenthal handout, when he deems it proper to make one available. National safety is too precious for Mr. Lillenthal to handle as an administrative matter.

Mr. President, Mr. Lillenthal's testimony is the kind of double talk we had in the TVA. Then we found that he ran it like a czar. He set up trick co-operative corporations with Federal money and then denied that Federal money was in them. He fought the General Accounting Office for years to prevent an honest audit of his books. He spent plenty of money on propaganda and self-glorification and charged it to regional development and demonstration projects. He made tricky allocations of funds between power, navigation, and flood control so as to set up a tricky yardstick on power rates. Dr. Arthur E. Morgan testified to this. The minority members of a House committee investigating TVA—mostly Republican—set it out in chapter and verse. There are other proofs if we have the time to set them up.

Mr. President, I do not want atomic energy handled in that way. But after reading these pages on military liaison that is what we will be in for with Mr. Lillenthal. But this time the very safety of our country and our people is at stake.

Mr. President, my reason for bringing this matter up and covering it so thoroughly this afternoon is because of the debate a few days ago, when there were questions and various interpretations about the relation between military liaison and Mr. Lillenthal. So far as I am concerned, for one, I am not satisfied, and when I am not satisfied I am not going to take a chance. I am not going to gamble with the future security of my country or the future peace of the world.

When one has any doubt in his mind or in his heart and votes for Lillenthal, he is gambling with the future of the Nation, the future security of all the people. More than that, he is gambling with the future peace of the world. That I am not willing to do, and I am not satisfied with the testimony of Mr. Lillenthal in any respect.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire, on the first page of his prepared address, in the first paragraph, stated:

I expressed deep concern at the unsatisfactory attitude maintained by Mr. Lillenthal in the hearings. The Senator from Iowa replied that the matter of the military liaison had been discussed with Mr. Lillenthal

on two occasions and that the Senator from Iowa had all his doubts set to rest by Mr. Lillenthal.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa if he interrogated the military liaison committee as to how they felt about this arrangement?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I did not interrogate the military liaison committee, but I interrogated the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, who are the heads, the appointed superiors, of the liaison committee. They expressed full satisfaction at the arrangement, and full confidence that the military liaison committee would not only be given full access and knowledge, but have the right to have it, and stated that it was amply safeguarded.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Iowa answer my question? I asked him if he interrogated the members of the military liaison committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I said at the outset of my answer that I had not.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the Senator why he did not interrogate that committee, the committee which was to sit with the civilian committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Because the responsible administrative heads of that committee are the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. They are the ones that constitute the committee. They can change the committee if they want to. They are the responsible heads of the Military Liaison Committee. I consulted with them rather than their appointees.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator answer a further question. He says the members of the committee are responsible to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. Of course, that is so; and because they are military officers, they are ordered to this particular assignment; but that still does not answer my question. I should like to know whether the Senator interviewed the military personnel of the committee. Certainly what they thought is not what the Secretary of War might think, or vice versa. Why did not the Senator interview them?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, for the third time, I will say the answer is, No; I did not interview the members of the Military Liaison Committee. I interviewed those who appoint and who are responsible for the decisions of the Military Liaison Committee, the Secretaries of War and Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a further question. Did the Senator interview General Groves?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I cannot say that I interviewed General Groves. I had two talks with General Groves about the matter sometime ago, in January. I think he went to Florida some time in January.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator did not interrogate General Groves?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I said I talked to him twice. It was not exactly an interview.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the Senator a question. I am not asking whether he had a social visit with General Groves. I am asking whether the Senator inter-

viewed General Groves about the very thing of which we are speaking, which Mr. Lillenthal promised would be done when he consulted the Military Liaison Committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I did not; no. I did not talk to General Groves after Mr. Lillenthal gave his testimony. I did, however, on several occasions either visit with General Groves or interrogate him or interview him—whatever terminology the Senator may prefer—about the Military Liaison Committee and whether in his opinion it was a satisfactory protection for the military production of atomic energy, and I received his assurance that it was. That was last year, after the law had been passed.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the Senator received assurance from General Groves that the law as passed by Congress was satisfactory. What I am asking the Senator is, Did he interrogate General Groves along the questions I have been propounding? Is General Groves satisfied with the Military Liaison Committee? Can the Senator answer that question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator mean the members of the committee?

Mr. WHERRY. I refer to the way it is being operated by Mr. Lillenthal, to this day.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have had no communication of any kind with General Groves since the interview, or since the testimony of Mr. Lillenthal was given to which the Senator refers.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the Senator have any communication with him before that?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I recited the interviews I have had with General Groves about the Military Liaison Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I would ask the Senator again, whether, either before January or afterward, he has consulted General Groves as to whether or not he is satisfied with the Military Liaison Committee that has been set up by Mr. Lillenthal?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Military Liaison Committee has not been set up by Mr. Lillenthal.

Mr. WHERRY. Or with reference to the nominees to the Atomic Energy Commission. Is General Groves satisfied with them?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I have not specifically discussed his satisfaction with the appointees to the Commission.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the distinguished chairman discussed with General Groves anything except the law? Has he discussed with him the nominees, or the prospective authority or the scope of the authority of the Military Liaison Committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think I have answered that question, Mr. President, two or three times. I shall be delighted to go through it again.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the Senator would do so. I should like to get it in the RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I told the Senator a moment ago that I had talked with General Groves about the Military Liaison Committee, its set-up under the

law, its functions, its rights, and its obligations. He told me that he thought that that was ample and sufficient protection and provision for the military end of the production of atomic energy and its control supervision.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there not a Military Liaison Committee now?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is.

Mr. WHERRY. When was it set up?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot give the exact date. General Groves is a member of it.

Mr. WHERRY. When was he appointed a member?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot give the Senator the date.

Mr. WHERRY. Was it after January?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It was about 6 weeks ago, I think.

Mr. WHERRY. Was it after this investigation began, and when he was in Florida?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I cannot recall. I do not know the dates when General Groves was in Florida, but it was about 6 weeks ago.

Mr. WHERRY. It was after the Senator talked to him in his office, was it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, yes; some little time.

Mr. WHERRY. That was after January 1?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; it was after General Groves was relieved as director of the Manhattan district.

Mr. WHERRY. Was he asked whether or not he would accept the appointment?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not have the least idea. He accepted the appointment.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether he will serve or not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He is serving.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know whether he will continue to serve or not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. He is continuing to serve up until this moment. I do not know whether he will serve tomorrow or not.

Mr. WHERRY. Why did not the Senator subpoena him, in order that the facts might be brought out before the committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I went through that the other day, Mr. President.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the Senator the other day. I would like to ask why did not the Senator call him before the committee, so that he might be examined?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. General Groves is an officer of the Regular Establishment, and my experience with officers is that they either announce the policy of their commanding officer, or they do not give their opinions on these matters.

Mr. WHERRY. That might be the opinion of the Senator, but that certainly does not excuse the committee from subpoenaing General Groves and asking some of the questions I have asked the Senator. The committee did not do that?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I cannot read the variations of the Senator's mind. I could not know

what questions he would ask General Groves. I had no way of anticipating what questions he was going to ask, or will ask me, so I could not call General Groves and ask him the questions that the Senator from Nebraska either has asked or is apt to ask me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this is what I would have asked General Groves. The first thing I should have asked him is this: "Do you feel that in this set up, under Mr. Lillenthal, the Military Liaison Committee will be given the information it should be given as it proceeds under this commission, under Mr. Lillenthal? Are you satisfied with that set-up?"

I would ask Mr. Groves why it was that Mr. Lillenthal did not reemploy Colonel Nichols, a man who knows more about atomic energy than any other man in the military service, and, I think, more than any civilian operator in this country?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President I can answer the question about Colonel Nichols.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I can answer the question any time the Senator wants to know.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well; but I should like to continue for a moment. I would ask General Groves why it was that he did not reemploy General Farrell, one of the outstanding men on military practice in connection with atomic energy in this country? Colonel Nichols is now serving as a professor at West Point, wasting his energy, wasting his knowledge. He is one of the best authorities on atomic energy in this country.

I would like to ask if the men who took their places are satisfactory. I think the Senate has a right to know that. I think those are important questions.

The second thing I would ask is this: How many times has Mr. Lillenthal consulted the military since he took over? How many times has Mr. Lillenthal consulted with General Groves? The other day, on the floor, the distinguished Senator from Iowa stated that he had consulted with him, I think, three times, before January 1; and then, as I recall the record, there were remarks or observations made here that he had consulted him several times after that. But I am here to ask the question whether Mr. Lillenthal consulted with General Groves officially about atomic energy, since he was made chairman of the civilian commission? Has he asked his advice? I should like to hear the truth of the matter, and I believe that if General Groves were subpoenaed and asked to talk, he would talk, regardless of the fact that his superior is an Army officer. I think it is unfair to assume that an officer would not speak his mind, or that he could not speak his mind, simply because he might not be in total agreement with some military man who is his superior. I am as confident as I am that I am standing on the Senate floor at this time, that if General Groves had been called before the committee there would have been entirely different answers from those given to some of the questions I have asked this afternoon. That is one more rea-

son why I am in favor of recommitting the nomination to committee until these questions have been gone into thoroughly.

If there is any doubt about what I have said, I simply ask the committee to request that the nomination be sent back to it, and subpoena General Groves and let us get the truth from the General himself. I have examined the record. We are told that representatives of the Commission were in Florida on the 7th or the 8th or the 9th or the 10th of the month. I assert now on the floor of the Senate that no individual, with the exception of one, has been there to see General Groves since January 1 on an official mission connected with the Atomic Energy Commission. They are not consulting with him. They have refused to consult with him. That is their attitude and that has been their attitude until the afternoon when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] questioned Mr. Lillenthal on what he expected to do in the matter of cooperating with the military.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. What is the source of the Senator's information?

Mr. WHERRY. That is something which I have the privilege, as a Senator, not to disclose. All the Senator has to do is what I told him to do, and I am sure he will secure the information that I have received, and about which I have asked questions today on the floor of the Senate. The Senator will not then have to depend upon me for the source of the information.

Mr. McMAHON. Did the Senator receive it from General Groves?

Mr. WHERRY. I will not answer any questions respecting the source of my information. I do not have to. I am a Senator of the United States.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course I have no power, Mr. President, to—

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute. I have not yielded to the Senator at this point. I have not concluded. If I want to secure this information for myself I can secure it. But I will tell the Senator that he is not treating the Members of the United States Senate fairly when he does not have called before the committee the men who really know what the situation is. What so-and-so thinks is not the kind of testimony we need. What we want is the direct evidence, and we want it from the men who are high in authority. I challenge the Senator to summon them before the committee so they may tell the story. As to what answers General Groves would give to the questions I have asked I do not know. But I have a right to assume what he might say. I have the right to think what he might say, he having been one of the leading men in helping to develop atomic energy.

I know what happened to Colonel Nichols. I found it out for myself. I know what happened to Major General Farrell. I found that out for myself. Anyone can find that out from the record. But we should know what the true situation is before we vote to confirm this

man Lillenthal to the most important position in the world. Why, this man is going to be the chief justice of civilization. We as Senators have the right to have a searching investigation made and find out everything we can respecting Mr. Lillenthal. Instead of merely going to Mr. Lillenthal and asking him, "How do you feel about this; what do you think about this?" we have a right to go to those who developed atomic energy—those who have kept that development a secret since 1942—and find from them what they think about the nomination. There is not a word from them about this matter in the testimony.

Senators are asking me to support Mr. Lillenthal on the basis of what he said. I want to know what some of those who helped develop atomic energy think about the matter. I have the right to know what they think about it. I think every Senator on the floor should make up his mind not to vote on the question of confirming the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal until we have gotten the whole truth and nothing but the truth as to how the military liaison group feel toward Lillenthal and his nomination to the Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a statement and then to ask the Senator a question about it?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was present in the committee when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] interrogated Mr. Lillenthal about the part the Army would have to play in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission. I have not examined the record in the last day or two and do not recall exactly what the record says about the matter—it may have been changed—but as I remember what Mr. Lillenthal said to the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Colorado, it turned them both, as I understand, against him, for he said that the military was not to have anything to do with the matter, or that the military would play a very secondary part, or practically have nothing whatever to do with it. As I recall, the two Senators said that did not suit them at all; that Lillenthal's reply and his position did not suit them at all. I never saw a man change front any faster than Lillenthal did on that occasion. I never saw Lillenthal himself change faster than he did on that occasion.

Mr. BRIDGES. And that is quite a record.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is quite a record when Lillenthal changed faster than he ever has before in his different capacities. He changed immediately, but for some remarkable reason the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Colorado both voted favorably on his nomination notwithstanding what he had said on that occasion. To me that is one of the strangest things about this whole proceeding, and I want to know how it strikes the Senator from Nebraska? After General Groves had undertaken a task which has been the task of the ages, because for more than 2,000

years men have been trying to unlock this great secret—and General Groves and Colonel Nichols are away up at the top of the atomic-energy experts, and they are servants of the Army, servants of the people, working for the defense of our great country—after they and others engaged in the project had performed almost a miracle in bringing about this history-making discovery, is it not the most remarkable thing the Senator from Nebraska ever heard of that the Congress, and the Executive, should turn their backs on the great men who helped make this discovery, under whose management and control the discovery was made? Is it not the most remarkable thing in the world that those two men should be virtually turned out of the Army, and a man who probably had never before heard the words "atomic energy" used together 15 times in his life be given this important position? The words "atomic energy" never appear in any of his written works. They never appear in any of his letters or speeches or his correspondence until after Hiroshima.

Does it not occur to the Senator that it is a most remarkable lack of appreciation on the part of our Government, on the part of the Congress, on the part of the Executive, to say to these two men who took the lead in bringing about this discovery "Get out; the Government has no longer any use for you; you can go to Florida if you want to"; and to the younger men to say, "Why, you can take another job if you want to. We do not want you around. You have served us"—they did not even say, "You have served us"; they simply turned them out. Not a word of commendation was uttered for their part in what was probably the greatest discovery that has ever taken place in the history of the world. Those men were simply kicked out. Does not that seem a little remarkable to the Senator from Nebraska? I should like to have the Senator's view on that point.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that no one has more ably answered that question, or can, in my opinion, more ably answer it than the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has already answered it. That is the burden of his message. I have been surprised. The answer can only be that we are amazed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think we ought to do it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], for whom I have the highest regard, says to us that he talked with Mr. Lillenthal, and that on two occasions Mr. Lillenthal told him that everything would be all right. That satisfied the distinguished chairman of the committee. That is not testimony. I am amazed that there is not one word of testimony from General Groves. He was trusted with this secret for years. He developed atomic energy. He helped to build the bombs. I was a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and year after year I voted vast appropriations without ever asking a word about them, because I understood that they

involved a great military secret. I would have approved any appropriation that was asked for under that heading.

General Groves did this job, and now we have no word from General Groves. I do not know what he would say. I tried to get him on the telephone. He was in New York. I should like to know what General Groves would say under oath before the committee about the military liaison. I should like to know if he is satisfied with the plan, whether he was asked to serve, and many other things. I should like to ask him a number of questions.

Mr. President, I think the Senate has a right to know what General Groves thinks about this question. I think Colonel Nichols should be brought here. Let us talk to him and see if he is satisfied. What is wrong about it? Why should we not obtain such information?

Earlier in the day it was stated that because of a precedent we could not get FBI reports on these nominees. We can get them only with respect to Federal judges. I think that is the answer of a school boy. I think we can get an FBI report on every one of these men if the Senate insists upon it.

This afternoon we have the revealing statement of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. Once again we ask the question, What about the military? Why were not they consulted? We find that they were not consulted. They were not consulted before January. They are not being consulted now, and there is not a word of testimony from any of the top-flight men who gave us atomic energy.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I entirely agree with the Senator from Nebraska. General Groves is one of the ablest men I have ever come in contact with, and he deserves as much credit for the atomic bomb as does any other man living. While he may not have done the scientific part of the work, he did the manufacturing part. I was a member of the first Committee on Atomic Energy, and I must say that I am surprised that General Groves was not called as a witness on this very vital question about which he can tell more than almost any other man.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his observation.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to make one further point. Mr. Lillenthal very glibly passes off the question of military liaison, which was apparently disregarded by Senators who formed the majority of the committee.

I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the distinguished chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as well as the President pro tempore of this body, have heard the statement of Mr. George Earle, who was formerly Ambassador to Bulgaria. He was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt to the position of Ambassador to Bulgaria. He served over there all through a very

violent period. The other day, testifying before a committee of Congress, he stated that, in his judgment, 5 years from today, as a result of atomic destruction, less than 10 percent of the people in this country would be alive. I do not know whether Mr. Earle is right or wrong. He may have made an exaggerated statement. Time alone will tell. Nevertheless, I point out that he was the Democratic Governor of the State of Pennsylvania. Democrats supported him. He was appointed by Franklin D. Roosevelt as Ambassador to Bulgaria. He is a member of the Democratic Party. I assume that when he was elected Governor of Pennsylvania and when he was appointed as Ambassador to Bulgaria, there must have been good reason for choosing him. He comes back with this very doleful prediction.

When a responsible person makes such a statement, and when we hear reports as to what is actually going on in the world, a very deep and heavy obligation and responsibility is placed upon us as United States Senators in connection with the Lillenthal nomination. If this country should be partially destroyed by atomic weapons, and millions of our people should be killed, I would not want the responsibility on my shoulders. Therefore I say that we should have as the head of the Atomic Energy Commission a man upon whom we could all agree, a man of unquestioned integrity and purpose, a man so outstanding that every Senator, whether Republican or Democrat, could agree upon him. We can select such a man.

The first necessary step in that direction would be for Mr. Lillenthal to withdraw. If Mr. Lillenthal had any sense of propriety at all he would withdraw his name from consideration for the position to which he has been nominated. I believe that the first Senators who should ask to have the nomination referred back to the committee on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] should be the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and other Senators who reported the nomination. I do not believe that they want on their shoulders the threat of potential responsibility which might result from some of the violent things going on in the world today.

So let us send the nomination back to the committee. Let us put Mr. Lillenthal out to pasture, where he can do no damage. Let us select some outstanding man that we all can agree upon, whether it be the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and other Members of this body. There are many outstanding men in the country upon whom all Senators could agree.

In my judgment Mr. Lillenthal should withdraw. If he does not withdraw,

then the members of the committee which reported the nomination should hold another meeting of the committee and withdraw the committee report on the nomination, which it is within their power to do. Let us put Mr. Lillenthal back in the private-citizen class where he belongs, and start anew. Would it not be a great thing for this Nation and the world; would it not be a great thing for the President of the United States, Mr. Truman; would it not be a great thing for the Atomic Energy Commission, if a man could be selected whom all Senators could support? It can be done. It is an important enough issue that it should be done. I think that is a goal for which we should all strive.

It is said that General Groves is in Florida. The attitude assumed was that it was not important enough to bring him up from Florida to discuss this weighty question. If we have great men in the country who know the military aspects of a world which is aflame and perhaps headed toward destruction, we should bring to bear on this problem their brains and put them at the service of the Atomic Energy Commission. We should not place at the head of such an agency a man like Mr. Lillenthal, who will turn a cold shoulder to the military, and ring down the iron curtain.

If Mr. Lillenthal has been autocratic to date, wait until his nomination is confirmed. I venture to say that even as partisan a Senator as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] may be upset by his actions in the years to come. I know that at present the Senator from Connecticut is pretty well sold on Mr. Lillenthal.

Mr. President, we face a tragic moment. Make no mistake about it. It may be glibly passed off by many, and it may be said that Mr. Lillenthal should be quietly accepted by a docile Senate with their eyes closed and ears shut. But we are in a very violent period in the history of the world. It is our primary duty to safeguard the security of this Nation. The United States Senate is torn asunder by lack of confidence in this nominee of the President. I do not want the responsibility on my shoulders, but I am afraid that it will rest on the shoulders of other Senators if we approve the nomination of such a man.

It is a very serious thing. Let us make no mistake about it, and let us not try to dodge the responsibility or evade the issue. It is here. We cannot dodge it; we cannot evade it. A Senator who votes for Mr. Lillenthal must bear his share of the responsibility. The tragic thing is that it will be too late then. Perhaps millions will be dead; perhaps part of our Nation will be destroyed. Even now, before the Commission gets started, Mr. Lillenthal is denying the military access to the Commission. It is tragic. Newspapers, including some in Washington, are carrying on a personal feud with the United States Senate because some Senators dare to stand up and be counted and are not willing to gamble with the safety of our country.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. A while ago I called the Senator's attention to the responsibility which attends voting in favor of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal. A tragic responsibility rests upon those who delay longer the establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission so that the business of atomic energy and the safeguarding of this country can go forward. We are in that tragic situation now. At this moment we are making no progress in atomic energy. It is vital that we make progress. So there is a responsibility on both sides.

So far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the responsibility when I cast my vote for Mr. Lillenthal; and, conversely, those on the other side will have to accept whatever responsibility may attend further delays and further continuation of argument which prevent our going forward with atomic energy.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I raised that very question the other day. I asked the able Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, whether or not the present Commission is now functioning as fully, completely, and comprehensively as it will after the nominations have been confirmed. The Senator told me that it is. It is serving under Executive appointment, and I understand that it is performing all the functions it could possibly perform, and is expending money that is turned over to it in anticipation, I presume, of confirmation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may amplify my statement?

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The members of the Commission whose nominations are before us for confirmation have full power under appointments made by the President last October or November. It is true that they have power, but the practical result is that the uncertainty of the situation has caused a stalemate, which will exist until the question of the confirmation of the nominations of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission is settled, whether it be this Commission or another commission. I dislike to think of the tragic further disruption of the atomic energy plan of this country if these nominations are not confirmed. There is an overriding public good which has to be considered in addition to our personal agreement or disagreement with respect to individuals on the Commission.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator speaks of a stalemate. Does he infer that the situation at Oak Ridge is static and that there is no production of atomic energy or bombs?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No bombs are made at Oak Ridge, but some of the materials that go into them are produced there. Atomic material is being made.

We must keep the plants going. A certain degree of efficiency and progress has been attained in the present state of the art, but we have already lost 19

months of progress into new fields of atomic energy. I do not mean that 19 months' time has been lost in this debate, but we have lost the time that has elapsed between the time the last bomb was dropped in Japan and the present time. We have lost that time in the progressive development of new and additional fields of atomic energy. That is the situation we face at the present time. We are not making the progress we should make, and we certainly are disrupting that progress with every day or week of delay.

Mr. STEWART, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I think the tragic thing we are faced with now is that we have a civilian commission in charge of atomic energy. I believe that the statement of the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which I put into the RECORD this afternoon, hits the nail on the head. When war clouds are actually hanging low over the entire world, atomic energy should be under the control of the military. I believe that one of the strongest blows which we could deliver to a potential enemy which respects nothing but force would be to return control of atomic energy, for the present, at least, to the military to make such use of it as we are told we may have to make in the not too distant future. I hope such use will not be necessary.

In almost every newspaper we may pick up we are daily confronted with the statement that Russia has the know-how; that Russia is making demands of the United States and other nations which are utterly out of reason. From the over-all picture, the conclusion which is drawn by men who are quite able to draw conclusions is that in the not far-distant future we may actually face serious trouble with Russia. Mr. Bullitt, former Ambassador, testified that if Russia had the atomic bomb and we did not have it, she would have dropped it upon the cities of America. I think the tragic mistake that is being made is that the military is being excluded and pushed aside. I believe that the military should have full control at the present time.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. As I have previously indicated, I have been repeatedly irritated by reference to 19 months having been lost. I do not understand it. I understood that the military were in charge up to January 1, when the Commission took over. I understand that the Commission is functioning; I understand that research is being carried on. We have heard the suggestion repeatedly from scientists that they were going on a sit-down strike if we did not arrive at a solution acceptable to them. That is one of the most amazing suggestions I have ever heard—that unless we adopt a formula of which they approve they will walk out on us. That is pretty near to deserting in the face of the enemy.

Within the past week I have read in the newspapers that the Atomic Energy Commission, now functioning under recess appointment, had decided to shift the emphasis in research from military uses of atomic energy to civilian uses. The clear inference from that statement is that military research had been going on, and that now a shift in emphasis to the civilian aspect is to be made. It comes at rather an extraordinary time, when we are saying to Russia, "Thus far and no further." I cannot conceive of any time in the past 19 months when a shift from military to civilian uses would have been more inappropriate than it is at this particular time. It is notice to Russia that we have gone as far as we wish in the military direction, and that we are now placing emphasis on the civilian aspect. I do not know how many thousands are employed by the Atomic Energy Commission, but I presume they are earning their money and doing their job. If they are not, certainly the Atomic Energy Commission is rather seriously derelict in its duty.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the statement was directed to me, I say that I think when the bill was passed last year, the whole intention of Congress—perhaps not the intention of every Member of Congress, but certainly the intention of the overwhelming number of the Members of Congress—was to emphasize the civilian development of atomic energy. We were then under the illusion or the delusion that the war was over. Whether we were mistaken in that belief we do not need to argue now. The bill was written as a civilian bill. It was written to declare the importance of civilian investigation and of civilian uses of atomic energy. But I say now that the military was and is amply protected in that bill. In the first place, in the Commission itself there is a division of military applications. In the second place, there is a military liaison committee; and under the law it is entitled to acquire, and can acquire and will acquire, all information within the activities of the Commission touching upon the military activities of the Commission. If the Military Liaison Committee believes either that what the Commission is doing or what the Commission is failing to do is inimicable to the national defense, the Military Liaison Committee can appeal to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy; and if there is anything there at all that does not satisfy them, they can take the matter to the President, who then can order them to do something to benefit the national defense or to refrain from doing something that is harmful or calculated to be harmful to the national defense.

I say, I believe we are giving ample programing to questions of national defense. If this Commission or any Atomic Energy Commission can be assured of its position and can proceed with confidence, and if those in key positions under the Atomic Energy Commission can be assured that the work is to go forward, real progress can be made. But until that occurs, the uncertainty of

the whole matter is damaging to the very thing—the national defense of the United States—about which all of us are concerned.

I say that in my opinion many Members of the Senate are permitting personal disagreement with an individual or individuals to interfere with and prevent action by the Senate in respect to the overriding national good in the present instance. I am just as much concerned about the difficult times in which we find ourselves and the uncertainty of international affairs as is any other Member of the Senate.

I made a suggestion to the Senator from New Hampshire, the other day, in speaking frankly about Mr. Lillenthal. The Senator from New Hampshire had asked me whether I thought Mr. Lillenthal was the best man in the United States for this job. I said, "No; I do not think so, but I do not think he is the worst man, either." Mr. President, I do not know who else would take this job. As I said to the Senator then, Mr. Lillenthal can do the job; we find no dishonesty about him; he is able; and those who oppose him did not begin to establish any charge of communism against him; and we are in an emergency.

I say to the Senator that in my opinion today, not only in atomic energy but also in our whole international situation, we are in an emergency period, and we had better think rather quickly and act rather vigorously, with great speed and great determination.

I should like to see this issue settled one way or the other. I know how I shall vote. I shall not quarrel with any other Senator about how he votes. But we had better begin to vote rather quickly.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think all of us appreciate the importance and urgency of this matter. I am sure the Senator from Iowa will not be critical of the Senate for wishing to take a small portion of the time the committee itself took in considering this matter and in conducting hearings on it. We have this great volume of hearings before us, which we have had an opportunity to study only for the last week or 10 days. The President took a number of months in considering the matter himself before he acted—all under the pressure of this urgency.

Do I correctly understand that work is being done, that research is being carried on, and that emphasis is being shifted from the military to the civilian uses? Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield to me, let me say that I think work is being done and research is being carried on, but I do not think they have the steam up that they need if the job is to be done.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am sure we can understand that there might be some doubt in their minds. But I should appreciate it if during the remainder of this discussion we did not have the repeated statement that 19 months have been lost. Can we not agree that it has

been only 18 months or 17 months, or even a portion of that time?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall be glad to split the difference with the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. As a matter of fact, the Senate has had this subject before it for only 10 days or 2 weeks. So if there is any cause for complaint as to unconscionable or unwarranted delay, certainly the responsibility is not upon the Senate, except for the 2 weeks during which it has been giving the matter consideration.

I should like to ask the Senator this question: Would he consider it good judgment, in view of our current relations with some foreign countries, to shift the emphasis at this time from the military to the civilian? I understood the Senator to say that when we made that decision last year we thought the war was over. Of course, I think we have begun to realize that perhaps the war is not over. Is not this a rather unusual time, in view of the present status of affairs, for this Commission to make a decision of apparently such profound significance, with General Marshall at Moscow, and with our troops getting ready to form along the new line that is proposed?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield further to me, let me say I do not know the news report to which the Senator from Maine has referred, but I say to him that it is my belief that we did shift from the military to the civilian. Please bear in mind that when the war ended, the entire activity in regard to atomic energy was military, completely devoted to making atomic bombs. That was all it was. Then we thought the war was over. However, the military kept control of the atomic energy situation, under the Manhattan district, until Congress passed the law setting up the machinery and organization which would take control from the military and place it in civilian hands. That happened; that law was passed. I think the transition from complete emphasis upon military production to emphasis upon civilian production has been going on for quite a while, but in my opinion the military has not been neglected and is not now being neglected.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the able Senator from Iowa; namely, whether he wishes us to infer, from the last answer he made, that in his opinion the military were not capable of doing the research which could be done under civilian control. Is that what the Senator desires to indicate; in other words, that the military fell down on conversion or transfer over to the civilian?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, no, Mr. President; by no stretch of the imagination could my statement be interpreted as meaning that. If in some way it is so interpreted, I should like to correct it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then how could we lose 19 months, if the military was in full control up until January 1 of this year?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. After the military operations had ended, the military was merely holding the plant together until the Congress and the country had decided what the permanent disposition of this great new force should be.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from New Hampshire to yield further.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does what the Senator from Iowa has said mean that the executive branch had this held in abeyance, and nothing was done during this period? Is that what we are to understand?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think they kept the wheels moving, kept the plant in a sort of a stand-by position. A little progress was made, but there was no program, and today there is no reliable program, because the Commission is not confirmed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. I have been trying for quite a while to enter the debate to read something which I think will be illuminating, and inform the Senator from Maine as to just what the situation is, what has developed in the past year and a half, and why it was developed. If the Senator from New Hampshire will indulge me, it will take me about 2 minutes to read this quotation from Prof. Karl T. Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

It might be of interest to the Senator to know that Dr. Vannevar Bush, Dr. Karl Compton, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Dr. Conant, of Harvard, are the three top scientists, and have been, in the matter of atomic energy. The engineering was done by the engineers for the great concerns of the country—Eastman, Monsanto, General Electric, Chrysler, and I could name a dozen more that built the plants from the designs of the scientists.

General Groves was assigned the managerial job. He was in charge of security. He procured material. He was the coordinator. But not even General Groves' most ardent admirers, in the Army or out of the Army, would claim that General Groves made any contribution to the scientific or to the engineering aspects of this project.

Now let me read to the Senator what Professor Compton has to say about the present situation in which we find ourselves, and why we are in it:

Having known Lillenthal more or less for about a dozen years, and having been in conference with him several times since his appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission, I am convinced not only that he is well qualified for the post, but also that I would know no one as well qualified and possibly available.

However, my concern with the situation goes deeper than the fate of Lillenthal himself. He has won the respect and backing of the key people in the atomic-energy development. Among them there is, so far as I can judge, a universal feeling of disillusion-

ment over the manner in which the case has been handled by the Senate. If this should lead finally to failure to confirm him, I believe it will be a very serious blow to our future progress in the atomic-energy field, especially in the direction of its practical application to industrial and military objectives.

This development is in the nature of the case dependent primarily upon the work of the nuclear physicists, chemists, and a very few research engineers, on whose findings the practical application must be built.

Already the projects at Oak Ridge and Los Alamos have been severely reduced in effectiveness by the withdrawal of a large portion of the scientific personnel after the war. The shortage of competent scientists and the competition for their services are very great indeed, and practically all of the key men have many other offers and most of them still on the job have stayed there from a sense of duty.

If, however, they become disillusioned or gain the impression that political or special interests are getting control of the program, I believe that it will collapse into a rather hollow shell. This, it seems to me, is the fundamental threat. Considerable harm has already been done, but I believe that much greater harm will be done if the confirmation is not made.

We can talk glibly, both nationally and internationally about a great atomic-energy program but it will be relatively empty talk unless this program is carried on with enthusiasm.

Then there was Enrico Fermi, and if I were to award the palm to one man I think Fermi would be the one who is most responsible for the discovery of atomic energy.

Fermi is an Italian by birth. He was born in Italy, and did some work in Italy. He happened to marry a Jewess, and Mussolini persecuted him for that reason. He fled to our shores, and carried on his work in Chicago and New York, and came upon the great discovery of chain reaction in Chicago in 1942.

Mr. BREWSTER. What is the date of the statement the Senator has read?

Mr. McMAHON. This statement from Mr. Compton appears in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists for March 1947.

Mr. BRIDGES. On what date did he make the statement?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator means on what date Mr. Compton made the statement?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. I think he sent this telegram to the President pro tempore about 10 days before the hearings ended, which would be about the 1st of March, if I am not mistaken. That was the date when he made the statement which is reprinted.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senate at that time did not have the matter before it for consideration.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator from New Hampshire will further indulge me, I am not at this point quarreling with Senators as to the dereliction of the Senate or its position on the question before it. I am not going to argue that at this time. I may have something to say about it later. I am trying to point out to the Senator the foundation on which the Senator from Iowa, the distinguished chairman of the committee, based his conclusions, which he stated so eloquently, as to the danger of delay in this program.

Senators will appreciate, I think, that if we fail to obtain international control of atomic energy, effective international control, as I have said since September 6, 1945, when I made the first speech that was made on the floor of the Senate, or in the Congress, on this subject—I recently reread the speech to refresh my recollection—the only defense we will have—and God help us if we have to rely on it—is more and better and bigger bombs. That is the only thing that will save America, more and better and bigger bombs, and we cannot have more and better and bigger bombs unless we have nuclear scientists, and unless we have the cooperation of the engineers in the process.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator also recognize that we will not get more and bigger and better atomic bombs for military use unless we continue, during the period of the present crisis, to turn our attention to that, rather than shifting our emphasis, at this time of all others, from military to civilian research? That is what puzzles and astounds me. The eloquence of the Senator only reinforces my fears.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not know the source of the Senator's information.

Mr. BREWSTER. I read it, what I thought was an authoritative report in the public press. Perhaps the Senator can inform me about it.

Mr. McMAHON. I might inform the Senator that no such release has come from the Atomic Energy Commission at any time.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is not the question. The question is whether there has been such a shift. That is the question.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me point out to the Senator that there has been at Oak Ridge, Tenn., a development in the nature of an experiment looking to the use of atomic energy—fissionable materials, that is—as a source of power. However, our experiments have gone forward at Los Alamos, the weapon center, under the conditions, as well as they could go ahead. It is necessary to have fissionable material first. It is necessary to make it cheaper, to make it faster, and to make more of it, if we are to have more material to put into the casings that do the exploding. There must be additional research and additional engineering if we are to have a weapon which will make the Nagasaki and Hiroshima bombs look like a model T Ford.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the Senator trying to tell us that that can be secured only under Mr. Lillenthal? Is that what he is saying?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is misinterpreting me. What I have said to the Senator is that the only way we will accomplish the desired result is through nuclear physicists, scientists, and the cooperation of the scientists and engineers who broke down the atom in the first place.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is the implication—

Mr. McMAHON. Just a moment, if I may interrupt the Senator. Now, what does Fermi say? I cannot give you the

exact date, but in the month of March he said this:

Russia is behind us now, but she may pass us.

That refers to the delays.

What does Urey, the inventor of heavy water, say? He is another Nobel prize winner who made a distinguished contribution to atomic science.

Many of my colleagues are deeply disturbed over the possibility that the Senate may decline to confirm the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I share this concern. I believe that atomic-energy work in the United States will be crippled for several years if the chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission is changed at this time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Just a minute, please.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will pardon me, I want to read a little further.

Mr. BRIDGES. I say that is the "bunk."

Mr. McMAHON. Pardon me.

Mr. BRIDGES. For any man to say that the development of atomic energy could be crippled for several years if Lillenthal is not confirmed is just pure, undiluted "bunk."

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator has been very kind and indulgent.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have been.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to read just two more paragraphs of what Mr. Urey said:

Eighteen months have now passed since Hiroshima. During this time the work on atomic energy in the United States was virtually at a standstill because there was no one who could take the responsibility for major decisions. Many of the projects badly disintegrated during this period. Other projects are still held together by the hope that a responsible management will soon be established. The Lillenthal Commission took over the operations on the first day of January, having previously made a study of the problems of operating these projects. If the Chairman of this Commission should be refused confirmation now, another 6 months will pass before orderly operation of atomic energy research will get under way. During this time, these projects may collapse, and the work on atomic energy in this country will be wrecked at a time when other nations are making rapid progress in this field. The scientists hope that Congress may keep party politics out of the vital issue of atomic energy.

In conclusion, let me say this: The Senator may wish to voice his opinion, and I have respect for it, and I know his colleagues have, too; the Senator and others brought about an appropriation to make the atomic bomb, but neither he, nor any other Member of this body, contributed one iota of ideas or intelligence that went into nuclear science.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did Mr. Lillenthal?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Lillenthal, sir, has contributed at least to this extent, that since his appointment and designation as Chairman of the committee for the international control problem, in the State Department, he and his associates, Mr. Acheson and General Groves—let me pay him a compliment—and Dr. Conant, and the other members who are on that Commission, contributed a basic plan of control for this terrible thing that has been developed, which all sensible per-

sons in the United States, so far as I know, have noticed. That was his contribution.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. In the light of the recent developments, I should like to point out that under the extraordinary plan produced by Mr. Lillenthal, which the Senator read recently, if the proposal to locate bomb plants all over Russia were carried out, such plants could now be devoted to producing atomic bombs, if this plan had gone through.

Mr. McMAHON. I have read the plan, I would say to the Senator, on which he bases his comment. I anticipated, I may say to the Senator—and I see that my anticipation and prediction have come true—that during the course of this debate there would be two principal attacks made; one, on the so-called military control of atomic energy, a question which we settled after a very thoroughgoing consideration of the matter, a year ago; and, the second, the soundness of our international proposal. I expect to be heard later, during the course of the debate, on the soundness of those proposals.

Mr. TAFT and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The extraordinary proposal to which I referred was that there should be set up an international authority on which there was to be no restraint. It was to have strictly international personnel. It was to take charge of all atomic development. It was to build atom-bomb plants in Russia, in order that they might balance the atom-bomb plants that we had. That was expressly provided. That is the plan that was proposed. He says that—

As such operations and facilities have been established by the atomic-development authority, and are being operated by that agency within other nations, as well as within our own, a balance will have been established with us, because we have got the atom-bomb plants today.

Not only that, but this international authority, with international personnel, was to come into this country, take over our Oak Ridge plant, and all our plants, and operate them, if you please, with international personnel, Russians, perhaps, who would find exactly how the whole thing had to be operated—an international agency over which we would have no control whatever.

It seems to me that it is the most extraordinary plan, and if that is what Mr. Lillenthal is praised for in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission, then I see no basis whatever for saying that he has contributed to the solution of the atom-bomb problem of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose

of enabling me to answer a question which was directed to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the light of what the able Senator from Ohio has read about the establishment of plants in Russia, under an organization international in all respects, I think it would be well for us to read the editorial in the Washington Post this morning, about the international organization created to investigate the Greek situation, and how they have conducted themselves. I think it would be well worth while for us to read that in the light of this report.

Mr. FERGUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my last remarks, the editorial from the Washington Post of today, to which I referred. I have just obtained it, and I hope all Senators may read the editorial.

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

FINGER ON MR. LIE

Reports of the poor quality of the UN Secretariat that accompanied the Balkan Commission to the Greek frontier are sufficiently authoritative to warrant a strict investigation of Secretary-General Lie's office. It appears that some of the 75 secretaries that accompanied the mission are not possessed of the standards of "efficiency, competence, and integrity" that the United Nations itself laid down as the prerequisites of international service. Integrity is, apparently, the main deficiency. Some of the attachés are said to have displayed a bias in favor of the countries of their nationality amounting in a few cases to outright sabotage. Like a government, the United Nations is singularly dependent upon the integrity of its civil service, and these revelations are second only to the Russian abuse of the veto power in undermining confidence in the existing United Nations.

Staff service for international organization did not receive the attention it deserved when the Charter was under draft at San Francisco. The prime reason was the foolish attitude of some of the chief delegates in thinking they were pioneers of history. The fact is, of course, that they were engaged in a quest that mankind has been engaged upon since the days of the Amphictyonic League, B. C. They forgot, as the jurists who were considering the World Court did not, that, as Oliver Wendell Holmes put it, continuity with the past is not a virtue but a necessity. In consequence, nobody seemed to pay any attention to the lessons of the League of Nations, and several past and present staff members of the League, who had been invited to San Francisco, were left to cool their heels in their hotel. Nobody was interested in listening to their voice of experience. No League officer undoubtedly would have argued against leaving the Secretary-General without a Deputy Secretary-General. They would have advised that the United Nations Secretariat should be offered in part by neutrals. For instance, the nationals of Sweden and Switzerland have given men and women of great merit and international mind to administrative and expert tasks in world organization. What the UN Secretariat needs above all is the same degree of impartiality.

Upon UN's Secretary-General will devolve the task of explaining the kind of men he saddled upon the Balkan Commission. To be

sure, his staff problem is formidable, as a result both of the newness of the organization and the relatively slim nature of his budget. But Mr. Lie above all knew the explosive nature of the task of this Commission, and he should have been most scrupulous in making these appointments. This is not the first time that we have seen fit to question the administration of Mr. Lie. There was the occasion last April 17, when we protested his effort to remove the Iranian dispute from the Council agenda. As a result of this intervention, many observers felt some doubt about Mr. Lie's own impartiality. The doubt arose again when Mr. Lie last week administered an oblique rebuke of the United States for its near eastern policy. This might have passed unnoticed but for the precedent, for the United States, to our view, was, indeed, remiss in not informing the UN earlier of its proposal, and of not giving greater attention to the UN in the President's message to Congress. The scandal about the Balkan appointments, however, admits of no extenuation.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I just entered the Chamber as the Senator from Connecticut was referring to some of the scientists. I want to observe in this connection that this is a most important discussion we are having, from every angle. I appreciate everything that is being said on both sides, because I am trying to get light.

I want to say to the Senate that during the last month or two I have been engaged in working on the new scientific foundation bill, and during that time I have been in touch, through correspondence, having nothing to do with this controversy, with Dr. James B. Conant, of Harvard; Dr. H. D. Smyth, of Princeton; Dr. Karl T. Compton, of MIT; and Dr. Vannevar Bush. I wish to read a postscript to a letter Dr. Karl Compton, an old friend of mine, wrote me in discussing the foundation bill. He added a postscript which reads as follows:

I am very much worried lest failure to confirm Lillenthal may pretty much wreck the atomic-energy program. The keymen have confidence in him, and are pretty much disgusted with the way he has been handled. All these keymen could step into other attractive jobs easily.

I know what Dr. Karl Compton contributed to the cause of atomic energy and the part he played in it, and while some may discount it if they care to, one in my position is bound to consider that as a very important statement from a very important man.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President—

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. What the Senator from New Jersey has read is another expression of something of a profoundly regrettable nature which I feel is creeping into our consideration. It was manifested a while ago, at the close of the war, in the suggestion of some scientists that they were going to quit, and at various times, an intimation of what apparently was a sit-down strike if this atomic energy matter were not handled in the way they deemed desirable. I do not question their patriotism or their intelli-

gence, but I do challenge the attitude of mind of men who will express themselves as the man whom we have all come to respect and admire expresses himself in that postscript, to the effect that unless Mr. Lillenthal is confirmed it is going to be impossible or impracticable for scientists to continue their collaboration.

The same note was apparent in what the Senator from Connecticut read, when he intimated that political or special interests might be moving into this scene. That idea again, I say, is expressed in what was read by the Senator from New Jersey, from a statement either by Dr. Compton or Dr. Conant, I do not know which the Senator was quoting. That injects the idea that unless we all sit in a sacerdotal attitude, accepting the edict of the scientists as to the solution of what, after all, is primarily a question of business management of a great governmental enterprise, they will not play on our team, they will not play ball.

Mr. SMITH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. No, I will not myself yield. I want to finish what I am saying, now. I cannot conceive that men having the character, the caliber, and patriotism of these scientists are going to take such an attitude. The chairman of the committee has said here, with a candor that does him credit, that he does not necessarily believe Mr. Lillenthal is the best man, nor does he believe he is the worst man; he recognizes that among 130,000,000 people, and with all the graduates there are of Harvard Law School, of whom I am one, it might be possible to find someone else who could handle an administrative position comparable with the one in question.

I think Dr. Conant or Dr. Compton or any of the others, if they realized the implications of these suggestions, would be the first to regret them. Now we are trying as earnestly and as honestly as we can to solve this problem. I have, from an experience of more than 10 years of observing Mr. Lillenthal, grave doubt as to the wisdom of selecting him, and particularly because of certain of the men associated with him in the management of this great enterprise, in the Atomic Energy Commission. That is the result of my observation, Mr. President, of Mr. Lillenthal over many years. Certainly it seems to me it is possible to secure some other man or some other men who can be commensurately equal for this job. For them to say that everything is going to wrack and ruin unless the Senate of the United States, with almost a gun pointed at its head, solves this matter by confirming the nominees, or the scientists will walk out, is something I regret.

Mr. President, we had a period from 1920 to 1930 when big business was in the saddle. We had a period from 1930 to 1940 when big government was in the saddle. We have a period now when we are challenged by big labor. And apparently the suggestion is now being made that over the horizon big science is preparing to move onto the scene.

The American people in the period 1920 to 1930 showed their opposition

toward big business when it became too strongly entrenched. In the 1940's the American people slapped down big government. We are now in the process of coping with big labor. And I say to my friends in science that greatly as we appreciate their achievement, profoundly as we respect their knowledge, they do not have a monopoly on the political wisdom that is essential to the solution of the problem we here face, and with all deference we say to them that if in their scientific research they will show a little more deference to the Senate or the Congress of the United States as possibly having an equal patriotic devotion to the common good, and perhaps having a little understanding of all the political aspects—and I use the word "political" in the highest sense—and that perhaps it is a subject to which some of us have devoted our time and talents, and if there will be a little recognition on their part of our knowledge regarding some aspects of the conduct of governmental business with which they have not been hitherto concerned, it would be a salutary lesson to the people of the United States and be helpful in the consummation of the objective which we all hold as common to our cause.

Mr. BRIDGES. I want to compliment the Senator from Maine for the statement he has just made. To me it is a terrible thing that scientists—and I have great respect for them—should infer that they are going on a strike against America simply because the Senate does not do what they want done. To me it is a terrible thing to contemplate that they would take such a position.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator. I am thoroughly sympathetic with the statements which have been made, but I know that the statement that Dr. Compton made to me had nothing to do with a strike or anything else. The scientists are very much disturbed because they turned loose in the world something more terrible and destructive than had ever before been known. I know they have had heart burnings over what they have done, and have wondered how this terrible problem could be solved in an international way or otherwise. They are concerned that there should be lengthy discussion over the pending nominations and delay in dealing with the subject, because they feel we are delaying their ability to acquire the information they need and the effective means of dealing with this matter. I want to commend them for their deep sincerity and I want to enter a protest against the suggestion that there is in their minds such a thing as a strike against America. There is no thought on their part of a strike. But they want to get on with the work of developing atomic energy and safeguarding its uses.

Mr. BREWSTER. What did they mean, as suggested by what the Senator previously said?

Mr. BRIDGES. They are going to strike against America. That is what the Senator said.

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not agree with the Senator. These men are trying to

show to the country that what we are now dealing with is something much more serious than anything ever before dealt with in the history of the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. At a time when our national security is in question, the Senator from New Jersey stands up and says the scientists are going to strike against America. That is certainly the implication. That is a terrible thing to contemplate.

Mr. SMITH. I disagree with the Senator's conclusion from what I said. The scientists did not say that.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wonder if the scientists mean that unless we follow Mr. Lillenthal in his proposal to give this secret in part to Russia and to the other nations, we ourselves are going to run.

Mr. SMITH. Not at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is our secret; it is our property; it is our discovery. Does the Senator want to follow Mr. Lillenthal in his plan to divide it up with all other nations, and especially Russia, at this time, when we are so greatly concerned over Russia's attitude? I hope the Senator does not feel that way. I have always esteemed the Senator as being an American 100 percent. Does he want to give this great discovery to all the world as a method of settlement of international problems? That is Lillenthal's proposal.

Mr. SMITH. Might I ask the Senator if anything I have said has even suggested such a thing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; what the Senator just said suggested that to me very definitely.

Mr. SMITH. I am very sorry the Senator from Tennessee has drawn that conclusion from what I have said. I am trying to defend my scientific friends who are sincerely troubled and deeply concerned over this matter. What they are particularly deeply concerned with is the Senate's delay in acting upon this matter. They feel the importance of there being no further delay, and they feel concerned over the debate that is going on in the Senate. That concern is felt all over the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the scientists take the position that the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Connecticut take about this matter, as well as Mr. Lillenthal himself, that this discovery should be divided with all the other nations of the world, that means that Russia will also be given the secret. The scientists then would turn it over to Russia in part, and to all the other nations in part, when we now own it ourselves. I am opposed to the scientists doing that. I think this discovery ought to stay in America. We furnished the money with which the work was done and the discovery was made.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee whether he thinks this discovery can remain in America only, merely because we possess it alone? Is not the Senator aware that the scientists know that Russia already knows a great deal about it?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is not a nation under God's heaven save our own

that can put up \$2,600,000,000 to bring about such a discovery.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad for the Senator's sake that he thinks a wall of that kind can protect America. But I do not share his view.

Mr. McKELLAR. To me it would be exceedingly foolish, it would be exceedingly silly, after having spent \$2,600,000,000 in making the discovery and now owning it ourselves, voluntarily to divide it up with all the nations of the world.

Mr. SMITH. I am not advocating that, Mr. President.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like, if I might, to have the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. The Senator from Ohio asked me when I had last read the Acheson-Lillenthal report, and I told him I had read it again within the last 10 days. I wonder whether the Senator from Ohio has had an opportunity to read the Acheson-Lillenthal report or the propositions which were made by Mr. Baruch which incorporated the Acheson-Lillenthal report, before the beginning of this debate.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I read the report when the Lillenthal nomination first came before the committee. I read the report on the international control of atomic energy, the so-called Acheson-Lillenthal report. In fact, the statement which I made a month or so ago was based largely on the reading of that report. I may say further that I also read at the time the Baruch report and the various minutes of the Atomic Energy Committee of the United Nations from which it was perfectly apparent that Mr. Baruch really thoroughly disapproved of the Acheson-Lillenthal report; that he did everything he could to put safeguards around it. I understand that Mr. Baruch was told, after he had accepted the appointment of the Atomic Energy Commission, that this must be the basis of American policy, and that until that time he did not know that his hands were tied; that he had gone so far that he did not desire to retire at that time from this thing, but he hedged the Acheson-Lillenthal report about with safeguards. His report, if anything, places the other report more in the background and emphasizes the elements of security, the elements of the surrender of the veto, the elements of change in the whole United Nations set-up that he proposed. Certainly I could not find any kind of so-called approval of this report. He puts the report further in the background.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator that I regret he had not read the report when it was released by the State Department, I believe, in April of last year. It was probably as important a proposal as the State Department or any section of it has made on policy in many generations.

I will say further to the Senator that Mr. Baruch stated before our committee in praise of Mr. Lillenthal, that—

He was one of the authors of the so-called Acheson-Lillenthal report, and that, gentlemen, was a very fine report.

Furthermore, the proposals which Mr. Baruch made to the Security Council are basically the proposals which have been made in the Acheson-Lillenthal report, which the Senator criticizes. Mr. Baruch added only one important thing to it, and that was the point with respect to the veto.

Let me further inform the Senator that it was not within the comprehension of the instructions which were given to this committee to go into political questions, as the President pro tempore of the Senate pointed out during the hearings when that question was raised.

Mr. TAFT. I only wish to call attention to the fact that the agreement which was finally voted on in the United Nations to a very large extent eliminated the Acheson-Lillenthal report. I think the Senator will find that that is a fact. The so-called international agency has practically disappeared from the proposals which were finally voted on in the United Nations.

Mr. McMAHON. The record will show who is right on that point.

During the hearings before our committee, on December 3, 1945—and this is probably as good a place as any to place it in the RECORD—I said to Dr. Bush:

Doctor, to reach the objection proposed by Senator JOHNSON and also advanced by some of our other witnesses, that peacetime use of atomic energy in power plants complicates the problem of control, would it be possible or feasible, do you think, to have any such peacetime power plants controlled under the United Nations organization, to be internationally maintained with, perhaps, a stock to be owned on a basis of contributions, such as the UNRRA organization? That is, each country putting in that portion which their national income will justify for international control of these power plants, internationally inspected and internationally operated?

I will say further to the Senator from Ohio and to the Senator from Tennessee that the international proposals are based upon three principles: First, that this is the controlling weapon; second, that there is no defense against it; and third, that we cannot maintain a monopoly. That is why Winston Churchill said, in a stirring speech on this subject in the House of Commons, that in his opinion unless mankind learned to live together in peace and harmony, within a period of 3 years there would be no hope for civilization itself. I say that America has done one of the finest things any nation has done in the history of time. Its position is morally unassailable. We have said to the nations of the earth that we propose to share with them the fruits of the greatest discovery ever made by man, in return for only one thing, namely, suitable and effective guaranties that it shall not be used murderously against us. On that position we can all stand with pride.

Let me say to the Senator that no one is more tragically disappointed than I am that our Russian ex-allies, friends, or whatever one chooses to call them, have not seen fit to accept that proposal. As an American and as a United States Senator I take a great deal of satisfaction in the fact that we have justified our

place in history in this respect as the primary power of the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that we have perhaps justified that place up to the present time; but we now come to the question of who is to head this great Commission. There has been a great deal of debate on the subject.

I regard the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as a very good friend. I may have been a little harsh with him a moment ago, but I had no personal feeling in the matter. He speaks about delay. We could eliminate delay in a moment. We could obtain action in one of three different ways.

First, we could vote immediately on the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit the nominations to the committee.

Second, the committee itself, headed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], could be called together and could recall the nomination.

Third, the President could withdraw the nomination.

I am sure that a nomination could be placed before us which Senators would approve in 30 minutes. It is a sad commentary upon the United States and a reflection upon our future to spend our time in trying to determine, not whether this man is well qualified for the job, but whether he is too bad for the job. That is what we are doing. We are being subjected to high pressure from all sides.

It is said that we are playing politics. The political thing to do would be to vote for Mr. Lillenthal, because the press and a large section of the misled public, some of whom are most sincere, are for Mr. Lillenthal, and we would be patted on the back and called great Senators. But I believe this is the time to stand up for America.

We have heard the statement which was made by the former ambassador to Bulgaria, a former Democratic governor of Pennsylvania, appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Mr. Earle says that within 5 years only 10 percent of the people of America will be alive. Such a statement should cause us to pause and think. Whether the statement is justified or not, whether it is an exaggeration or not, it is made by a responsible citizen.

We have a very deep responsibility as individual Senators. Before a Senator votes on this question he should commune with his God and his conscience, because within a reasonably few years his action may have tragic consequences. When I vote I may be unpopular with certain of the press. I may be unpopular with the "pinks," the "reds," the "crackpots," the fellow travelers, and some sincere but misled people, but at least I shall be clear with my own conscience and my God. I intend to vote against Mr. Lillenthal.

If Senators do not wish to delay this matter, the thing to do is to recommit the nominations so that a nomination can be sent us upon which we can immediately agree. It need be only the nomination of one of the best qualified in America, one upon which every Senator could agree, whether he be the Sen-

ator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], or the Senator from New Hampshire. I am sure that we could agree upon such a nomination.

That is the issue. Let us not try to dodge it, because it will return to plague us. The testimony in this case and the debate in the Senate will be examined in the months and years to come, and we shall have to answer for our action. Let us not try to dodge our responsibility.

The record to which I referred today showed how Mr. Lillenthal dodged the question of military liaison in this violent period in the history of the world. It shows what the situation is, and what we must face.

If Senators want quick action, let us recommit the Lillenthal nomination, and see if the President cannot name an outstanding man. He does not have to be a Republican. There are many outstanding men available; men like Bob La Follette, who served in this body with us, and whom all of us know and respect.

Many persons may say, "The Senator from New Hampshire is against Lillenthal because of his attitude on the question of public power." That is not true. That is one of the damnable lies put out by commentators in the press and on the radio, and by the "pinks." Bob La Follette is as much in favor of public power as Mr. Lillenthal, but I would vote for Bob La Follette, because I have no question as to his integrity. They could put up a man like Jim Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy. There could be no question about him. They could put up a man like Mr. Bernard Baruch. There could be no question about a great American like Bernard Baruch. They could put up a man like former Senator Byrnes, men of that character and caliber. The Senate would not hesitate a moment to confirm the nomination of that sort of men. Mark my words. I know that many of the Senators have this in their minds, because some have told me about it privately. If the Senate confirms the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal, within a period of a relatively few years the Senators who support the nomination may regret it and they will have to answer for it to the people of this country, and perhaps to members of their own families. It is a tremendous decision that we are making. On the night before the Senate votes we should go home and kneel down and pray to God to guide us in our voting on the next day. The situation is that serious, because it affects the future of this country, the security of this Government, and the future of the world.

I yield now to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in relation to Mr. Lillenthal's attitude toward the international aspect which has been raised by Senators on the floor today, I should like to put into the RECORD and say something with reference to a statement which Mr. Lillenthal made on October 30, 1946, shortly after his appointment.

In this connection I should like to make reference to some excerpts from

the first statement issued by him after his nomination to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. With casual indifference he dismissed all methods of handling atomic-energy problems through international treaties, inspection procedures, and United Nations machinery, and came to the conclusion which a man of his philosophy always reaches, namely, that—

The sole workable plan, Mr. Lillenthal held, was for the establishment of an international atomic development authority composed of men "who might well become the elite of the scientific world," and who would know as much as anyone in the world about new possibilities in the field of atomic energy.

That quotation is from the New York Times of October 30, 1946.

He looks upon himself as being a leader of an elite class to whom should be entrusted the whole of the people's welfare. He considers himself so omniscient as to know as much as anyone in the world about new possibilities in the field of atomic energy.

The able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] said today that General Groves had no scientific knowledge and contributed nothing to the science of atomic energy in this great development. I find nothing in the record to show that Mr. Lillenthal is a scientist, but he wants to head all international organizations in order that he may become the elite of the scientific world. This is in keeping with all his other statements about the need of the people turning over their affairs to superexperts and managers.

Expressions like these honeycomb all of Mr. Lillenthal's activities ever since he came to Government, and they constitute one more confirmation of my belief that a man of such tendencies should not be entrusted with the enormous powers at the disposal of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. So much has been said regarding the Lillenthal report that I think the Senate should not get the idea that the report was written by Mr. Lillenthal all by himself. Whatever may have been his contributions to the report, there were a number of very eminent men who helped to prepare and write the report and who put their stamp of approval on it. Some of those who contributed to the report were Mr. Chester I. Barnard, president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.; Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, of the 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.

In addition to those gentlemen, who prepared the report and unanimously concurred in it, were the members of the State Department committee: Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State, who is chairman of the State Department committee; Dr. Vannevar Bush, who I believe is chairman of the Science Institute; James B. Conant, president of

Harvard University; Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, of the United States Army, who at one time had charge of the Oak Ridge project—in fact, he had charge of the whole project, so far as authority was concerned; and also John J. McCloy, who was Assistant Secretary of War under Secretary Stimson, and resigned as Assistant Secretary of War before he accepted a position on the committee of the Department of State.

All the gentlemen to whose names I have called attention, and who joined in the preparation of the report, approved it, and it was really the composite wisdom, work, and effort of all of those distinguished gentlemen.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to say just a word, Mr. President. It has been pointed out this afternoon that it was contemplated that an international agency would control the production of atomic bombs in various parts of the world. Some Senators seem to deny the third premise of the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], namely, whether it is possible to make a monopoly of this most destructive of all powers, and that Mr. Lillenthal, Mr. Acheson, and their conferees were contemplating a time when the production of atomic bombs would be under international control, rather than that atomic bombs would be produced in many nations of the earth, with no control from any international source.

My last observation, Mr. President, is that it would be a tragic mistake for Members of the Senate to underestimate the power of the Soviet Union to make this bomb. It has even been suggested by the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that no other country could make the bomb because no other country could appropriate approximately \$2,000,000,000 for its construction. Mr. President, I assure the Senate that a nation that could build the big dams that the Soviet Union built upon its mighty rivers, a nation that could remove whole cities from their original sites to places behind the Urals, a nation that could build upon barren plains cities of many hundreds of thousands of persons, a nation that can use the power of all its people, under the direction of only one man, assuredly can make the atomic bomb, once it obtains the technical know-how.

Therefore, I hope we shall not underestimate the power of the Russians, as some did when Hitler attacked them, and I hope that none will gamble with the mighty strength that Russia possesses, by underestimating Russia's great power.

So, Mr. President, it is imperative that we contemplate the establishment of international control of this great power; and if we have to make some concessions in order to bring it under international control, that will be the lesser of the two dangers.

BRITAIN'S FINANCIAL POSITION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, two articles which appeared in the April 1

issue of the New York Times, will, I believe, be of great interest to many Senators.

The first is a statement that Britain had a deficit of slightly over two and a quarter billion dollars for the fiscal year 1947, which, in Britain, ends on March 31 of each year. It is worth remembering that Britain's financial operations are on a much smaller scale than ours, and that this deficit amounts to about 15 percent of her total expenditures. It is clear that the British Labor Government has not been very successful in restoring financial soundness. With a deficit like that, it is no wonder that Britain is suffering from inflationary pressure, and is badly in need of financial assistance from abroad. I ask unanimous consent to have the article inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

BRITAIN'S DEFICIT SLASHED TO £569,122,597 FOR YEAR

LONDON, March 31.—Britain had a deficit of £569,122,597 (\$2,276,490,388) for the fiscal year that ends tonight. This is considerably less than was expected.

The Treasury returns show that total ordinary revenue was £3,341,223,358, more than had been estimated and an increase of nearly £57,000,000 over last year's receipts despite a slight easing of the income tax.

Expenditures, £3,910,345,955, were well below those estimated and showed a saving of more than £1,500,000,000 since the previous year.

Mr. BUTLER. The second article is more or less of an unofficial denial by official London, as the correspondent calls it, that the British Government is considering a request to us for an additional loan. Several days ago Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the British Board of Trade, in a public address made some reference to the fact that the British loan was being used up very rapidly, because of high American prices, and suggested the possibility of needing an additional loan. The gist of the article to which I am referring is that Sir Stafford's words were misunderstood, and that no such request is being considered at the present time. At this point I ask consent to insert that article in the RECORD.

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

BRITAIN DISAVOWS HINT OF NEW LOAN—LONDON IRKED AT INTERPRETATION OF CRIPPS' TALK—HIS VIEW OF BORROWING CLARIFIED

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

LONDON, March 31.—Official London is disturbed and mildly irritated by the latest wave of speculation about new United States financial help for Britain.

Misinterpretation of a statement by Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the Board of Trade, in his speech Saturday in Bristol seems to have given some sections of the British and American press the idea that Britain had already decided to seek a new loan.

What Sir Stafford said was that Britain would have to borrow £350,000,000 (\$1,400,000,000) abroad during 1947. Britain does not borrow money under the United States and Canadian agreements until an actual drawing from one of the Treasuries is made.

Sir Stafford was merely repeating the estimate made in the economic white paper that Britain would have to use up £35,000,000 of foreign credits during this year. While con-

ceding that Sir Stafford might have used better terms, a Board of Trade spokesman was quite emphatic today in his assertion that an effort to read into the statement a subtle approach to new loan negotiations was mere misdirection of energy.

Britain still has an unused balance of more than \$3,000,000,000 under the United States credit. The real concern is not over the rate of exhaustion of credit, which has not so far been much in excess of original expectations—despite frequent assertions to the contrary—but over the fact that so much of the loan has been spent without resulting in any substantial improvement in the country's productive capacity. Britain has been using the loan just to keep up minimum imports, without getting either much new equipment or rebuilding her stocks of industrial raw materials.

In addition to the loss of exports as result of the industrial crisis of February, the yet unknown additional strain on imports resulting from flood damage to agriculture has made it likely that the rate of exhaustion of credits will increase.

It can be stated quite definitely, however, that a British request for a new loan is at present out of the question. While a few back-benchers of both major parties have raised the issue in Parliament, the Government is not now looking in that direction for a way out of the country's difficulties.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I believe this semiofficial denial may clear the air somewhat. Speaking merely as one Member of the Senate, I should like to state that I do not believe this body will be inclined to look favorably on a proposal for an additional loan to Great Britain. A number of Members of Congress expressed the opinion last year that a loan to Britain would not solve her problems, but that a more fundamental readjustment was necessary. If Britain should come to us with a request for another loan, I suspect that many more Members of Congress might come around to the thinking of those who opposed the loan last year.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I request that the proper officials of the Senate have placed on the desk of each Senator tomorrow a copy of the Acheson-Lilienthal report. I understand that the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] will discuss it tomorrow. I think it better to request that the report be placed before Senators in that way, rather than to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which would be a rather expensive way of getting the report before Senators. I think it clear that the report should be before us when we meet tomorrow.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am quite sure the majority leader the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] would wish me to announce that it is planned that when the Senate meets tomorrow, the session will run into the night if a vote has not been had upon the question of confirmation of the nomination of

Mr. Lilienthal. So I desire to announce that it is planned that tomorrow the Senate will continue in session during the afternoon and into the night, without a recess at the dinner hour.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is also true, is it not, that the same program is contemplated for Thursday and Thursday night, if the Senate has not previously taken final action on the nominations?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; I thank the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee for that statement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER rose.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I spoke to the majority leader about the possibility of deciding today or tomorrow whether to ask the Senate to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote perhaps some time on Thursday on the nominations. I am not prepared to make such a request at this time, because very few Senators are now on the floor of the Senate. I had in mind having further discussion along that line with the majority leader tomorrow. I wish to give notice that such a request may be made some time tomorrow, so that Senators will at least be in a position to make up their minds about what they will do if such a request is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the committee that of course such a request is always in order, but my opinion is that it will depend entirely on how we get along with the debate. Certainly there are many speeches yet to be made. I know that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] will speak, and I imagine he will speak at length, because we wish to hear from him. There are many other Senators whom I know will wish to speak. At any rate, we shall jump that hurdle when we reach it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska agree that if he hears from me at length, he will listen at length?

Mr. WHERRY. Of course I will. I always am glad to listen to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. If I can convert one Senator, I shall be glad to speak at length, for that will be the first time I shall have had that experience since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, do I hold the floor?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, when the Senate convenes, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until

tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Samuel N. Karrick, Corps of Engineers, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. George Mayo, Corps of Engineers, to be relieved.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Galilean Master, Thou who hast given to home and country all that can be given; who didst carry in Thy holy breast all the sacred aims which cannot die, bear witness of us that this day may be blessed.

We pray to open the way that leads to lofty altitudes of conscience and thus honor our high estate, fortifying our understanding with freedom from prejudice, from intolerance and bigotry. Quickened the sentiment of the public in deepest sympathy for all who suffer, that it may not fail in the performance of its whole duty for the welfare and protection of the people.

O that the spirit of our Master may bless and comfort those whose loved ones perished in the darkness of the bowels of the earth. Walk with them on the road to their earthly Emmaus, breaking the bread of eternal life.

"When sinks the soul, subdued by toil to slumber,

Its closing eye looks up to Thee in prayer.

Sweet the repose beneath Thy wings o'ershading,

But sweeter still to wake and find Thee there."

In Thy holy name and for Thy sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the completion of the legislative program and any other special orders heretofore entered, I may have the privilege of addressing the House for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. **BOGGS** of Delaware. 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 Delaware?

There was no objection.

[Mr. Boggs of Delaware addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **PATTERSON** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD** and include a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. **CRAWFORD** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a brief summary of the various State laws dealing with communism.

Mr. **MEYER** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include an editorial from the Independence Reporter.

Mr. **SMITH** of Ohio (at the request of Mr. McGREGOR) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include some letters.

Mr. **McGREGOR** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. **THOMAS** of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the **RECORD** and include a letter which I have just sent to the Attorney General, asking the Attorney General why he does not prosecute the Communist Party under the Voorhis-McCormack Act.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. **MITCHELL** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD**.

Mr. **AUCHINCLOSS** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include an editorial.

Mr. **JENISON** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD** and include an editorial from the Danville (Ill.) Commercial News.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY

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, I asked a man who operates a little gasoline station in a small town what he thought about the President's plan for Greece and Turkey. He said he was perfectly willing to extend some little help to

Greece but was absolutely opposed to sending any troops. He is also opposed to Congress appropriating large amounts to numberless foreign countries without some direct approval by the people.

He says that people are now asking him for credit for a couple of dollars' worth of gasoline, which they did not do before, and from his conversation with them he thinks they are losing their respect for their Government.

He says a man is not born "red," but becomes that way because of conditions, and that if we continue to give away everything we have and continue high prices for scarce goods in this country we will have a field in which communism can thrive.

EMERGENCY TEMPORARY DISPLACED PERSONS ADMISSION ACT

Mr. **STRATTON**. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **STRATTON**. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to permit admission to the United States of our fair share of displaced persons, provided they meet the standards under the immigration laws.

This bill seeks to give those unfortunate people, uprooted by war and unable to return home for fear of persecution, a chance to lead decent, useful lives as free men and women. At the same time, the bill would result in the saving of millions of dollars now spent in maintaining displaced persons' camps.

Offering these people opportunity would be totally in keeping with the tradition of our Nation which was founded by immigrants and always has profited by their contributions.

OPINION AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF SENIOR CLASS OF THE HIGH SCHOOL AT SPARTA, WIS.

Mr. **STEVENSON**. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. **STEVENSON**. Mr. Speaker, I was very much pleased this morning to receive a letter from the senior class of the Sparta High School of Sparta, Wis., giving me their opinion and recommendations as to the proposed loans to Greece and Turkey.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include this letter as part of this statement.

I commend the members of the senior class of Sparta High School for writing their Congressman and giving him the benefit of their views. I wish all senior classes in the United States would write their Congressmen and let their Congressmen know their opinions on national issues. I welcome the useful and stimulating remarks of every senior in every high school on all matters before Congress.

SPARTA, WIS., March 27, 1947.

The Honorable WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: After having put in some study on foreign relations, we have decided that the only way to have a firm American policy is to back up the one we state.

We are much in favor of President Truman's plan as put forth in his recent speech regarding aid to Greece and Turkey. We feel that unless immediate action is taken, the issue will die in committees. Too many times, the American people have threatened and not acted. We have seen the results of delayed action in the Nazis' attack on Europe, in the attack on Pearl Harbor, and the Japanese invasion of China.

It would seem that the American people have backed the President almost unanimously in his stand against the spread of totalitarian forms of government. Yet Congress does not seem willing to express the people's desire for immediate action.

We have told Russia where we stand; now let us show her that we mean what we say by carrying out, without delay, the policy we have stated. That would mean not quibbling about the methods by which it should be done but to get it done as quickly as possible.

Very respectfully yours,

The Senior Class, Sparta High School:

Phyllis Martin, Robert Munger, Wm. Ziegler, Shirley Petersen, Betty Knudtson, Beverly Hohn, Margaret Van Kirk, Basil Abbott, James Beron, Jesse McComb, William Hggzman, Mary Flood, Madge Morgan, Dora M. Olsen, S. Barrett, George Olson, Eleanor Paulson, Bob McCollough, David Sullivan, Lloyd W. Peters, Verna Schober, Carol Schild, Arvilla Van Dkye, Beverly Hannis, Beverly Waage, Byron Zimmerman, John R. Druyer, Robert Goodman, Jeanette Griffin, Betty Jane Guy, Carmen Hesselberg, Suzanne Johnson, Juantine Knouse, Viola Brockman, Rosemary Kness, DeLaus Mautzke, Jane Peterson, Dick Hubbell, Carlos Z. Cartilh, Dolores Bonin, Gloria Leenett, Dale Bennett, Lucille Andringa, Jerry Neumann, Doris Ninneman, Dolores Rasmussen, Connie Schauf, Bob Salmon, Charlotte Schlaver, Jack Shlimovitz, Alice Slaver, Joyce Swingle, Beverly Zimmerman, John L. Sullivan, Allen Stendal, Farrell D. Sousek, David Koss, Janet Erlandson, Jean Hanson, Rietk Christensen, Sue Hill, Margaret Willey, Margaret McCoy, G. Oakley, Dolores Ottum, Arnold Petersen, Mary Schmitz, Elizabeth Schroeder, Don Sutter, Carol Wilcox, Ronald Wettstein, Helen Lebbe, Donna Newbeng.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. **ELLIS**. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. Ellis addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **COUDERT** (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include a message and report

of Adele I. Springer, the new president of the National Association of Women Lawyers.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article by David Lawrence and also a report by Cecil Holland.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATION REDUCTIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, \$6,000,000,000. The question is, Where are you going to save the money?

We now have the answer, and the answer is by slashing appropriations for the veterans, by slashing appropriations for the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, by crippling national defense, by understating our known obligations, and by refusing to pay our just debts and obligations.

Mr. Speaker, that is the program of the majority as I see it, and I am against it.

GOOD FRIDAY A LEGAL HOLIDAY

Mr. SASSCER. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate on the eve of Good Friday to call to the attention of the House H. R. 1981, a bill which I introduced several weeks ago. The purpose of this bill is to give Good Friday the same legal status as Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, and Armistice Day.

I am sure that if the Members of the House will read the hearings recently held by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, they will be impressed with the justification for making Good Friday a national holiday.

Since introducing this bill I have been receiving mail from all over the country commenting favorably upon the measure and expressing the hope that it will be enacted into law.

There has been a marked progressive increase in the observance of Good Friday in recent years in this country. Among Christian countries Good Friday is looked upon as a great holy day and one to be observed with appropriate reverence. The United States is the only large Christian country in which Good Friday is not a legal holiday. It has been made a legal holiday in the British Empire, the Baltic countries, Italy, Austria, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, and practically every other country. And in most of the countries where it is not a legal holiday it is religiously observed.

I am informed that approximately 15 States in our Union have, either by legislation or proclamation, established Good Friday as a holiday.

It is my hope and belief that if this bill is enacted into law in order to permit a more free and full religious observance of Good Friday, it would aid in the advancement of the fundamentals and ideals of Americanism and contribute to the resistance of ideologies foreign to our way of life.

I have been pleased at the general national interest that has followed the introduction of this measure and the support that it is receiving from the churches, service organizations, women's clubs, fraternal organizations, business and trade organizations, and civic groups.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the TVA appearing in last Sunday's Boston Herald.

Mr. MCCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the essential parts of a speech recently delivered by Father Edmund A. Walsh, regent of the School of Foreign Service of Georgetown University, at Boston.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Country Gentleman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the session of the House, the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia may meet today.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DORN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

OUR NATIONAL DEBT

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, I want to address my remarks to my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who just spoke a while ago with reference to what the Republican Party was trying to do which would be harmful to the veterans and public works. We Republicans are not trying to do anything at all that is harmful to the veterans. We want to assist them all we possibly can. I want to say that if the New Deal Democrats had not been so much of a spendthrift administration for the last 10 or 15 years, you would not have had a debt of \$259,185,335,159 on March 27. It is because you people have been squandering the money of the taxpayers of America that you have got this country in the terrible hole in which we find ourselves. A shocking debt. We are only trying to save this country for the veterans and for our people. We are trying to save this country for the American people, the thrifty people, the people who want to work and earn and save and protect America. That is what we want to do. We want to help these people, not harm them, and the Republican Party is going to stand up and do everything it can to preserve the institutions of America and make this country safe and solid for everybody for years to come. We believe in a sound, strong Government so we can have a good government for our people to live in, one that can protect and defend all our citizens by having a sound Treasury, a well-balanced economy, jobs for all, and happiness on every hand.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article by Paul Mallon.

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

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the bill unanimously reported favorably by the Committee of Public Lands, of which I am chairman, to grant statehood to the Territory of Hawaii, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 13 of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, adopted March 28, 1947, and House Resolution No. 45, adopted March 26, 1947, by

the House of Representatives of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by him at the University of North Carolina under the sponsorship of the Carolina Political Union, dealing with the President's proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. BAKEWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of an address delivered by Rear Adm. O. L. Colclough at a convention of the Reserve officers of the naval services held in St. Louis last week end.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles from Los Angeles papers.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include remarks made by Daniel Webster 123 years ago on the subject of extending relief to Greece.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE GREEK FINANCIAL SITUATION

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank at the time that Premier Tsaldaris was in this country seeking a loan made a confidential report on the Greek financial situation. Why does the State Department refuse to make public this report of one of the agencies of our Government? And, Mr. Speaker, the UNRRA in February of this year, made a confidential report which the State Department also refuses to make public. Mr. Speaker, why is the State Department afraid to tell this Congress and the American people the truth about the financial foreign indebtedness of Greece, and why is the State Department afraid to tell the truth about the present Greek Government?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Department of State does not have confidence, in the common sense, of the Congress, or confidence, in the common sense, of the American people. The State Department seems to be infected with the idea that the truth is not a good thing. In fact, they seem to have procured an iron curtain from somewhere and they have decided to put an iron curtain around the truth about Greece and Turkey. I suggest that the State Department give us the truth, and they return that iron curtain of theirs to the place where it belongs. The American people do not like iron curtains, and our State Department, if it does not yet know that, ought to become

acquainted with the love that the American people hold for the simple plain truth about situations in which they are asked to take action. As an example of the kind of thing I mean, will our State Department please inform the Congress whether or not the Greek Minister of Security Zervos was a collaborator of the Nazis during the time of their occupation of Greece? Second, will our State Department please inform us why it is that over 1,500 officers who served in the Nazi security battalions during their occupation in Greece are today officers in the Greek Army. Mr. Speaker, we would like to know how many of the present ministers in the Greek Government were collaborators with the Nazis—we want to know! We have a right to know. We are being asked to support that Government with assistance of American taxpayers, and before we vote to pour that money down a rat hole, we want to know the truth about the present Greek Government—its financial commitments, its foreign indebtedness, the history of its cabinet ministers, and why it is that 1,500 officers in the Greek Army were Nazi security police.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANDIS. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. VURSELL. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, replying to the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to where we are going to make slashes in the Federal budget, I know a young man who is now working with the Army. After working 8 hours for the Government he works 8 hours in private employment. He says that out of 86 people in his department, 40 could be disposed of with resulting greater efficiency in that civilian branch of the Army. He says those conditions exist generally as to civilian employees in the Army and Navy. So we can cut the budget of the Army and Navy and help to meet the \$6,000,000,000 reduction in the budget and get greater efficiency. It is my opinion that there are no departments in the Government in greater need of being gone over with a fine-tooth comb by the Committee on Appropriations than the Army and the Navy. By so doing we will not impair national defense, but will increase it.

THE BRITISH PUNISH THE INNOCENT

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 British Palestine Government will require the entire Jewish community to pay for the damage of at least \$1,000,000 caused by fires of oil installations at Haifa. This damage was sabotage and is ascribed to terrorists. The British action is equivalent to visiting punishment upon the innocent. Responsible Jews in and out of Palestine deplore terrorism. I condemn it. Jews themselves have been hurt and killed by the unlawful action of members of the Stern and Irgun gangs. Certainly the entire Jewish community should not be made to pay for the crimes of a few desperadoes.

Attlee and Bevin fail to realize that the deliberate default of their solemn pledges to open the gates of Palestine to refugees has caused despair, and despair creates terrorism. But why hold innocent people as hostages and make them pay blood money? It makes a farce of British justice. It is like making the entire citizenry of Washington pay for the desperate action of a few of its citizens. That is unthinkable.

But British cruelty knows no bounds in Palestine. Our administration should offer vehement protest to the end that Great Britain will punish the guilty and not the innocent.

We are up to our necks in the middle east. Our Government can and should protest the latest campaign of British injustice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include three pages of a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

INTERNATIONAL MOON GAZERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the Members of the House of Representatives should not remain silent while a large number of international moon gazers, who seem to be floating around in a pink cloud of sublimar radiation, attempt to destroy the Government of the United States or make it subordinate to UN, which has been compared to an international Sanhedrin.

I am opposed, and I believe nine-tenths of the American people are opposed, to setting up any supergovernment over the United States.

These speeches that were made on yesterday, especially by Mr. "Corn" Wallace, former Secretary of Agriculture, and others I could mention, demanding that we subordinate this Government to this outfit in New York, this Tower of Babel if you please—that behind-the-scenes talk mostly about what they are going to get out of the United States or what they are going to do to us—do not

reflect the sentiments of the American people.

It is time for real Americans to wake up and say to the world that we are not going to destroy the United States or subordinate it to the will of an outfit dominated by Joe Stalin, Molotov, or Gromyko.

We have appeased those enemies of our country too long now.

We had better look out for our own country and our own people before it is too late.

Remember that—

No man escapes
When freedom fails,
The best men rot
In filthy jails;
And they who cried:
"Appease, appease,"
Are hanged by men
They tried to please.

Communist control of this country would mean the putting to death of probably millions of our people and the enslavement of tens of millions more. It would be the end of freedom of all kinds in this country.

It must not happen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Dr. Sayers, Director of the Bureau of Mines, giving some information about the safety situation in the coal mines.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the front page of the New York Times on the Communist drive in this country.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include newspaper articles.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 31]

Abernethy	Chapman	Gorski
Allen, Ill.	Cheif	Grant, Ala.
Allen, La.	Clements	Hale
Andersen	Clippinger	Hall
H. Carl	Combs	Edwin Arthur
Andrews, Ala.	Cotton	Harless, Ariz.
Andrews, N. Y.	Coudert	Harness, Ind.
Barden	D'Alesandro	Hartley
Bates, Ky.	Dawson, Ill.	Heffernan
Bishop	Delaney	Hinchaw
Bland	Donohue	Hooven
Bonner	Doughton	Howell
Bradley, Calif.	Elliot	Huber
Bradley, Mich.	Elsasser	Hull
Bramblett	Fallon	Jenkins, Ohio
Brophy	Feighan	Jenkins, Pa.
Buchanan	Fletcher	Johnson, Tex.
Buckley	Fogarty	Karsten, Mo.
Burke	Fuller	Kean
Byrne, N. Y.	Gallagher	Kearney
Byrnes, Wis.	Gavin	Keefe
Carson	Gerlach	Kelley
Chadwick	Gordon	Keogh

Kirwan	O'Brien	Simpson, Pa.
Klein	Pace	Smith, Wis.
Knutson	Passman	Somers
Larcade	Pfeifer	Taylor
Lyle	Philbin	Thomason
McMillan, S. C.	Plumley	Towe
Maloney	Potts	Vall
Mansfield, Tex.	Price, Fla.	Vinson
Meade, Ky.	Rains	Wadsworth
Meyer	Rayfield	Whitten
Mills	Rooney	Williams
Morgan	Sadlak	Winstead
Morrison	Sadowski	Woodruff
Murray, Wis.	Shafer	
Nodar	Sikes	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 318 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 167) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to protect the funds of his office by purchasing insurance, in the amount of \$50,000, providing protection against loss with respect to such funds. Until otherwise provided by law, premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers signed by the Sergeant at Arms and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On March 22, 1947:

H. R. 1968. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

On March 27, 1947:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution making an appropriation for expenses incident to the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest.

On March 29, 1947:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry; 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.

On March 31, 1947:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard;

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of

title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

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. 2489, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Readjustment benefits: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Readjustment benefits," \$523,836,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 9, line 5, strike out the sum "\$523,836,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$873,836,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am restoring by this amendment, and the House will if it adopts the amendment, the \$350,000,000 cut which was made by the committee in connection with this matter. There was an item of \$624,000,000 which was expended to meet 1946 requirements, about which there was considerable confusion in the testimony and direct confusion in the main table that we considered on page 4 of the justification that General Bradley presented to us. We had General Bradley up after his representatives called our attention to it late yesterday. This question took place while the general was there:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You can see in this testimony that Mr. CASE refers to how apparently there was some trouble on the cut which we made, and there was apparently some misunderstanding, but that testimony certainly indicated that that cut was in order.

General BRADLEY. If I misled you there, I am sorry, because I was discussing the amount needed for the rest of the year. I also did not begin back and pick up this \$24,000,000 that we started short.

Now, that is the reason that cut was made. We were deceived by this page 4 of the justifications which we had before us when the General was before us and this did not show the \$624,000,000 expenditure, and although we made the most careful analysis that we could of the picture, we did not run into that testimony and these figures. I am sorry that the committee made that mistake, and I can see nothing else to do under the circumstances except to offer this amendment. I hope it will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on his strategy. He was wise enough to sense the temper of the House and its determination to increase the appropriation to the amount

requested by the Bureau. At this late date, in a deathbed repentance, it is proposed to restore the \$350,000,000 cut.

Something has been said about deception. If there was any deception it was self-deception, because this whole matter, including the expenditure of the \$624,908,509 in 1946, the first half of the fiscal year, is plainly set forth in the table on page 650 of the hearings. This table was before the committee at the time the bill was marked up—at the time it was determined to make this unwarranted cut in this important provision for the veterans. There could have been no mistake about it. It stood out like an elephant in a flower garden.

The table lists the total amount of money available for the year. The first question that naturally would have been asked—if they had not known already—would have been, "How much of it have you left at this time?" It is evident that the insistent fight made by the minority to restore this item, and the obvious support of the House on the floor yesterday during the debate on the amendment has not been without results.

To have passed the bill as it was submitted to the House yesterday without this \$350,000,000 would have been to deny the veterans benefits and advantages to which they are entitled under veteran's legislation enacted by the Congress by practically unanimous vote. I am glad the motion comes from that side, although we had the identical motion ready to offer from this side and the House was ready to pass it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it strikes me it is just a little unfortunate that the gentleman from Missouri was not present during a great deal of the hearings on this bill so that his committee might have had the benefit of his knowledge; also that the gentleman was not present at the time that this item in the bill was marked up. I am not criticizing the gentleman, for the gentleman's many duties may have called him elsewhere, and I can add that it was not my privilege to be present during a great deal of the testimony of General Bradley because the Committee on War Appropriations was meeting at the same time, and I was there much of the time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the gentleman will let me proceed; then if I have time I shall be glad to yield. The hearings, of course, are available to everyone.

Let me call your attention to the following statements made during the testimony of General Bradley and appearing at page 638. The chairman asked General Bradley how much money had been spent month by month. They went over the various months, and the Chairman said:

The CHAIRMAN. In January a little under \$90,000,000; with \$15,000,000 it would be \$105,000,000. If you call it \$110,000,000, you would be getting to pretty near a stable average; would you not? It ought not to run over \$110,000,000.

General BRADLEY. Under present conditions that ought to be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. On that basis \$550,000,000 ought to take care of the last 5 months, which would make about \$1,505,000,000 for the year. This was 7 months. The first 6 months was \$955,000,000. So that \$550,000,000 would cover your requirements for the way the thing looks now.

Mr. MOORE. That would be that one particular phase.

Mr. Moore was the finance officer.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I am asking you about.

General BRADLEY. We think that will. You see the figures I gave you a minute ago on which the estimates were based were made up last fall, and we anticipated about 1,250,000 average, and now we are getting only about 1,150,000.

In other words, last fall, when they made up their deficiency estimates, they estimated they would have a million and a quarter veterans getting the readjustment allowances. Now it is running about 1,150,000 as an average. So, taking the figures which General Bradley had given and running them back to him and asking him if \$550,000,000 would be sufficient for the balance of the year, the chairman was entitled to think, on General Bradley's replies, that the amount suggested would cover the requirements. That is, the \$1,505,000,000 on which the committee's figures were predicated.

In the same way, during the testimony on the estimates the chairman asked General Bradley about the funds required for Army and Navy pensions based upon the monthly expenditure experience. And in the same way General Bradley answered him on that, and said it looked like they could do with \$241,000,000 instead of \$441,000,000. In other words on Army and Navy pensions General Bradley said that a cut of \$200,000,000 could be made. He reiterated that this morning and the figures on that saving will not be changed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fact that both in the subcommittee and in the full committee Republicans and Democrats alike were unanimous on both these matters?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. And is it not a further fact that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] at no time prior to the time the bill came on the floor indicated that the cuts as made were not properly made?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is a fact. The action of the committee so far as anyone knew was unanimous, and if the gentleman had some other information the committee did not get the benefit of it. In any event, the figures that were presented by the committee were on the basis of the testimony that I have cited, and General Bradley this morning expressed his regrets that his replies had unintentionally misled the committee.

In addition to that, it should be pointed out that the general table at page 4 of the estimates showing the amount of funds that had been appropriated for 1947 gave a larger amount than was needed to meet 12 months' expenditures at the rate of actual expenditures. The explanation is that actually some of these

funds which were listed as appropriated for 1947 were used in 1946 fiscal year.

In fact, \$624,000,000 was spent before June 30, 1946, which explains the misunderstanding that developed. There is even a definite possibility that the amount of the budget estimate being provided by the chairman's amendment will not meet the requirements. In that case, we hope that an additional deficiency estimate may be considered before the end of the fiscal year so we can get on an even keel and start the new fiscal year with a clean slate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Missouri and my friend who has just spoken, I am glad that this matter has been taken care of in the way it will be in a few minutes; however, the action to be taken shows the constructive import of a minority party in this body. The Democratic Party, as I have said on several occasions, the role of our party, is as a constructive critic, a constructive proposer and a constructive opposer. In other words, the role of a minority party under constitutional government is one of constructiveness and the Democratic Party in the House yesterday under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] as well as others, who spoke yesterday on this bill, lived up to the highest ideals of that role, in calling the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that a very serious mistake had been made in the sum of \$350,000,000, a matter of grave import to the veterans of this country. I congratulate the gentlemen on my side for their constructive leadership of yesterday which was brought about, I am sure, mainly as the result of the leadership of the minority party in taking the action that will be taken today and in the action taken by the leadership of the majority party, and I want to express to them my congratulations for recognizing the power, the force and the logic of the constructive criticism and the constructive suggestions made only yesterday by the leaders of the Democratic Party in connection with this bill, bringing back into the bill \$350,000,000, which means so much and will mean so much between now and June 30 to the veterans of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

GEN. OMAR BRADLEY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, of course, I am for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to restore this appropriation, but I rise at this time to deplore the unjust

criticism that is being heaped on General Bradley.

I saw the same thing done to General Hines 2 years ago. I served in this House as a member of the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation in the minority, for many years and 8 years while General Hines was head of the Veterans' Administration. I never knew a more conscientious public servant in my life than Frank Hines. Two years ago an investigation was stirred up and some writers poured into the RECORD statements that when run down were found to be made by inmates of insane institutions.

It embarrassed the Administration and General Hines resigned and became Ambassador to Panama. Now, the same type of attacks are being made on General Bradley, one of the great heroes of the war through which we have just passed.

When General Bradley became head of the Veterans' Administration he came before our committee. I said, "Now, General, remember you have only been through a war up to this time. It may look like a sewing circle by the time you get through with this job."

I am not saying that everything that is done by the Veterans' Administration is perfect, but suppose you keep on until you drive General Bradley from that position, just whom will you put in his place? Why disturb an institution that is doing so much for the servicemen of this Nation by continuously nagging that great soldier, that great American, who is now head of the Veterans' Administration?

I just wanted to utter these few words of protest and say to you that General Bradley has one of the hardest jobs that ever fell to the lot of an individual any time, anywhere. It is one of the biggest jobs in the world, and the less criticism, unjust criticism, that is hurled at him, the better he will be enabled to discharge the duties of that exalted office.

For my part I say that General Bradley is doing a splendid job. Let's help him and not hinder him in the discharge of his duties as head of the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military and naval insurance: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Military and naval insurance," \$3,125,500, to remain available until expended.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would not burden the RECORD with a personal reference but for the fact that reference repeatedly has been made by the gentleman who has just spoken to my absence from the committee.

It is a matter of common knowledge in the committee that I was a member of two subcommittees meeting simultaneously, devoting part time to each committee, and in addition was a victim of the flu a considerable part of the time the two committees were in session. For

that reason I was unable to attend the meeting of the committee when the bill was reported and certainly would not have agreed to the item had I been present. I was, however, present when the bill was marked up in the subcommittee and offered numerous suggestions, but not a single suggestion I made was given the slightest attention. So the statement made that it was unanimous is not sustained by the record.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, maybe the coolness with which the gentleman was received was what gave him the flu.

Mr. CANNON. The warm friendship of all members of the subcommittee more than made up for the official chilliness accorded my humble suggestions.

But we must not get away from the one proposition, Mr. Chairman, that an attempt has been made here to deprive the veterans of \$350,000,000 without which we could not have carried out the provisions of the GI law. The proponents of the cut planned to cut that much money from the bill and drafted the bill with that in mind and wrote the report and brought it in here on the floor. Only our determined opposition to the cut here on the floor yesterday—and the obvious support accorded us from both sides of the aisle—brought about the change which they propose this morning. They marched up the hill. They saw the situation. And they promptly marched down again.

Now, the only alibi offered is that they did not know about this \$624,000,000 spent in the first half of the fiscal year. It was like a headlight on a locomotive at midnight. It could not have been overlooked. It is here in the table on page 650 of the hearings. They had this table before them in print when they marked up the bill. All of that has been said here—all the citations of colloquy with General Bradley cannot conceal the fact that they made this cut of \$350,000,000 with their eyes open. Any other version would be a sad reflection on the ability and alertness of the large number of experienced men at the majority end of the table who made a searching cross-examination of all witnesses who testified on behalf of the Veterans' Bureau. Any suggestion that they did not know that any part of the money for the fiscal year had been spent in the first half of the year constitutes one of the most transparent alibis ever offered on this floor.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I must offer condign criticism against the members of the Committee on Appropriations for the failure to include moneys for payment of judgments obtained in the Court of Claims and approved by the Supreme Court, approximately \$2,000 for the salaries for past services rendered by Goodwin B. Watson and William E. Dodd, Jr., formerly members of the Communications Commission staff, and Robert Morss Lovett, former Government counsel of the Virgin Islands. The Supreme Court held that the action of the last Congress in depriving these men of their salaries was a bill of attainder. We now thumb our nose at the Supreme

Court and still refuse those salaries to those three gentlemen, although that Court said our previous action was illegal. Thus we continue an illegality and refuse to admit our error.

As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for many years and as a student of the excesses growing out of the actions of the French Chamber of Deputies in passing bills of attainder during the Reign of Terror, I think the Committee on Appropriations was woefully in error when it previously deleted these salaries, and this Congress was woefully in error in adopting the views of the Committee on Appropriations. Now the Committee on Appropriations repeats its sin by deleting the salary of one Warren of the Conciliation Service and by still refusing justice and earned salaries—now reduced to judgments against the United States—to Messrs. Dodd, Watson, and Lovett.

Let me read you briefly from the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of United States against Lovett:

What is involved here is a congressional proscription of Lovett, Watson, and Dodd, prohibiting their ever holding a Government job. Were this case to be not justiciable, congressional action, aimed at three named individuals, which stigmatized their reputation and seriously impaired their chance to earn a living, could never be challenged in any court. Our Constitution did not contemplate such a result. To quote Alexander Hamilton, "A limited Constitution . . . [is] one which contains certain specified exceptions to the legislative authority; such, for instance, as that it shall pass no bills of attainder, no ex post facto laws, and the like. Limitations of this kind can be preserved in practice no other way than through the medium of the courts of justice; whose duty it must be to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void. Without this, all the reservations of particular rights or privileges would amount to nothing."

We will again be flying in the face of the principle enunciated by Alexander Hamilton if we follow the lead of the Committee on Appropriations and agree to cut out the salary of this man Warren. To my mind, this action is small; it is petty. Not much money is involved, but a very bad practice is involved, as is a very bad precedent, a precedent that may well come back to plague us in the future. If we can cut off the salary of Warren, then we can cut off the salary of an Ambassador, a Federal judge, a Cabinet officer, the President himself. Such action destroys the separation of powers theory of our Government. Cutting out salary is tantamount to dismissal—an executive act.

This is the first time I know of that an appropriations committee has recommended that a debt sanctified by a decision of the Supreme Court shall not be paid.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. In connection with that, may I say to the gentleman that in the case of Dalton against the United States in 1930 the Committee on Appropriations refused to pay a judgment of \$11,900. That came up several times, and an amendment was offered on the floor in

several subsequent years, and it was refused.

Mr. CELLER. I am not familiar with that instance. I am not informed of the court that rendered the judgment. I probably should be. I probably am delinquent in not recalling that incident. I do not recall whether the judgment was rendered by a State or Federal court. But I know it is repugnant to the Nation's conscience to repudiate a debt. A debt was incurred when these men rendered services and when Mr. Warren rendered services. After the services were rendered and a debt has been incurred, by an ex post facto enactment you cut off that salary, you repudiate that debt.

Mr. TABER. I presume the gentleman is familiar with the provisions of the Constitution that no money shall be authorized to be paid out of the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. I am well aware, of course, that the powers of appropriation reside in the legislative branch, but in the exercise of those powers the legislature cannot poach on the preserves of the judicial or executive branches and the legislature cannot indulge in what I might say in common parlance is lynch law, to condemn a man or woman without trial and without confrontation of witnesses and without an opportunity to be heard to defend themselves. That is what we do in the case of Warren if we delete his salary. That is what we did in the case of the three gentlemen I mentioned—Messrs. Dodd, Lovett, and Godwin Watson. We simply said in effect, "You men are guilty," because somebody somewhere said that they were associated with certain subversive organizations, but they had no chance to defend themselves and confront their accuser before this body—the body that sought to judge them. We acted as prosecutor and judge and jury. We have no such procedure here to permit them to exculpate themselves, to defend themselves. We simply point a finger of guilt at them and we say, "You are guilty, and you must be taken off the payrolls."

I want to say I do not harbor any sympathies for these men, if they are subversive. I may not agree with their political ideologies. If they are Communists, I want them taken off the payroll, but there are other methods by which we can take them off the payroll—legal ways. We seek to dismiss them in an illegal way. Only the executive can discharge them. We have no such rights.

The President of the United States in his wisdom recently announced a procedure to determine an employee's loyalty and we should follow that procedure, but we should not, as I said be-

fore, develop a kangaroo court here and make of justice a travesty by our action.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. If the founding fathers had expected that the Congress would exercise its power to appropriate funds in any other way than by an exercise of its discretion and the merits of each item that came up, a provision would have been inserted making the payment of judgments of this character automatic.

Mr. CELLER. I am speaking now of the Warren case, and this is what the Supreme Court says.

Mr. TABER. I am talking about what is before us.

Mr. CELLER. I am speaking about the Warren case. We cannot exercise the power of appropriation by passing what I called before ex post facto statutes or bills of attainder. Here is what the Supreme Court said:

Those who wrote our Constitution well knew the danger inherent in special legislative acts which take away life, liberty, or property, of particular named persons because the legislature thinks they are guilty of conduct which deserves punishment. They intended to safeguard the people of this country from punishment without trial by duly constituted courts. When our Constitution and Bill of Rights were written, our ancestors had ample reason to know that legislative trials and punishment were too dangerous to liberty to exist in a nation of free men and vision, and so they proscribed bills of attainder.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. In order to correct the RECORD, the gentleman stated that Dodd and Watson had no hearings and were not confronted by witnesses.

Mr. CELLER. I did not say that, sir. I did not say that. I said there were no hearings before us where we constitute ourselves as a court and strip them of their rights and privileges. A hearing before a legislative committee is not a judicial hearing, hearing where there is accorded the right of counsel, the right to be confronted with the accusers, the right of cross-examination, the right of direct examination under proper rules of procedure, with no admission of hearsay and self-serving declarations. That is what is meant when we speak of judicial hearing.

Mr. MASON. Hearings were held before the committee of this Congress and full testimony was taken.

Mr. CELLER. I agree with that, but that is not a court. That is not a procedure outlined by our Constitution whereby the condemned secures a fair trial before his rights of property or salary are taken from him. The accused are deprived of their rights under the Constitution if we do not accord them a trial where they can adequately defend themselves and have counsel and cross-examine and confront hostile witnesses. A hearing before a legislative committee is insufficient to ground the claim to deprive a man of his property or his security or his life.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after listening to my good friend from New York [Mr. CELLER]

lamenting the actions of the Appropriations Committee, I think I ought to say a word in the way of commiseration of the committee in view of all the pressure that is being exercised at the present time. To me it is an astonishing spectacle that pressure of the most highly organized type is becoming so rife in the country today with respect to the actions of the Appropriations Committee and the House of Representatives in respect of appropriations for the Federal Government.

One of the latest editions of my very fine collection—and I assure you I am getting a collection from all over the country—is a letter sent out by the National Customs Service Association, dated the 27th of March 1947, and signed by one J. F. Doyle, the president of the association. It is a very interesting document, and I think the House and the country ought to know a little something about it.

It starts out in the first paragraph by saying:

In anticipation of favorable action by the Senate on the customs budget—

You see under the rule one should not mention the deliberations of another body, but already they are anticipating favorable action from another body. They are anticipating that the money will be restored. They are anticipating, of course, that they are going to roll back the well-deliberated action of the House of Representatives and the subcommittee that spent weeks and weeks in exploring these matters.

They say further:

This letter is being distributed so as to put you all on your toes.

Get ready, boys, for one grand offensive upon the Congress of the United States that is charged under the Constitution as the guardian of the purse and the taxpayer's money. So get on your toes now for a grand assault upon the Public Treasury.

They say further:

We must all be ready to get going.

Be ready in all corners of the country now, not only to retain your spot on the pay roll but to get additional spots on the pay roll.

This letter goes on:

Contact particularly the House Subcommittee on Appropriations.

And then it mentions the names. They forget about the antilobbying statute, and perhaps it needs a little doctoring up. It is deficient in the sense that you have to use public funds to carry on this lobbying work. The time has come when we are going to have to give serious consideration to this business of these people who are entrenched on the pay rolls of the country pressuring Congress to put back money that should have been taken out long ago.

So, "Contact members of the subcommittee and then contact other members of the Appropriations Committee," and it names them.

Then, I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] it says, "Write particularly to Congressman TABER." You see, he is chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Write par-

ticularly to him. Address your missives and your telegrams to him, and put the bee on JOHN TABER, who has been fighting the battle of economy for a quarter of a century for the people of this country in this Congress. JOHN TABER, who has been on the Appropriations Committee since 1923, has done a magnificent job for the country. So, boys, put on the pressure now and see if you cannot weaken him, now that he is chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Then they have this further very significant thing. Now, listen, if you have any doubts about these telegrams coming from home:

Granting of the \$36,000,000 as approved by the Budget Bureau for personnel will allow the retention of all employees and the addition of 600 new employees.

The subcommittee was correct. They wanted to put on 600 more and we said, "No." So full steam ahead now. Put the pressure on Congress and on all Members and get some favorable response from them. That is the kind of propaganda that is going out by the ton at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some of it has been inspired here in Washington.

Now, I will read a little more from this very edifying document:

Have your letters and telegrams ready. Have your contacts made.

If anybody has got any influence now, have him call his Congressman. Have him send telegrams, have him send letters, find out who your Congressman is. Maybe none of these boys have had contact with him before, but find out now, because maybe your job is in jeopardy, but be sure and contact your Congressman. Maybe he had not shown up in other days and other years, but contact your Congressman now and find out who he is.

Do not miss any chance to convince your Congressman that he should act favorably.

Lay it on the line now. Tell every Member of the House and of the Senate that you demand favorable action to put this money back, including money for 600 over and above those who are on the pay roll at the present time. They are not satisfied with that kind of pressure. They go on to say:

Letters and telegrams from home are needed.

Circulate around in your neighborhood, find out somebody who knows the Congressman, and get them to send in letters and telegrams.

Petitions also will help. Circulate one in your own division or room.

Throughout the customs service they are urging that they send petitions to Congress to break down their resistance

in the interest of the taxpayers of the country so that more people can be added to the Federal pay roll.

Contact newspapers.

Now you know why all these articles have been appearing in the country press, and in the daily press. The boys are busy, they are giving a good account of themselves. I saw an article in the New Hampshire paper which says this, if it is put into effect, will result in dope smugglers running wild all over the country. And so the pressure is on. They are getting the word out to the country newspapers:

Contact chambers of commerce and business houses. Contact veterans. Contact railroads and steamships. Contact politicians.

That is great. Contact politicians and have them give Congress the business. Maybe there is a State legislator or a State senator out home; maybe there is a chief of police or a sheriff who is elected to public office; anybody, any elected official, any politician, get him to write in and tell the Congress how serious it is that the Senate ought to put back this money and the House ought to go along.

Contact your governor, the mayors of every city, all State and city officials, and everyone or anyone who can help.

Yes, they are getting ready to go out and put the pressure on Congress. They have got to get that "dough" back into their bill because there are 600 additional jobs that probably will be available in the 1948 election. So full steam ahead, boys, get everybody from the governor on down, the chamber of commerce, your neighbors; put the pressure on those humble Representatives in Washington, make them put back the "dough." The sanctity of the Federal pay roll must not be profaned by those profane Representatives of the people on Capitol Hill who are trying to scare up an occasional dollar for the great forgotten man in America, John Q. Taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a Member of Congress, and as a lawyer, I say the Supreme Court has a good deal of repenting to do before it will ever direct me how to legislate, especially after the Bridges case. Besides, it is not the prerogative of the Supreme Court to tell the Congress what to do. The Constitution vests that power in us.

I voted to eliminate these men from the pay roll before and I am going to vote so again.

To show you the kind of propaganda they are spreading all over the country they will be coming in here and demanding that the Supreme Court put back these men that President Truman is getting ready to throw off the pay roll.

I have here an advertisement that appeared in both big New York newspapers, an advertisement by the Communist Party, and to show you how they are going to concentrate on others I want to read this for the edification of the gentle-

man from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It states:

Act now.

To outlaw the Communist Party is to scrap the Bill of Rights.

That is a criminal party or organization engaged in a criminal conspiracy to overthrow this Government, a criminal plan for spreading poisonous propaganda for the purpose of destroying American institutions. There is a bill now pending before the Committee on Un-American Activities, a successor to the same committee before which these people had their hearing, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] was on the committee at that time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. They were convicted upon their own testimony?

Mr. RANKIN. That was my understanding.

Mr. MASON. By words from their own mouths?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. Now, they come back here, after the Supreme Court has made a first-class citizen out of Harry Bridges, and try to have the Supreme Court tell us how to legislate.

This Communist advertisement goes on and states:

Protest this effort.

Telegraph or write to (1) President Harry S. Truman, White House, Washington, D. C.

They ask these people to write to President Truman, as if he does not have enough mail on this subject already.

Who is the next one they want the people to write to? Listen to this:

(2) Representative RANKIN, House Un-American Committee, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

Just imagine the message in garbled English that will come to my desk as a result of this appeal.

They ask them to write to President Truman and to write to me.

Who is the third one?

(3) Your own Congressman.

That is, after they find out who he is, I presume.

No; this element that is attempting to browbeat Congress into keeping men on the Federal pay roll who are found to be unfit and unworthy has brought about a great deal of the trouble that we are having today. It has brought about the necessity for President Truman's issuing his Executive order recently to drive from the Federal pay roll those people who are subservient to a foreign power and who are working for the destruction of this Government.

Let us be men, let us vote our own convictions, and let the Supreme Court know that the Congress of the United States will do its own legislating.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Operating expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Operating expenses," \$38,220.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 11, line 6, strike out "\$38,220" and insert in lieu thereof "\$63,700."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment. We are glad to see the bill improved.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that I personally am responsible for the amount stated in the bill, and I personally want to be responsible for restoring this amount. It is for the conducting of our recreational facilities here in the District, and it is made necessary by action of this House in raising the wages of the people employed in those recreational facilities. I think it is mighty important that they be kept going at their present status.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' SERVICES

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], this question, while it is fresh in my mind and before I forget it, if it is true, according to newspaper reports, that you have ordered the discontinuance of construction of veterans' hospitals in this country?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, that is not correct. I have no authority to do anything of that kind. I have tried, insofar as I have been able, to persuade the Veterans' Administration to take over and operate hospitals that the Army and the Navy are using or have been using, which they are ready to surrender, so that they might have some place to take care of these boys temporarily, and I have also urged that the Veterans' Administration use the 3,000 beds that they were supposed to use in the Navy hospitals that are being operated by the Navy, so that they might be better able to take care of the boys who need hospitalization.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to also ask the distinguished gentleman this question: How could the plan operate without sufficient money? We also have inadequate staffs.

Mr. TABER. There is no question about sufficient money being available to the Veterans' Administration for those hospital operations.

Mr. DORN. I understand that in a lot of places right now, in addition to the 23,000 men who are on the waiting list, we have lack of funds to provide for adequate staffs to take care of some of those we do have.

Mr. TABER. Whether there is or not, that matter has never been presented to our committee. Frankly, from the best

computation that I was able to make, I felt that for salaries and expenses the chief of the Veterans' Administration had a margin of about \$25,000,000 for the balance of this fiscal year. Be that as it may, if an estimate were presented to us for our consideration, or if any facts were brought out which justified our going into anything of that kind, we would have hearings upon it and go the limit in trying to provide.

Mr. DORN. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman that the American Legion has quite a few facts on men that are on the waiting list for hospitalization, men of both wars, and also inadequate staffs in certain sections, and also that 14,000 beds of the Army and the Navy, civilian and State hospitals, are already being used right now.

Mr. TABER. Well, the gentleman may be right. Instead of using about 5,500 Navy beds they have dropped down to using 2,500 beds. That is the picture as far as utilization of Navy beds goes. I have felt that they should take advantage of their opportunity to use the Navy beds that are available to them. Maybe I am wrong in trying to get them to do that, but I felt it would relieve the pressure on the bed situation.

Mr. DORN. Did or did not the gentleman ask them to suspend construction? That is the report. Whether or not it is erroneous I do not know, so I am asking the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I did not ask them to suspend construction, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, since we are speaking of the beds for the veterans' hospitals, I should like to bring to the attention of the House a thing that has alarmed me very much, and that is General Eisenhower's reported statement that there should be one head over the Army and Navy and Veterans' Administration hospitals. I believe the Members of the House would agree with me that the veterans want to be hospitalized, in the main, in their own veterans' hospitals under their own veterans' physicians. The entire membership of the House will want to look into that situation with me and see that the Army and Navy do not take away that service. My understanding is that neither General Kirk nor Admiral Swanson want to consolidate the service. I believe that the veterans would not get as satisfactory care if that were done. There are many things that veterans require that are not so easily adjusted if they are hospitalized in Army or Navy hospitals. That is just one reason for not consolidating them.

Under the GI bill of rights we authorized the appropriation of \$500,000,000 for the construction of hospital beds, so there can be no question of there not being enough money to go ahead with hospital construction. We have all been greatly distressed that for one reason or another the construction of veterans' hospitals has not gone forward during the past 2 years. To me it seems inexcusable.

I should like to say to the House, in view of the fact that it has been stated quite often that General Bradley resents surveys or inspections or investigations, that as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I have the opinion, in which I think the other members of the committee will all back me up, that General Bradley not only does not resent our survey of his installations but rather welcomes our suggestions. I saw General Bradley this morning, and I am under the impression that he is very glad of any work done by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and its staff insofar as the curtailment of \$350,000,000 in this appropriation for veterans is concerned. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] acted promptly to reinstate the appropriation after the real need was shown for the appropriation at this time. I think it was work done by our Veterans' Affairs Committee or related to it that was somewhat responsible for the Veterans' Administration correcting the mistake in the figures they gave to the Committee on Appropriations so that the figures were finally agreed to. The employee of the Veterans' Administration who gave erroneous information is no longer doing that kind of work. That is an instance of the Veterans' Administration wishing to correct any situation that is not helpful. The task of caring for over 20,000,000 veterans is a staggering task. Cooperation is necessary if we are to be successful.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am just wondering whether the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs can advise us whether or not that committee is in agreement with the policy, as I understand it, of General Bradley with respect to having the veterans' hospitals wherever possible at medical centers and large points of population where they will be easily accessible to the veterans. Is the committee in agreement with General Bradley on that policy?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, as chairman, I cannot speak for the entire membership of the committee. We have 21 new members on the committee now, and the chairman does not know the views of all the members. I do think the committee would agree entirely that it is important to have hospitals where the most expert medical advice is available. On the other hand, it has been repeatedly stated that hospitals should be made accessible to the veterans. General Bradley and General Hawley deserve an enormous amount of credit for the fine medical and nursing service they are giving the veterans, the very fine outside consultants that are being used, and the outside clinics that make more beds available in the hospitals, outside clinics which, because they are available, allow the men to continue their work, since they can go to the clinics and still continue on their jobs.

In this bill is a ceiling of 100 persons in the Public Relations Division of the Veterans' Administration. I am of the

opinion that the other body will modify that cut in personnel. I should like to point out certain functions that Division performs:

The increase in staff of VA public relations was made by General Bradley because the previous Appropriations Committee established a ceiling of 300 people for this operation and specifically recommended that the then existing staff in this operation be built up in order that more and better information might be disseminated to veterans and their dependents as to their rights and benefits and how and where to obtain them. It was felt by the previous Appropriations Committee that an organized, nationwide effort of this sort would accomplish two things:

(a) Render a service to which veterans are entitled.

(b) Ease the ever increasing burden of letters, inquiries, misdirected claims, applications and complaints pouring into Veterans' Administration.

There is considerable evidence that VA public relations has more than paid its way in accomplishing those results. VA radio programs alone have done an effective job of disseminating information to veterans.

The figures on VA radio programs are interesting:

During the first 7 months of fiscal 1947 VA spent \$92,212 on radio salaries and \$17,609 on records. That is a total of \$109,820.

The programs those salaries and records created were aired by radio networks and stations throughout the country to the tune of \$5,170,899 worth of radio time for which VA paid nothing!

I want a complete analysis of the functions and effectiveness of this activity before too drastic cuts are made.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a few minutes ago, appeared to be very, very much disturbed over a letter that the president of the Customs Employees' Association had sent out. After 16 years of being on the majority side in the House and knowing what the results are of people exercising their constitutional right of petition—and that is all that this gentleman was doing—I would suggest to my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that he view these experiences from a more tolerant angle because what Mr. Doyle did—I think that was the gentleman's name—was under a constitutional right which he, as well as every other American citizen, possesses to petition their public officials. Whether or not he did it in a way that pleases my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is not the question. I think what he did is all right.

I remember in past years receiving many letters from the National Association of Manufacturers. I did not take the floor and accuse them of pressure of any kind. I received those letters recognizing the fact that whether or not I agreed with them that organization had a constitutional right to communicate with me.

It is only recently that the wool interests in my section of the country—and

I do not know that any of them are Democrats up my way, but I do know many of them whom I personally like—contacted me. They are businessmen. They have contacted me through the years, and I hope they will continue to do so as long as I am a Member of this body. I never considered they were doing anything other than exercising their right as American citizens to petition their public officials.

I have in mind the fight now between certain Western States and western interests and New England on the question of export of leather and hides. I have taken the position which I think is for the best interests of New England. I do not consider they are doing anything terrible or engaging in any sinister act in communicating with me. I consider they were doing so in the exercise of their constitutional right of petition.

However, Mr. Doyle's letter did certainly produce great results. In exercising his right as a humble American citizen, he has started into operation something that apparently disturbs greatly my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. In any event, it has brought to the country the fact that the appropriations for the next year for the Customs Service, unless increased, will seriously affect that service which the agency will be able to give to the business interests of America.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, on page 1367, I inserted a letter which I received from Commissioner Johnson which fairly sets forth the situation showing why they have had to lay the men off. In the deficiency appropriations carried in this bill, some slight relief will be afforded between now and June 30, but it will not meet the situation that will exist after June 30 because in the appropriation bills we have passed heretofore relating to the Treasury Department there is a provision, so far as terminal leave or annual leave pay is concerned, that it is to be paid out of 1947 appropriations and not out of 1948. The committee and the House by that action tapped into the 1947 appropriation in relation to separations, that ordinarily would have taken place on or after July 1.

But my main purpose in rising is to call to the attention of my friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] impersonally and in the most friendly and warm spirit, the fact that for 16 years we Democrats have received those communications on this side and we have considered it the constitutional right of citizens to petition their public officials. The letter that was sent out by the president of the Customs Association was one that he had a perfect right to send out. In doing so he is exercising his right as an American citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

COURTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a new member and I am beginning to learn that matters are not always debated where they appear on the agenda. I believe it would

not be fitting if some member did not visit on this side of the aisle to call attention to the failure to give full faith and credit to a judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States. As a lawyer I am shocked by the proposal before us to deny such full faith and credit to a judgment of the Supreme Court. The separation of the powers between the Judiciary, the Executive and the Congress is basic in our constitutional Government, we have found it the surest check on tyranny. There may be a tyranny of Congress just as there may be a tyranny of the Judiciary or the Executive. I do not want such tyranny nor, do I believe, does any clear-thinking Member of this House. For today the objection may be that the three men in question are fellow travelers I do not quarrel with that; tomorrow, it may be United States citizens of German, Polish, Italian or Russian extraction; it may be Catholics or Jews or it may be Negroes. Once respect for the coordinate branches of Government breaks down, there is no end to the mischief which can be done. No democracy can survive without self-discipline. I can sympathize with the feelings of the gentlemen of the Deficiency Subcommittee, when they speak of the odor relative to these cases, and I can appreciate the feelings of these and other members who believe sincerely that they have suffered here for years under the tyranny of a Chief Executive; but the people gave us a mandate not to substitute a new tyranny but to do away with the old. I believe we must honor these judgments of the Supreme Court.

I hope and pray that in the same spirit of public interest that some changes have already been made in this bill today, and on the basis of sustaining the coordinate branches of Government as we ourselves wish them to be sustained, the Deficiency Subcommittee may again consider this matter, small in money and yet very great in principle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public assistance and children's services: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Public assistance and children's services," \$155,200.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to interrogate the chairman of the subcommittee to clear up some misconceptions that apparently exist with regard to the availability of funds. It is important that these items that have just been read be made available as of March 1. Is it the understanding of the chairman that is possible.

Mr. TABER. My understanding is that this language as it reads would make funds available for the whole of the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. HORAN. Then there is no question as to their availability at any time in the fiscal year 1947?

Mr. TABER. Within the limits of the law which authorizes their distribution.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: On page 15, after line 21, insert the following:

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of 1946, \$6,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not authorized by law.

The statute which purports to authorize it provides as follows:

Such payments to any State in any fiscal year during the period 1947 to 1950, inclusive, shall be made upon condition that each dollar thereof will be matched during such year by \$1 from sources within the State determined by the Secretary to have been expended in connection with the school-lunch program under this act.

For the purpose of determining whether the matching requirements of this section and section 10, respectively, have been met, the reasonable value of donated services, supplies, facilities, and equipment as certified, respectively, by the State educational agency and in case of schools receiving funds pursuant to section 10, by such schools.

The total appropriation distributed amounts to \$72,975,000; the total matching complete \$11,470,000.

There has been complete failure of matching by local authorities within the provisions of the statute. Under the circumstances they have not complied with the law and there is no opportunity for a deficiency here.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, as the amendment indicates, the appropriation proposed here is to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of 1946. The act speaks for itself. Under the law the question of matching is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is not a matter to be determined by this body. That is a function specifically delegated by the act to the executive in charge of the program—the Secretary of Agriculture. There is no question about the amendment being in order. The sole proposition involved is to carry out the provisions of the act. I submit that the point of order is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is germane to the bill and the appropriation authorized by law; therefore overrules the point of order presented by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, there is an old saying that the shoemaker's children are without shoes. That is the situation before us in this bill today.

The bill carries \$300,000,000 for food for foreign countries. Under the provisions of the bill we provide money to feed children all over Europe. Out of this \$300,000,000 America pays to feed the children of every race, kindred, and tongue, Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, the learned and the unlearned, the washed and the unwashed, from Kamchatka to Karahissar. Foreign children are provided for but there is nothing in this bill for the children at home. The shoemaker's children are without shoes. American children are without food.

The evidence adduced when the authorizing legislation for the school-lunch program was before the House showed an appalling number of children in every metropolitan center in the United States who went to school without breakfast.

Mr. Chairman, the efficacy of the school-lunch program, and its universal need throughout the country, is demonstrated in a vivid and convincing manner in the reports from the draft boards in the recent war. Vast numbers of young men were disqualified by the draft boards and rejected for Army service because of disabilities directly due to lack of an adequate diet in the period of adolescence.

This program is now in operation in schools in every congressional district in the Union, and it is the practically universal testimony of teachers and parents that in schools in which the program has been adopted and noon lunches are being served, there has been a notable increase in the weight and health of the child, and simultaneously there has been a corresponding increase in scholarship. A hungry child lacks the power of concentration and study. An ill-nourished child does not learn as readily.

And results are not confined to the schoolroom or to the school life of the child. They are reflected in the training and ability, the body and mind of the adult. There is nothing this House can do that will contribute more directly to the physique and mentality of the next generation than the support of this appropriation to effectuate the National School Lunch Act passed by such an overwhelming majority in both Houses in the last Congress.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Is it not a fact that we have appropriated money to care for the cattle of our country, yet we neglect our children?

Mr. CANNON. That is true. We have just made an appropriation of \$9,000,000 to control diseases of livestock in Mexico. Now we are asked to refuse an appropriation of \$6,000,000 to ameliorate malnutrition of American children in every State of the Union.

One of the things President Hoover particularly emphasized when he was before the committee was that unless European children are fed now the next generation will be dwarfed and stunted for life. You can starve an adult and there will be no ill effects if proper food is provided in time. But if a growing child is starved, the child is permanently injured both mentally and physically,

regardless of the food eventually provided. Children deprived too long of proper nourishment never attain in later life full growth and stamina or the highest degree of mental alertness. European children must be fed now. And for the same reason American children must be fed during school years. Will you deny them that priceless heritage by refusing to add this small amount to the pending bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this school-lunch proposition comes here without any hearings before the committee, without any estimate from the President, without any approval of the Bureau of the Budget, and let me say to you that the matter was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and the Bureau of the Budget refused to make an estimate.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to remind the gentleman that I asked for permission to come before the Committee on Appropriations in behalf of this deficiency item, for that purpose.

Mr. TABER. After the hearings had all been closed.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. At the first opportunity I could come, I asked.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is this Congress going to let the Bureau of the Budget legislate for it?

Mr. TABER. No; but you know the Bureau of the Budget is the President's representatives, and I thought that you folks might be interested in knowing what the executive branch of the Government thinks of it.

Now, I want to give you the picture just as I see it. Seventy-five million dollars has been appropriated already. The total funds to match this appropriation that have been made by States and local governments run \$11,470,400 and those were the figures submitted by the Agriculture Department to the Bureau of the Budget.

Let me say to you that the children do not get free lunches. According to the amounts that were paid toward these lunches, the children paid \$127,000,000. Of the amount that was allotted by the Agriculture Department upwards of \$6,000,000 was for distribution. Well, if these things were operated right in the localities, they would be taken care of for less money. Now, the Federal Government is right on the verge of bankruptcy. Most of our State and local governments are in good condition. Many of them have surpluses. There has been no local matching that was at all satisfactory. The matching in New York State was the highest in proportion. There it was \$2,500,000 against Federal expenditures of something like \$4,400,000, and the statute requires that this matching be dollar for dollar, which it very evidently is not. Illinois comes next among

those that matched, and there, as against about \$3,100,000 they matched \$858,000. But no single State has matched according to the law. If they had matched according to the law, instead of the \$75,000,000 being used, there would be a very large surplus at this time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. What the gentleman says may be right, but does that relieve us of our responsibility to provide hungry children throughout the Nation with something which they need at a time when they need it?

Mr. TABER. I do not think it is necessary for the Federal Government to provide children with these lunches. I think the locality should do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Where the State has failed to supply the necessary funds, they have been supplied from other local sources.

Mr. TABER. No; they have not. They have not been supplied at all. The payment for the lunches is in no possible way a compliance with the law. The law has been violated the way this money has been distributed. These States and localities have utterly failed to meet their responsibilities if they are going to continue with this operation.

Another thing I want everyone to consider is that if this bill is passed by the 1st of May, that is about as good as we can expect, and it is impossible for anything of this kind to begin to operate on a deficiency basis at that time. There would be no excuse for any money being appropriated here even if there had been a legal and valid operation of this proposition. It is time the Federal Government begins to balance its budget and that we cease to raid the Federal Treasury for every single item that is needed for the operation of schools or anything else in the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from New York has made the assertion in opposition to this amendment that there was no estimate from the President or no approval by the Bureau of the Budget. What the gentleman says is correct. However, we are doing the legislating, and on past occasions this House has acted independently of any recommendations from the Bureau of the Budget. I will concede that as the general rule and the general practice an estimate from the Budget is sought, and it is generally followed, and the appropriations are generally reduced where there are reductions, but it does not necessarily

follow that there are no exceptions made. In my years here I have many times seen estimates increased, and I have seen money appropriated where authorized by law where there was no estimate, where the Committee on Appropriations included it in a particular appropriation bill. I call the attention of my colleagues to the occasion of only a few days ago when the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill passed the House. There was a budget estimate and a Presidential recommendation for \$50,000,000 for hospital construction to carry out for the next fiscal year the provisions of the bill we passed last year. In its wisdom, and I agree with the wisdom of the subcommittee and the full committee, the committee struck out the \$50,000,000 recommended in the President's budget but included a provision permitting the agency administering the law, the United States Public Health Service or the Office of Education, the right and power to make contract obligations in the sum of \$150,000,000 during the fiscal year 1948. There was therefore no Budget recommendation for this. I think the committee acted wisely, and I approved of the action and made that approval manifest.

In the same bill there was an increase in the appropriation for cancer research. I think the appropriation of \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000 was increased to \$19,000,000.

Again, I wholeheartedly approve of that. I think there were one or two other appropriations or items in the bill where there was an increase. So I think that is a complete answer to my friend from New York [Mr. TABER], whose main argument is that there is no estimate.

The House has inserted items in bills before where there was no estimate, and so has the committee.

We must also keep in mind that my friend from New York [Mr. TABER] a few weeks ago, in answer to a question that I asked of him, frankly admitted that he personally is opposed to the school-lunch program. One thing about the gentleman—when he gives an answer, he always gives a frank answer. Of course, we have to keep in mind in interpreting his state of mind with reference to the remarks he made today is that he is personally opposed to the school-lunch program.

It seems to me that this has been a very fine program. It is now permanent law. We made it permanent law last year. No matter what the original intent of Congress was in making the appropriations in connecting it up with surpluses on the farm, that has been changed by act of Congress and we have passed permanent authorizing legislation. Therefore, we consider it in all of its aspects to be a wise policy for our Government to follow.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. The gentleman from New York in his remarks in defense of this cutting of the school-lunch program said the Federal Government was on the verge of bankruptcy.

May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, in view of the statement of the gentleman from New York: Does he

believe then that this is the time for us to cut taxes and reduce the revenue of the Federal Government?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I do not. The distinguished gentleman is correct.

The gentleman from New York is sincere in his position, but his main argument today is not a precedent for this House to follow. We have repeatedly in this House put in items in a bill where there was no estimate. The Committee on Appropriations has also done so. We did so, as I said, in the labor and security appropriation bill just a few weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have profound respect for the good judgment and integrity of my good friend from New York, but I do not subscribe to the doctrine of being penny-wise and pound-foolish. If I economize, and I am for economy, I will never economize at the expense of a hungry child.

I have taught school back in the mountains of my native east Tennessee and in the coal-mining camps. I have seen children come to school who did not have enough food at home or enough food in the little lunch baskets that they brought with them. In many instances they did not have enough food to properly nourish them.

If we appropriate this \$6,000,000 to supplement the school-lunch program, it will cost each and every person in this country the stupendous sum of 4 mills. If there is any Member of this House who feels that he or she cannot afford to invest 4 mills in the minds and bodies and souls and welfare of the school children of this country, while I am not a wealthy man, I will reimburse him or her the 4 mills that he or she is out as the result of the adoption of this amendment.

Abraham Lincoln said that a nation may be said to consist of its people, its territories, and its laws. The vital and determinative feature of a nation's life and existence, its whole future, lies in the growth and development of our boys and girls. They are the seed corn of the Nation. I know that the people of Tennessee are complying with their part of this program which the Federal Government held out to them in the law of the land, establishing the school-lunch program. Thousands of devoted women in Tennessee are canning hundreds of thousands of cans of fruit and vegetables each year that are used in preparing these lunches for the school children. We will be asked in a few days to appropriate \$400,000,000 to start with, in undertaking to take care of Greece and Turkey. Well, if we are to undertake to take care of Greece and Turkey and the other countries of the world, we must first take care of America. These boys and girls are our first line of defense. They are the hope and pride and strength of the Nation. They are the power of the people unto the salvation of the State. They will meet our enemies in the gates.

I recall that during the First World War, one of the ablest physicians and surgeons that I ever knew in all my life, Dr. James L. Heffernan, of Jellico, who was on the board of medical examiners who examined the manhood of Campbell County, my home county, for military service, referred to the fact that the men of Great Britain were so undernourished that only a small percentage of the manpower of that country was fit for military duty. He said that in his examination of the men from Campbell County he had to turn down less than 1 percent. They had been properly nourished. Great, vigorous, broad-shouldered, muscular men who were unafraid, and capable of being built into a living wall of offense and defense for their country's victory in that war.

Mr. Chairman, let us not pinch a penny or skim around the brink until we fall into perdition. Let us vote this 4 mills per capita, and my proposition will be made good to any man in this House. If he wants his 4 mills back, I will refund it to him; if he wants it back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when in 1933 and 1934 food was rotting on our farms, to relieve the situation and bring about a fair distribution of the tremendous surpluses, we provided an appropriation for a school-lunch program through which a great deal of the food that was going to waste was utilized by the children of our country. At that time nearly all of you gentlemen representing the rural districts and agricultural districts supported this proposition. But, unfortunately, of late you seem to forget that that appropriation was passed to aid you and to help the children of the poor. You do not need that aid now, because the prices that are being received for milk and other farm products are so favorable that this legislation really is not necessary at this time. But the children need these school lunches more than ever.

Does not the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] remember that in the last session the Congress passed the National School Lunch Act, which set forth a declaration of policy and authorized such appropriations for each fiscal year as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act? I quote sections 2 and 3 of the act, as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of nonprofit school-lunch programs.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Sec. 3. For each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, there

is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") to carry out the provisions of this act.

I concede that we have many school districts like those in the district of the gentleman from New York, populated by well-to-do people, who can and do provide nourishing lunches for their children, but even in those districts there are families who, due to misfortune, illnesses, or disability of the wage earner, can ill afford to pay the complete cost of these nourishing lunches.

Mr. Chairman, I observe the bill before us carries a provision for an appropriation of \$300,000,000 to feed people in Germany, Austria, and Japan, and, in fact, the committee increased the appropriation provided for Germany and Austria by \$28,000,000. But, to the minds of some, it is not necessary for us to provide for the continuation of a worth-while school-lunch program that will give proper nourishment to our own children to keep them strong in body and health.

I also notice that the committee has increased the appropriations for "Grants to States" by \$2,600,000, as well as providing for an additional appropriation of \$20,000,000 for crop insurance, yet it would deny insurance for the most valuable crop—namely, 10,000,000 school children who will be denied school lunches if provision is not made therefor.

Many letters, telegrams, and resolutions are received by me daily urging my support of a deficiency appropriation to provide for the carrying out of the school-lunch program for the remaining months of the fiscal year. I would insert some of them in the RECORD except that I will have one insertion to make in my remarks and do not wish to unduly encumber the RECORD. However, I want to say that there has not been a single appropriation proposed since I have been a Member of this Congress which has been for a more humane and deserving purpose than the one for this school-lunch program. I was hopeful that the gentleman from Missouri would offer an amendment providing at least an additional \$10,000,000 in order that the program might fully continue.

I appreciate that had it not been for the higher price of food and milk and the increased number of schools who subscribed for participation in the program, the original appropriation would have been sufficient. With the cost of food having increased by nearly 60 percent it consequently follows that this additional appropriation of several million dollars is necessary for the schools to continue to furnish luncheons for these needy children, many of whom without this balanced and nourishing sustenance would actually be hungry.

Mr. Chairman, only a few days ago you read about the terrible mine disaster in my State, outside of Centralia, Ill., where 111 miners lost their lives. Most of these men wrote letters to their loved ones while dying, and it was their urgent plea that their children should be pro-

tected and provided for. I read only a few excerpts from some of the letters:

Goodbye ——— and ———: God bless you and two boys, your father and ———. Please do as your father has told you and listen to Mom.

(Addressed to two boys): Be good boys. Please your father. O Lord help me.

Tell Dad to quit the mine, and take care of Mom, not like this.

Dear Wife: Please take care of the children.

Dear Wife: Goodbye. Forgive me. Take care of all the children.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposing this additional appropriation to continue school lunches, if adopted, will help some of these children, will relieve some of the widows and mothers of these children in saving them from hunger. If only the children of those miners who died will obtain their school lunches, it will be money well spent. Not only will it be a great blessing and benefit to them, but to the 10,000,000 other school children in our country. Provide proper nourishment for the child and you have given it the best basis to make a successful life.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. My time is limited and I have only a few moments remaining. I regret I cannot yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not insist on his motion until we have had some debate.

Mr. TABER. We have had long debate and three times as much on the affirmative side as on the negative.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) were were—ayes 82, noes 72.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 90, noes 85.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROOKS. Does that motion mean that the gentleman who has already been recognized has all of the time, or does it mean 10 additional minutes to the 10 that have already been allocated to the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the motion to close debate in 10 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all who desire may extend their remarks in the RECORD on this amendment at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, every State in the Union is in better financial condition to provide school lunches than is the Federal Government.

Apparently hearts do not bleed for the lunch program back in the States. All the bleeding hearts are here in Congress.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion there is nothing so important pending before Congress at the present time as the request for additional funds to extend the free school-lunch program. The taxpayers of this country, I am certain, will all agree with me that we should first take care of our undernourished children at home before trying to feed the undernourished children of the world.

We have appropriated funds for the relief of practically every country in the world during the past 6 years and there is no sound reason why we should not appropriate sufficient funds to continue the school-lunch program. It is my sincere opinion that the school-lunch program is one of the finest pieces of legislation ever enacted during the Democratic administration. It has proven highly satisfactory to the children and to the farmers who have surplus farm products. There is no sound reason why additional funds should not be appropriated at this time to continue the school-lunch program.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at the opposition to the continuance of the school-lunch program. The issue is very simple. You are either for the school-lunch program or against it. If you are for it you will vote for the amendment; if you are against that program you will vote to defeat the amendment. I am for it and I rise to support the amendment.

I fail to follow the reasoning of the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee. He urges that this program should be a local one; that the States should pay the cost of it and that they are better able to do it than the Federal Government; that they have substantial surpluses, and yet in the next breath he criticizes the States for not matching the contributions of the Fed-

eral Government as the program contemplates. I ask how can we ever expect the States to pay all of the cost of school lunches when the gentleman admits they will not even pay their one-half share. The answer is simple. If we do not pass this amendment and depend upon the States to carry the load we will have no school-lunch program at all. We all want to feed hungry school children. Then let us do it and not indulge in specious arguments with the object of defeating this worthy, necessary, and humanitarian project. I must repeat: If we want to feed hungry school children, we must vote for this amendment.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely shocking that the Republican Party has cut from the budget the money to help feed the school children of America. This is something that should be passed without partisan politics, but since Republicans have now exalted dollars and cents above flesh and blood let the full blame fall on you members of that party. Do Republicans feel that a solvent fiscal America is more important than a solvent physical America? I charge you with playing political football with American children. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] quoted his facts. Let me give facts of human life.

The National Research Council states:

Every nutritional survey in the past decade has revealed diets below standard in the United States.

In New York City 48 percent of low-income families had an average daily caloric intake below the minimum requirement. Seventy-four percent of the high-school students studied in New York City had substandard diets.

A survey of low-income families in Baltimore, Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Syracuse showed 27 percent had diets below minimum standards.

An examination of school children in Texas revealed that 20 percent were so anemic as to require medical attention; 50 percent could not meet the Red Cross standards for blood donors.

Families of wage earners and clerical workers in 43 industrial centers showed only 21 percent had good diets; only 11 percent of the colored families had good diets.

A survey in 66 counties scattered over the country showed only 35 percent of farm families in the North and West, and 27 percent in the South, had adequate diets.

Another survey of 140 villages and 20 small cities across the Nation revealed that fewer than one-fifth had diets meeting the standards of the National Research Council.

In a Maine study of school children, only one child in seven got the minimum standard of one good vitamin C food daily.

Of over 3,000 women college students in the North Central States, 68 percent had diets deficient in at least one essential element.

In Minnesota, more than one-half of the children studied had poor diets; only one-tenth had good diets; children were encouraged to study food values and the school-lunch program was started; in 1 year poor diets dropped to 26 percent and good diets increased to 28 percent.

Fourteen percent of 15,000 volunteer blood donors were rejected by the one Red Cross unit in Chicago because of nutritional anemia.

A survey of 1,000 families in Louisiana showed less than 1 percent had diets that could be called good.

Diets of 7,000 children studied in Chicago showed 72 failed to meet the minimum standards.

Seventy-nine percent of children 1 to 12 years of age in a survey in Tennessee were found not to be receiving proper nourishment.

A survey of a group of Vermont school children showed 85 percent had evidence of rickets; one in four had spongy gums due to a lack of vitamin C.

In a North Carolina survey, 24 percent of the children had swollen gums; after only 6 days of feeding them canned grapefruit juice, 84 percent showed definite improvement.

Other studies in Maryland, California, North Carolina, Michigan, Florida, Philadelphia, Wilkes-Barre, etc., all tell the same story. In an experiment in England, a group of school boys was divided and half of them were given an extra pint of milk a day; after 1 year it was found that those not receiving extra milk gained an average of 3.85 pounds and 1.84 inches; those who got the milk gained 6.98 pounds and 2.63 inches. This experiment was then extended to hundreds of thousands of school children and the official report states that it unquestionably improved "the children's well-being, zest, and mental alertness." Similar gains in growth, better physical development, improved health and increased mental alertness as a result of school lunches have been widely observed where the school-lunch program has been in operation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the school-lunch program is one of the finest things ever undertaken by our Government. It is a real investment in the future of America. It is an investment in our children. The number of young men rejected for military service for physical reasons in the last war is itself sufficient proof of the need for this program. In all too many cases these rejections could be traced directly to inadequate diets. While, therefore, we are preparing to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to feed starving populations abroad, it seems to me we should also make this relatively small contribution to the health and well-being of our own American children. I strongly urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, the omission of an appropriation for the school-lunch program in this bill submitted by the majority is indefensible. I shall vote for the amendment offered by the ranking Democratic member of the committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for \$6,000,000 although I am in accord with the opinion expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] that he had hoped the amendment might be \$10,000,000.

To my colleagues on the Republican side let me say that we have fed the children of the world for the past many years—why not continue to feed the undernourished children of our own country? I take it that shortly this Congress will approve a \$400,000,000 loan to Greece to aid among others the children of that stricken country. Why not, my Republican colleagues, think now of the children suffering from malnutrition in our own country? Perhaps within a short time our largess will be extended to

Korea—why not indeed extend the largess of our Government now to the underprivileged and undernourished children in the substandard areas of our own municipalities, or to similar children in the rural areas of our country.

We speak of the spread of communism throughout the country and we are disturbed at its spread. Communism thrives on hunger and distress; it thrives especially where the victims of hunger are children and where their plaintive cries for food drive their parents to desperation. The adoption of this amendment will not only be a boon to the undernourished children of America, but it will be a direct and affirmative act against the spread of that ideology which preys upon the distress of people.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the appeal Spokesmen for Children, Inc., for a Government appropriation necessary to continue and extend the national school-lunch program, I wish to include a résumé of the facts and figures of nutrition surveys which have been reported by the National Research Council, the United States Public Health Service, and other medical and scientific groups, as follows:

The National Research Council states, "Every nutritional survey in the past decade has revealed diets below standard in the United States."

In New York City 48 percent of low-income families had an average daily caloric intake below the minimum requirement, 74 percent of the high-school students studied in New York City had a substandard diet.

A survey of low-income families in Baltimore, Cleveland, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Syracuse, showed 27 percent had diets below minimum standards.

An examination of school children in Texas revealed that 20 percent were so anemic as to require medical attention; 50 percent could not meet the Red Cross standards for blood donors.

Families of wage earners and clerical workers in 43 industrial centers showed only 21 percent had good diets; only 11 percent of the colored families had good diets.

A survey in 66 counties scattered over the country showed only 35 percent of farm families in the North and West and 27 percent in the South had adequate diets.

Another survey of 140 villages and 20 small cities across the Nation revealed that fewer than one-fifth had diets meeting the standards of the National Research Council.

In a Maine study of school children only one child in seven got the minimum standard of one good vitamin C food daily.

Of over 3,000 women college students in the North Central States, 66 percent had diets deficient in at least one essential element.

In Minnesota, more than one-half of the children studied had poor diets; only one-tenth had good diets; children were encouraged to study food values and the school-lunch program was started; in 1 year poor diets dropped to 26 percent and good diets increased to 28 percent.

Fourteen percent of 15,000 volunteer blood donors were rejected by the one Red Cross unit in Chicago because of nutritional anemia.

A survey of 1,000 families in Louisiana showed less than 1 percent had diets that could be called good.

Diets of 7,000 children studied in Chicago showed 72 percent failed to meet minimum standards.

Seventy-nine percent of children 1 to 12 years of age in a survey in Tennessee were found not to be receiving proper nourishment.

A survey of a group of Vermont school children showed 85 percent had evidence of rickets; one in four had spongy gums due to a lack of vitamin C; in a North Carolina survey, 24 percent of the children had swollen gums; after only 6 days of feeding them canned grapefruit juice, 84 percent showed definite improvement. Other studies in Maryland, California, North Carolina, Michigan, Florida, Philadelphia, Wilkes-Barre, etc., all tell the same story.

In an experiment in England, a group of school boys was divided and half of them were given an extra pint of milk a day; after 1 year it was found that those not receiving extra milk gained an average of 3.85 pounds and 1.84 inches; those who got the milk gained 6.98 pounds and 2.63 inches. This experiment was then extended to hundreds of thousands of school children and the official report states that it unquestionably improved "the children's well-being, zest and mental alertness." Similar gains in growth, better physical development, improved health and increased mental alertness as a result of school lunches have been widely observed where the school-lunch program has been in operation.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained during the quorum call earlier this afternoon but I am glad to be able to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for the appropriation of sufficient funds to continue the school-lunch program to the end of the current fiscal year. I hope the amendment will pass because in my opinion the school-lunch program is one of the soundest investments we have ever made. One of our greatest assets is the youth of our Nation. To keep them well and healthy will insure a stronger and better America. I am going to support the amendment and I hope that it will be adopted. We have heard a great many speeches in recent weeks about the health of the young men and women of our Nation. The statistics of rejections from the military service is appalling. Here is an opportunity to continue a program that will go far in raising the standards of health of our school children. I hope the amendment will pass.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for the appropriation of \$6,000,000 for the continuation of the school-lunch program until the end of the present school year, June 30. As a staunch supporter of this worthy program I am hopeful that this House today will forget partisan politics and that there will be enough Members on the left side of the aisle joining with us on the Democratic side to carry this amendment.

Economy is a good thing. Any sensible person favors it. I know I do. But some measures offered in the name of economy very often in reality are not for the best interest of our country.

In this case, scrapping of the school-lunch program may be termed expensive economy. Congress some time ago—in the days which the gentlemen to my left like to refer to as the period of the New Deal—authorized the school-lunch program by passage of permanent legislation. Now a new Congress, under Republican leadership, seeks to kill the program by withholding funds. If we fail to accept this amendment this afternoon

the actual program will be dead, yet the statute books will still carry authorization for the program.

I know the argument will be raised that this should be a function of the community and the States. The communities in many instances already participate. In no instance does the Federal Government bear the entire load.

From the past experiences we know the majority of States will not be able to support the program. True, State treasuries are filled with funds at the present time but as Governor Green of Illinois has pointed out most of these funds are earmarked for normal State functions which had to be put aside during the war years. As they are taken up once again, the State treasuries will quickly feel the drain.

The Illinois State superintendent of public instruction, Hon. Vernon L. Nickell, has urged the Illinois delegation in the House to support the school-lunch program. Mr. Nickell advises both State and Federal funds are needed in Illinois to carry on an adequate program.

Practically every school district in the State of Illinois favors this program. Teachers by the score have written to me—telling me of the wonderful accomplishments of the program and pleading for my support to continue the good work being done.

At Collinsville when the funds were exhausted the cost of school lunches immediately doubled. That will be the story everywhere. The result will be that thousands of children will suffer.

At Alton the school system was enthused over the school-lunch program and when it was written into permanent legislation the board looked into the future foreseeing the great benefits it would bring.

"During the past year our board of education has spent over \$10,000 of its building funds for the improvement of our school cafeterias, and we have planned for more expansion next year." Mr. P. L. Ewing, superintendent, wrote to me. The Alton board did this because it felt it had some assurance that the Federal and State school-lunch program would be carried out.

If we fail to act favorably today we will be letting down many school boards like the Alton board. More than that we will be taking the chance of injuring the health of thousands of school children. If you do not believe this latter statement just review the record of the program.

Most of us can remember when a child's lunch consisted of a hot-dog sandwich, a coke and a piece of pie or perhaps a scoop of mashed potatoes. Do we want to return to that? The school-lunch program taught children to select adequate meals and it developed in them a desire to do so.

Teachers can tell you how successful this program has been in this regard. Teachers also know that without Federal help most children cannot afford to buy the lunch previously provided. Purchase of milk under present prices would be almost prohibitive.

In 1941 a survey showed that 75 percent of school children failed to meet a standard even lower than that recommended

by the National Research Council. In 1946, principally because of the school-lunch program, a survey revealed a 25-percent improvement.

We can avoid a future recurrence of the 40-percent draft rejections of World War II due to nutritional deficiencies if this percentage of improvement is allowed to continue at this rate.

It is generally conceded by principals, teachers, and lunchroom workers, and parents alike, that the student partaking of a hot plate lunch daily, improved immeasurably in scholastic and athletic ability. They say there is less absenteeism and more attention at classes.

This problem affects the health, progress, and security of our Nation—and for these reasons I shall continue my support of the school-lunch program by voting for this amendment, and I sincerely hope it carries.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and endorse all that he has said so well.

It is difficult to understand the philosophy of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAHER]. Apparently he believes that the children of our Nation should be penalized because of the failure of the States to match the funds of the Federal Government. I do not know if or why the States have neglected to do so, and I am not the least bit interested in that phase of the debate. I am interested in providing sufficient funds to continue this program of providing lunches for needy school children. Juggling of figures has never appealed to me, nor have I the ability to do a good job in this respect, but there are men in this House who have a great gift for that sort of thing.

I would like to see the school-lunch program strengthened and extended. The money spent will bring great dividends to our Nation in the form of healthier children today and more efficient citizens tomorrow. In a survey I made 36 years ago in several public schools I found that most stupid children were found to be the victims of poor nutrition. Following this survey a group of women, of which I was one, became interested in this problem; we cooperated with the teachers who had called our attention to the situation and provided milk for these undernourished children, and in a very short time thereafter a decided change was noticed in their mental attitude. Thirty-six years ago few communities realized the tremendous importance of nutrition in its relation to mental attitudes, particularly in growing children. Now we have at long last attempted to correct this waste of human energy, but we have not gone nearly far enough. We are conscious of the need of children of other lands and are making some provision to better their condition, and I am all for that, but why a Republican majority should dare to deprive the children of our own country of a paltry \$6,000,000 to provide school lunches for needy children is something completely beyond my comprehension.

I sincerely hope in voting on this amendment politics will be put aside and that we shall vote for the amendment in

the name of humanity and better American children for America.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I have said before, and I wish to reiterate today, that it is poor economy indeed to try to save taxpayers money at the expense of such a worthy and necessary project as the school-lunch program.

In yesterday's debate the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] very ably explained the necessity of continuing and maintaining the school-lunch program. It is difficult to conceive of any justification for the termination of the program which has meant so much to the health and well-being of our children and Nation.

Many of the school-lunch projects throughout the country are now being discontinued simply because this body has not appropriated the funds necessary to carry on the project and furnish the lunches which are so vitally needed by thousands of our growing children. To many school children, Mr. Speaker, the continuation of this program will mean the difference between health and sickness, the difference between malnutrition or sufficient food to properly sustain the youngsters of our fair land.

Mr. Jesse B. Gilmer, Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration, has recently advised me that at least 32 States would face deficiencies in the school-lunch program if a deficiency appropriation were not made to tide the program over until the end of the school year.

Included in the 32 States is my own State of South Carolina, which will have a deficiency of several hundred thousand dollars. Some little money may be covered from the few States which will have a surplus, but that amount would be far less than the sum needed to carry the 32 States over until the end of the school year.

Mr. Chairman, in refusing to appropriate sufficient money to carry this program over, the Congress is scuttling one of the most progressive pieces of legislation passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress. In effect it is wiping out a public law which was passed to establish a permanent program for the benefit of our Nation as a whole.

No other program sponsored by the Federal Government has met with more wholehearted approval by the people of the Nation, and no program has had less criticism. The amount of money involved is insignificant in proportion to the benefits derived from the school-lunch program.

The money spent for this program is an investment in health, happiness, and national security. If we are to be strong as a Nation our children must be healthy; they must be assured of the nutritious foods they require. It is a fact that many school children who are the beneficiaries of the fine program would not otherwise have sufficient food properly to keep them in sound health of body and mind.

During the 1945-46 school term this program served more than 4,500,000 children, and in this year's program it has been estimated that more than 7,000,000 have been served.

I for one, Mr. Chairman, do not want to be guilty of depriving a single child of the food that he needs. But I know that if we fall in our responsibility to appropriate sufficient money to carry this program on, many thousands of children will be deprived.

I am convinced it will be a grave mistake if we allow this national school lunch program to go by default.

WE MUST FEED OUR OWN

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if we deny the underprivileged school children of this Nation an opportunity to be assured of at least one balanced meal during the school day, it will be as pathetic as tragic—pathetic on our part to look into the future and tragic to those who cannot provide for themselves.

In this Nation there are countless thousands of undernourished and underfed little children grasping for the light of education.

In this country there are many thousands of families who know nothing about providing their school children with adequate and balanced diets. From the mountains to the seas, there are families who must have our help on this matter.

We have recently loaned the British government \$4,000,000,000.

We are now contemplating making a loan to both Greece and Turkey to feed their undernourished. Can we be remiss if we provide for our own?

I do not care what course the Republicans may follow in this matter, but as for me, I am for the future men and women who will carry on long after we have perished into forgotten dust.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the majority membership of the Appropriations Committee has decided to make a small saving in appropriations at the expense of the health and welfare of our greatest asset—our American children.

Our Government has spent billions to fight a war for liberty and we should not now refuse to spend a comparatively small sum to protect the health of young America who will be our country's leaders in another generation. The Federal Government spends millions on soil conservation and it is money well spent because it guarantees to the future abundant food and prosperity. We spend millions each year on conservation of our natural resources so they will last down through the years to serve our people and this is also money well spent. We spend millions each year conserving the health of our livestock, treating cattle for hoof-and-mouth disease, hogs for cholera, and more millions developing food to make cattle and hogs put on weight, cows to give more milk, chickens to lay more eggs, and so forth. I am not opposed to the above expenditures, but the majority membership of the Appropriations Committee of this Congress should not deny to our children a small percentage of the money spent for care of animals and soil. We want our American children to grow and develop physically and mentally into real American men and women, strong in mind and body so they will be capable of carrying

on and preserving our God-given institutions of freedom, liberty, and equality. I know the fathers and mothers of America are for the school-lunch program.

The school-lunch program is not a new idea. Progressive, far-seeing men and women, church groups and parent-teacher associations in many sections of our country years ago realized the need of a child for a hot, nutritious school lunch and in a great number of instances the above groups provided school lunches on their own initiative.

I am satisfied that the Members of Congress, when they give solemn and serious thought to the necessity of providing hot school lunches for millions of underfed children that they will gladly appropriate these necessary funds. Let us protect and aid our greatest asset, the foundation of our country, our American children.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to provide \$6,000,000 for the school-lunch program. We are appropriating by this very bill before us today \$300,000,000 for aid to our stricken brothers across the sea. I am happy to support that program. I believe the American people are back of it, but I find myself unable on the same day I am taking that action, to deny to the children in our schools the benefits which I know they have derived from this program.

My attention has been called again and again to cases where children from the lower income families have gone to school without any breakfast at all. They cannot do their work. They cannot become useful citizens in our community, or any other community, on empty stomachs. It is, in my opinion, false economy in this bill, which provides total appropriations of almost \$2,500,000,000, to deny this comparatively modest sum for a worthy project.

I yield to no one in my desire and sincere intention to cast my vote in favor of the reduction in governmental expenditures. I voted to reduce the President's inflated budget by \$6,000,000,000. I have already withstood repeatedly the assaults of various pressure groups who have sought to get my assistance in restoring cuts in their budgets which have been made with prudence and sincerity by the Appropriations Committee. I shall continue to follow that course.

Furthermore, I am an opponent of Federal interference with the conduct of our schools. I think they should be under a control closer to the grass roots. I shall welcome the time when the school-lunch program can be taken over in its entirety by the localities. That will benefit the State which I have the honor to represent, since they pay more than any other to the support of this and all other Federal programs.

Until that time comes, however, I do not believe the people of my district want to see the school children go hungry, as I have been informed will happen in many instances unless this amendment passes. Certain it is, at least, that my conscience will not permit me to cast a vote which will effect such a result.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, that I shall support the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, for the life of me I cannot understand the position taken by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the leadership on the other side of the aisle in opposing this amendment, which seeks to appropriate the comparatively small sum of \$6,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of 1946. How can they justify their approval of the item in this same bill of \$300,000,000 to the War Department, as urged by former President Hoover, for government and relief in occupied areas all over the world, and their refusal at the same time of \$6,000,000 for undernourished American school children? They cannot; that is why they used their majority to shut off debate as they did, denying the privilege of the floor to a dozen or more Democratic Members who sought to speak for 5 minutes in behalf of this meritorious amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. During the current year 130 schools in the State of Wyoming participated in the school-lunch program. An average of 12,500 lunches were served each day. Under the act of the last Congress Wyoming has been given a total allocation of \$109,421.59, of which amount \$18,000 was earmarked for the purchase of equipment, leaving a trifle over \$90,000 to reimburse all school-lunch programs in our State. The increase in the cost of food, cost of labor, and other expenses has resulted in exhaustion of the funds for this purpose some time back. I was extremely sorry to learn that the Bureau of the Budget had not approved an item in the deficiency bill for the school-lunch program. I think that was a mistake.

I am not certain that the appropriation of \$6,000,000 will be adequate to provide funds sufficient to continue the Wyoming program for the present school year, but it will go a long way toward that desired end.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Congress committed itself to this program last year, and I am very hopeful that this amendment will be adopted. I shall vote for and support the amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, Federal funds allotted to Minnesota for the school hot-lunch program were exhausted on March 31, 1947. Approximately \$375,000 are needed to continue this worthy program in Minnesota for the remainder of the school year.

Daily, 150,000 to 160,000 children in Minnesota participated in the program, and the beneficial results are apparent in the improved health and physical well-being of our youth. We cannot allow the discontinuance of this program.

Parent-teacher groups, school boards, educators, and civic organizations have joined parents in a demand that their children be not sacrificed for the so-called mandates, campaign promises, and false economy expounded by the majority Members. I join our people in a concern for true economy, but it is not economical to sacrifice the health and well-being of growing children. This is penny-wise reasoning; a contribution toward adequate food for our

young people is a sound governmental investment. We are building for a healthy citizenry of tomorrow.

NEED HEALTHY CHILDREN

Much is said of the need to conserve our natural resources. Here are the most precious of all of America's resources. Our country must preserve its heritage. We need offer no apologies for our pride in our country and its people. But we cannot be merely satisfied. We must continue working for our country and its people. A well-fed, healthy child today becomes the backbone of a progressive, clear-thinking citizenry tomorrow.

We fear for the depletion of our mineral resources. With a wealth of minerals, they will do us little good unless we have the strong hands to mold them into the tools of an advanced civilization. The milk, soup, meat, and vegetables we provide now will strengthen those who will guide us tomorrow.

Make no mistake, the few dollars taken from these children are intended for those who need none of our sympathies. The few dollars sought here will be used as tax-relief for the big-income earners who have garnered more money than ever before in the history of our country.

I am personally familiar with the hot-lunch program. For some time before the war I helped administer the program in the rural schools of our communities. From the beginning, we could see the health of the pupils improve. A hot, balanced meal prepared by expert cooks, served under supervision, showed its results. That program expanded until almost every community in our area participated. There have been only words of praise from the parents and school officials. They now plead for a continuance.

SHOULD KEEP PROMISE

The Seventy-ninth Congress made our people a promise that the hot-lunch program would be a permanent project. Are we to breach the promise in this first year of its "permanence"? Depending upon the word of the Congress, States and school districts have gone to expense in providing their share of supplies and appliances. Are their contributions to be forfeited now? This Congress has a moral obligation to provide an adequate appropriation to carry the hot-lunch program through this year and to appropriate sufficient funds for the next school year.

I call upon my worthy colleagues to subordinate their concern for tax savings to the wealthy and to concentrate on building our national wealth, our children.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this amendment which increases the school-lunch moneys by \$9,000,000. I have already heard from my home State of Louisiana and find that some 4 months before the end of the fiscal year, the school-lunch moneys were exhausted. As a result of this fact, the price of the school lunch to the children is increasing and unless additional funds are appropriated, the entire program may break down completely before July 1.

I believe \$9,000,000 will go far toward remedying the current shortage. In my judgment, the overspending by the several States is due to the encouragement which Congress has already given them. We have previously indicated we desire the program to expand and to include all poor children who do not have money to pay for their own lunches. No Government can justify a failure to take care of the hungry school children and at the same time export hundreds of tons of food to the hungry mouths overseas. I therefore hope very much that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment which I consider to be an expression of part of the national responsibility for health. The program of a hot lunch for school children has met with the universal approval of mothers, teachers, educational authorities, and Parent-Teacher Associations. The cost is infinitesimal compared to the benefits. The health of the child determines the health of the man. I look forward to legislation which will be a national expression of the responsibility for the health of all citizens. The continuation of the school-lunch program is an early and a necessary step.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, as a Member of this House, I introduced H. R. 1775, providing for \$15,000,000 for the school-lunch program. I feel that both the House and the Senate would be doing their duty toward the people of this country in making this \$15,000,000 appropriation for such a worthy program. However, since this amendment now before the House calls for only \$6,000,000, I am at a loss to understand how any Member can conscientiously vote against this amendment and then go home and face his people and try to answer for his action.

When we stop to consider that many of the Members of this Congress have appropriated millions of dollars to feed people all over the world, when we have appropriated money to prevent our cattle from being affected by the hoof-and-mouth disease from adjoining nations, it is inconceivable to understand why there should be any opposition to feeding our boys and girls throughout this Nation a good, nutritious, hot lunch—many of whom will go without if these funds are not provided. I know of no money that this Nation can spend more wisely than to provide and insure a well-balanced meal at lunchtime for the future citizens of this great Nation.

I am, therefore, in accord with this amendment, and shall support it, and my only regret being that it is for \$6,000,000 rather than \$15,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 88, noes 104.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON to act as tellers.

XCIH—189

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 128, noes 110.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The clerk read as follows:

TUSSECK MOTH CONTROL

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out operations, independently or in cooperation with State agencies, associations, organizations, or individuals, to combat an outbreak of tussock moth, \$395,000, to remain available until December 31, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay the cost of property injured or destroyed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I watched this vote a minute ago with interest. Many of you will remember that a few weeks ago I engaged in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] on this school-lunch program. The last 4 or 5 days that we have been debating appropriation bills I have been listening attentively to one phase, but this situation here a few minutes ago was slightly different.

I will say this to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who talked here a few minutes ago about lobbyists on the customs bill and about the letters that came out in mimeographed form putting the heat on, putting the pressure on: On this amendment here today you do not have that kind of lobbyist. I had a letter from the Governor of the State of Oklahoma. It was typewritten. I received a few scattered letters written with pencil on tablet paper from school children.

I can state that there is no red herring anyone can draw across the trail of this amendment; there is no lobby that will be the beneficiary of this amendment; no Edgar L. Warren will be the beneficiary of this amendment. The only beneficiaries of this item will be the school children of this Nation.

I wondered what the Republicans and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] were going to say to try to defeat it, and it comes down to this: Anything that takes money, no matter for what purpose, they are against it, whether it means the building of a strong Nation or not—they are still against it—and I do not believe you can point to anything that will build a stronger Nation than having healthy school children in this country. This is a sound program. You gentlemen on the left side of the aisle are so used to talking about boondoggling, waste, and extravagance that when a good bill comes before you, or a good amendment such as this one that was offered this afternoon, you forget and vote by habit, and vote against it. I am pleased to note that the vote in favor of this program has gained all the time this afternoon through pitiless publicity that was put out by the American people, not by paid lobbyists, not by mimeographed sheets, by just the conscience of American children calling out to you.

Down in my State we were a little bit worried about the Republicans last year. The fellow who ran against me said: "Send me up there and I will abolish OPA

and everything will be O. K." He never told the people he was going to abolish the school-lunch program, though.

This is something you are going to have to face. I want to make this observation: Here is a good bill. I was surprised that debate was shut off, because the American people would like to know what their chosen Representatives think about these things. No wonder you wanted to shut debate off. The vote, however, speaks for itself, and I think next fall you will find when you come before the people, when you are put on record, when you tell them what you are going to do, that some of you will have to vote as you did this afternoon. I do not know that these talks accomplish anything, but it is good to let the American people know. Maybe I am slightly presumptuous; I do not know, but I say to you, as I told the gentleman from New York: You did not get a mandate from the American people last fall to do what you tried to do this afternoon when you voted against the school-lunch program. If you had presented them with the kind of program you are putting through during this session I doubt if there would be as many over on the other side of the aisle as there are now, and when you get through with this session and come to the election in 1948 I think we are going to have slightly fewer on the other side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. TABER and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Georgia was recognized before the gentleman from New York was on his feet.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair inquired as to why the gentleman from New York rose.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 103, noes 78.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST SERVICE

National forest protection and management: The sum of \$410,000 is hereby transferred from the appropriation "Acquisition of Lands for National Forests under Weeks Act" to the appropriation "National forest protection and management."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen an example of what comes rather close to being a gag rule. I believe that no time is gained by efforts to shut off honest debate on a measure that Members are

honestly interested in and wish to present their views upon. Many Members desired to be heard on the merits of this amendment before the vote was taken. The rules permit that those who wish to speak may yet speak, as I am doing now, although, as the gentleman who just preceded me has pointed out, the vote has been taken, and what I say now cannot be considered with reference to the merits of the amendment.

The distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in answer to a question from me stated that I requested to be heard before the Committee on Appropriations after hearings had ceased. No notice was given, so far as I know, to the membership of this House as to when hearings would cease on these deficiency items. I made what I thought was a timely request to come before that committee and be heard on behalf of citizens from my district who were vitally interested and who are vitally interested in this measure. Now, if the hearings had been closed, what was wrong with opening them and having some more hearings? I remember very well during this session when the critical condition of this country with reference to copper was brought to the attention of the House. The Committee on Ways and Means promptly called hearings on a bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT]. Hearings were had. They were not scheduled prior to the time that this situation was brought before the House. Possibly the Committee on Ways and Means may have more time to hear presentations of bills than the Committee on Appropriations; I do not know. But this was certainly an emergency measure. The money was running out on the 31st day of March, and it strikes me that the action of the chairman of this committee then was in keeping with his strenuous efforts here today to block the passage of this amendment. The gentleman first made a point of order which was overruled. Then when the Committee had given unanimous consent to the gentleman from Illinois to proceed for five additional minutes, giving him 10 minutes in all, the gentleman from New York moved that all debate close in 10 minutes. Many Members who had been on the floor clamoring for recognition were denied the right to say what they wished to say on the merits of the amendment. That is not good for legislation.

We know and concede that there is a larger Republican membership in this House than Democratic.

Mr. JENSEN: Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said a lot of Members had not had the privilege of speaking on the amendment. Of course, the gentleman was not here during the Democratic reign in this House. If he had been, he would have seen the Democrats really put the bee on us by shutting off debate when there were possibly 25 of us who wanted to talk. There-

fore, I hope the gentleman will forget that kind of attack.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No; I was not here then. If I had been here then, I would not have participated in that kind of movement.

I noticed that many Republicans voted for this amendment, and I want to express my personal appreciation of that. I know what it means to vote one way when the majority of the members of one's party are voting the other way. My purpose in making these remarks now is to say that I feel that it is for the good of the country that when Members want to debate the merits of a thing they should be allowed the opportunity to do so, and not have to place a statement in the RECORD that will have no effect whatever on the merits of the matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fighting forest fires: For an additional amount for fighting forest fires, fiscal year 1947, \$3,944,000.

FOREST SERVICE ITEMS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of explaining the four items approved by the committee for appropriation to the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture.

The first item was \$395,000 for the control against the tussock moth. This money will be used in connection with a joint effort by the State and Federal authorities to stamp out an outbreak of tussock moth which threatens valuable timber in northern Idaho. Funds have already been provided by the State for its share in the enterprise.

The second item is \$410,000 for the cruising and offering of timber for sale over and beyond the amount which would otherwise be handled this coming summer. The Forest Service estimates that the Government will receive at least \$2,000,000 from the sales of timber which this appropriation will permit. The current market for stumpage is the highest in forest service history. The cuttings to be authorized are all within the sustained yield cycle. The funds are made available by transfer from funds heretofore appropriated for acquisition of lands under the Weeks Act.

The third item is for control of tree-insect epidemics of national-forest lands in Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana, in the amount of \$250,000. The committee was advised that, unless checked, these epidemics threaten to reach the scenic timber areas in the Jackson Hole country south of Yellowstone Park. While this situation does not have the same critical emergency character as that of the Tussock moth, and is more of the steady warfare which must be waged against enemies of the forest, the opportunity for making progress this season is good and the amount of \$250,000 will permit the organization of an effective campaign as time permits after the funds become available.

The fourth item is \$3,844,000 for fighting forest fires. The amount represents the full estimates of the Forest Service, based upon experience to date in this fiscal year.

Together, the approval of these four

items shows an appreciation of Forest Service problems which will please those who follow such matters, I feel certain. They provide real forest conservation.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1947," \$1,900,000.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say a few words in rebuttal to the statement of the gentleman of the committee who, when our distinguished colleague from Georgia protested at the manner in which he was taken off his feet previously, said that the Democrats had put the bee on the Republicans for the past number of years. Apparently that is what the Republicans intend to do to us, and without justification.

I challenge the gentleman to point out one instance in all the times when the Democrats were in the majority when a Member was on the floor and asked for 5 minutes additional time and when that time was courteously granted by the minority as we did today, when, in all that time, can the gentleman point out an instance, where, as soon as an extra 5 minutes was unanimously granted that the chairman of a committee or anybody else on the Democratic side ever rose and moved that there should be no more time except to the man who got the five additional minutes, leaving the other Members without an opportunity to speak.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. I shall not yield now.

Mr. Chairman, what kind of representative government are we going to have if the minority may not even rise and express an opinion? What kind of government are we going to have if the Members of the minority may not be permitted to speak before our committees? We have seen this same thing happen in the Committee on Ways and Means where members were not allowed to speak. Here we are seeing the same Republican formula being adopted in the House. For what reason? Because they have the votes to limit debate—yes, to prevent debate. The country knows you have the votes. The country knows also that you have the responsibilities of government in your hands. The country knows that despite the fact that you have been endeavoring to shut off debate and apply the gag rule you have not brought out a single worth-while bill since you took over the House on the 3d of January. If this continues, you will lose the complete confidence of the country—whatever confidence the country may now have in you, after you have been in control for the past 3 months.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYNCH. May I say to the gentleman that I do not doubt he can get all the time he wants to get.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LYNCH. The gentleman can get all the time he wants. He can make a motion to strike out the last word. You know how to get time. But on your side

it is different; you have more votes than we have, and you can stop us from talking. The majority have stopped us from talking when we had 8 or 10 men standing here who wanted to speak on the school-lunch program and the Republicans would not give them a chance to speak.

As has been said, there is a very good reason why you would not want us to argue about the school lunches; a very good reason why you would not want the people to know that despite all your promises about what you are going to do for the country, you do not even want to give school lunches to the undernourished and underprivileged American children, although we have given and will undoubtedly continue to give, millions of dollars to feed the people of other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Of course, it is not necessary for me to stand here to answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], because everyone who was in the House during the reign of the New Deal knows that the gentleman was just making a talk to the gallery. The gentleman knows, as everyone knows, that many times the Republicans were shut off from debate, even when the lives of American boys were at stake, and you know it. It was regular procedure for you fellows to shut off debate as the records will prove.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Subscriptions to capital stock, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to subscribe and pay for capital stock of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, as provided in section 504 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U. S. C. 1504), fiscal year 1947, \$20,000,000.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this \$20,000,000 to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is twenty millions more going down the rat hole of the worst administration of a public corporation I have ever seen administered by our Government since I have been in Congress. In 5 years they have squandered in the capital stock of the corporation \$90,000,000, besides expense money appropriated by Congress of close to \$50,000,000; also a profit made on wheat in 1945 of over \$8,000,000, besides all the premiums received for insurance. It shows up the incompetence of the organization. I have been in correspondence and by personal visits with the authorities. They stated in 1945 that their experience would enable them to work with more efficiency, and experience would cause them to do a sound insurance business. The results, however, are worse from 1945 to date than they were before. Federal crop insurance will never be a success—when it is under such supervision and administration.

It is a racket, and not sound business. If you want to aid the farmers do so without a Government pay roll of millions annually to the party faithful. Cut out the dishonesty by calling it insurance and causing unnecessary and untimely expenses of government. It is a racket and the Department of Agriculture should recommend its discontinuance at once. I have offered a bill to that end.

The Clerk read as follows:

Surgeon General", \$82,100;

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of title I be considered as read and be open to amendment. It is all Pay Act legislation. There is nothing else in the balance of that title.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 202 (a) For the payment of a judgment, rendered against the Government of the United States by a United States district court under the provisions of an act entitled "An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage services, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes", approved March 9, 1920 (46 U. S. C. 741 and the following), and which was certified to the Eightieth Congress in House Document Numbered 126 under the War Department, \$5,850.

Mr. TABER (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read down to section 203 and that it may be open to amendment at this time. There is no controversy down to that point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy Department, \$201,501.58;

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS:
On page 46, between lines 8 and 9 insert as follows: "Federal Communications Commission \$161.61."

Page 46, line 15, strike out "\$164,500.45." and insert in lieu thereof "\$166,496.85."

Page 46, line 16, strike out "and."
Page 46, after the number "45910" insert "46026."

Page 46, line 22, strike out "\$2,102,638.17." and insert "\$2,104,796.18."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment comes too late. The Clerk has read beyond that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman comes too late.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it this amendment was on the Clerk's desk and the fact it was not reported was due to the Clerk's failing to see the amendment. The parliamentary inquiry is: Does it come too late when the amendment was on the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama was not present to protect his rights and the Clerk continued to read beyond the point where the amendment should properly have been offered.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I was here but I did not know just where the Clerk was reading. I ask unanimous consent to return to the point where the amendment would be germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his gracious kindness. I appreciate it very deeply.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to put into this bill provision for the payment of those judgments which have been rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, and affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. No such provision is now carried in this bill.

These three judgment creditors of our Government are no longer in Government service. They have been separated therefrom for more than 3 years. No question is here involved of taking them off of any pay roll.

The question is: Shall we repudiate these debts of our Government? Or, phrasing it more specifically: Shall we appropriate the \$2,104,796.18 required to pay all of the judgments of the United States Court of Claims now past due and unpaid or shall we appropriate the \$2,102,638.17 that would pay them all except three, totaling \$2,158.01?

Each Member's answer to those questions depends not so much on how fiercely he hates the victims as upon how much he loves our Government. Another question guides the answer your vote will make. How much do you hate the decisions of the courts that decreed payment? Or this: Shall the Congress keep the faith and do its plain duty?

If you don't like the decision rendered by the Court of Claims, which Congress created, you have more legal right to vote to abolish that court than to repudiate a judgment Congress empowered it to render.

I have just as much right to vote to deny the payment of the salaries fixed by law for the members of the Court of Claims, or of the Supreme Court of the United States, as I have to so treat those appointed in accordance with the law Congress wrote governing appointments in the executive branch of our Government.

It is just as legal for us to wreck the Government by wholesale as by retail.

We could gain absolute power quicker if we could abolish the other two equal, free, coordinate branches of the Government designed by our forefathers and prescribed by the Constitution.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be glad to yield briefly, but I want to make my own speech, if you please.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has said that if this line of reasoning is correct, we could take the salary away from the judiciary.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman is unmindful of the fact that the Constitution itself says that they shall hold office during good behavior and shall at stated times receive for their services compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office. Certainly, to take it away would be to diminish it.

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all, sir. You propose to extinguish it—to wipe it out. And with no reference to "good behavior." In the Watson, Dodd, and Lovett cases there has been not so much as a syllable of criticism of their demeanor. They are to be punished, if you prevail, for the entertainment of a past belief, which, according to the testimony, never affected their performance of duty while in office.

So, I repeat, and challenge successful controversy, that you can just as legally deny all pay for the members of the Supreme Court or of the Court of Claims as for these three men.

But, my hypothesis was, as correctly stated by the gentleman: if the gentleman's line of reasoning is correct. And on that fallacious basis, may I ask: "Since that line of reasoning shows no regard for the Constitution, why claim it as binding in one case and not in another?"

In conclusion I must fling this challenge: Very emphatically, I am against all lynching, whoever may compose the mob, however high may be their motives, and no matter that the victim be our system of government!

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, before the legislation was passed which prohibited the payment of funds to Watson, Lovett, and Dodd, the Committee on Appropriations had hearings, and these three men appeared before a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, and on which served such outstanding Members of the House as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. From the testimony of these three men, out of their own mouths, it was apparent that they were not loyal to the United States and that they did not owe their first loyalty to the United States. Following that, in accordance with the law, payments were not made to them, and they brought suit and the suit resulted in this judgment.

This is not the first time such a thing has happened. In the Dalton case, about 1930, when the Honorable Will Wood was chairman of the House Com-

mittee on Appropriations, a judgment for \$11,900 was obtained under circumstances of very questionable character. The committee refused to consider it and refused to report the funds to pay it. Later further attempts were made to get the money, and an application was made to the committee when the Honorable James P. Buchanan, of Texas, was chairman, and that was refused.

The Constitution provides:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

We are not given authority over these things without having a discretion to exercise. If we exercise that discretion in our conscience, believing that this judgment should not be paid and that it is not a proper obligation of the United States, we are performing our duty. Otherwise we are abdicating the duty which the Constitution places upon us.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Was not the Dalton case one in which the Congress had refused to provide funds for the extinguishment of a claim which was subsequently pressed in a court and a judgment obtained?

Mr. TABER. No; it was not. It was not that kind of case.

Mr. WALTER. It was not for salary, was it?

Mr. TABER. It was for retirement pay, at a time when Dalton was working for and drawing a salary from the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

If the founding fathers had expected that a judgment of a court required funds to come out of the Treasury automatically, regardless of the proprieties, they would have so provided in the Constitution. At one time we had a law in effect that such a judgment should be paid automatically by the Treasury, but that has been repealed.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I voted to prevent any part of an appropriation made several years ago to go for the payment of compensation to Dodd, Watson, and whoever the third man was—Lovett. But that is not the question before the House today. There is only one question involved and that is, as I see it: Are we, the legislative branch, going to take a step that will nullify the judgment of the Court of last resort of our land? That is the only question involved here today.

I can remember over the years how jealous we have been of our prerogatives when the courts have done what we considered an invasion of the legislative field. But it certainly seems to me that there would be just as much justification for the Chief Executive to call out the armed forces to enforce an administrative order in conflict with the judgment of the legislative branch as it would be for us to refuse to honor the judgment of the Supreme Court.

I shall not discuss the decision in the Lovett case. It has been discussed on several occasions since this bill has been called up. But suffice to say that

the Court reached the conclusion that these men were entitled to compensation. That is the last word from our Supreme Court. I do not think any of us want to weaken in one single iota any of the powers of any one of the three coordinate branches of our Government.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. KERR. My distinguished friend is a member, as I understand it, of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House. Has not your committee recently approved an act to nullify the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States in the portal-to-portal cases?

Mr. WALTER. The Committee on the Judiciary has reported on numerous occasions legislation designed not to nullify but to restate the law where it has been very clear that the courts have invaded the legislative field. Certainly we did not do anything to nullify a decision of the Supreme Court in the so-called portal-to-portal cases. That was not the situation at all.

I am sure my friend has not examined carefully the Mount Clemens case.

But the point is, where will we go next if we refuse to honor and recognize the judgment of the Supreme Court? What will the next move be? It can be almost anything. It seems to me before we take this very important step we should carefully weigh the consequences.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the men who wrote our Constitution were experts in government. They thought in terms of government. They were familiar with every experiment in human government from the dawn of history down to their day. They knew that the mightiest instrumentality of governmental power is in the purse. Therefore they lodged the power over the people's pocketbooks, the power to tax, and the power to appropriate money primarily in the House of Representatives. If we surrender in this instance our right to control the purse, we will have surrendered the greatest prerogative with which this House is vested for the defense of the liberties of the people and the preservation of our institutions. The keynote of the whole controversy is in the discretion of the House. We have discretion in this matter that is inherent in the powers of the House. The simple test is this: Has any court in the land the power to mandamus and compel the Congress to appropriate money in discharge of a judgment that runs counter to our conception of what the powers of the House are? Do not be mistaken about this matter. This is the opening gun in the fight of this Congress and the American people to purge the public pay roll of men and women who do not believe in our form of government and who are in the positions they now hold with the avowed and settled purpose of overthrowing, hamstringing, and destroying this Government. If we do not vote to withhold this money which we have steadfastly declined to appropriate, then we cannot get rid of any of these men that the President says he now wants to

ferret out, expose, and get rid of. This is a power that we should not surrender, and I am not disturbed about this judgment of the Supreme Court. Let the Supreme Court follow down the path that Presidents and other judges have followed and then will be time enough for us to consider whether or not we will surrender this great power of purse, and this power of discretion which, in my opinion, it is our sworn duty to exercise under our oath of office. Let us vote down this amendment and preserve this power of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any more fundamental question that can arise in this Congress than the one now before us in reference to the payment and the discharge of these purported judgments. These employees had an opportunity to stay on the public pay roll of this Government. This House and the Senate of the United States provided in an action concerning their payment, that if they were appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, they could stay here. They never undertook to ask anybody to appoint them or to approve of their appointment. They continued the work they were doing, after they were ordered stricken from the pay roll, and they remained until they had secured enough salary in order to bring an action against the United States Government. They proceeded to sue us in the Court of Claims, and the case finally went to the Supreme Court of the United States. These employees, Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Lovett, were not deprived of their offices and they were given an opportunity, if they complied with the requirements of Congress, to keep their jobs and not lose them. They declined to do this in the light of the evidence against them and they remained on their respective jobs long enough, and in violation of the law of Congress, to acquire a sufficient amount of salary, as they thought, to bring an action against the Government.

There has been a great deal said today about the legal question involved in this controversy. I think the power of the purse is a very fundamental principle involved in the legislation of this country, and I am satisfied that the men who made the Constitution and created this Government, of which we are so proud, determined that the representatives of the people, the Congress of this country, should pass upon the fairness of all claims, the justice of a claim, and the legality of any claim. The position that the Court has taken has been misunderstood. For just a few minutes I wish to read to you what the Court has said in respect to this kind of action. I believe this House will understand very well why Mr. Dodd, Mr. Lovett, and Mr. Watson were asked to get off the pay roll of this Nation. I think certainly the large majority of this House understands it full well.

The Supreme Court has never held that Congress must pay any claim or debt against the Government. In the case of

Reside v. Walker (11 Howard 272), a verdict had been rendered in favor of an employee of the Post Office Department to pay certain compensation for services. The Supreme Court held as follows:

The difficulty in the way is the want of an appropriation by Congress to pay this claim. It is a well-known constitutional provision that no money can be taken or drawn from the Treasury except under an appropriation by Congress.

That is one of the leading cases, and it is a case to which my distinguished friend from Alabama referred on a previous occasion.

The Court went on to say:

However much money may be in the Treasury at any one time, not a dollar can be used in the payment of anything not thus previously sanctioned. Any other course would give to the fiscal officers a most dangerous discretion. But without such an appropriation it cannot and should not be paid by the Treasury, whether the claim is by a verdict or judgment, or without either.

This fundamental doctrine has never been overruled.

There is another opinion of the Supreme Court to which I wish to call your attention which clearly declares that Congress is within its fundamental rights, that we are protecting the people of this Nation as the makers of the Constitution intended they should be protected.

The situation was summed up by the Federal District Court in California in the case of *Spaulding v. Douglas Aircraft* (60 Fed. Supp. 985). In that case the Court held as follows:

The purpose of the appropriations, the terms and conditions under which said appropriations were made, is a matter solely in the hands of Congress and it is the plain and explicit duty of the executive branch of the Government to comply with the same. Any attempt by the judicial branch of our Government to interfere with the exclusive powers of Congress would be a plain invasion of the powers of said body conferred upon it by the Constitution of the United States.

I could cite many other cases holding to the same effect, that it makes no difference what sort of claim may be brought against the Government, the claimant cannot get his money until the representatives of the people say it shall be paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a great deal of discussion about the Supreme Court here this afternoon on this amendment. I wish to call attention to one fact, and that is that the members of the Supreme Court are appointed by the President, whereas the Members of the House of Representatives are elected by the people. I believe that puts us just a little closer to the people and more in touch with their ideas than possibly some of the members of the Supreme Court. For just a minute I wish to review some of the history of this case.

Mr. Chairman, in the early part of the Seventy-eighth Congress, in reporting out an appropriation bill, funds were denied these three gentlemen, Dodds, Watson, and Lovett. When the Democrats

at that time saw what was going to happen they desperately rushed in a resolution, setting up a special committee to investigate whether or not these three men were subversive. That was done, even though the Committee on Un-American Activities had made a report on them and the Appropriations Committee had made a report on them. They appointed a Democratic-controlled committee, chairmaned by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], who just preceded me. That committee, after an investigation, brought in a report recommending that these three men should not continue on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see how anyone can vote for this amendment if he will but take the time to read the testimony taken before that committee, a copy of which I hold in my hand.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. That report was unanimous?

Mr. BUSBEY. Yes. The gentleman from Illinois is correct when he says the report was unanimous.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is the question of the politics of these three men involved or is it a question of whether the House should honor a decision of the Supreme Court? Is that not the fundamental question?

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not agree with the gentleman that the fundamental question is whether or not we are going to honor a Supreme Court decision. I will say it is not a question of politics because it was a Democratic-controlled committee that brought in an adverse report on these three men.

One thing further. If the Members will read the report they will find this language:

Upon consideration of all the evidence your committee finds the membership and association of Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr., with the organizations mentioned, and his expressed views and philosophies of government constitutes subversive activity within the definition adopted by the committee, and that he is, therefore, unfit for the present to continue in Government employment.

If you will refer to pages 4480 to 4484 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 1943 of the Seventy-eighth Congress you will find that I gave a rather extensive account of some of these gentlemen in a speech I made at that time.

I do not see how you are going to uphold the hands of the President of the United States in support of his order of a week ago last Saturday to rid our Government of subversives and vote for this amendment. The President came out with an order, of which I have a copy and a full report of his committee. If you are going to start getting rid of these fellow travelers, Communists, and subversives in our Government, it would certainly be a very poor start to vote for this amendment which in effect pays the salaries of these three men accumulated under the circumstances explained a few

minutes ago by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

The Honorable Clinton Anderson, the present Secretary of Agriculture, a member of the committee to investigate Dodd, Watson, and Lovett, made a fine speech as to the fact the committee found these three men subversive and unfit for Government employment. In the final analysis it is a privilege to be employed by the Government of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, in the name of true Americanism this amendment should be defeated and I hope it will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler].

Mr. Celler. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that a judgment of the Supreme Court is a very solemn obligation which we should not, dare not repudiate in this Chamber. We would weaken the forces of law and order. We would encourage disregard of the decrees of all courts. Anarchy would follow.

There has been much said derogatory of the Supreme Court here in the debate this afternoon. But, of course, it all depends upon whose ox is gored. Some of the very men who made these statements against the Supreme Court acclaimed that Court a few days ago when it rendered the Lewis decision.

There is a great deal of hysteria developing in our campaign against the Reds, but that hysteria should not rob us of our common sense and of our wisdom in legislating here. If this body can in an appropriation bill chop off the appropriations of an officer say, of the Virgin Islands government, it could by token of the same reasoning or lack of reasoning chop off the salary of a district judge or chop off the salary of an ambassador; the salary of the President himself. You might say that is far-fetched, but not so many moons ago in this very Chamber there was an oligarchy of legislators, headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, who did things that seem rather queer to us now. By legislative fiat he practically ran the Government and trampled upon the Executive and the judiciary. He impeached the President on grounds which were subsequently declared utterly and willfully unconstitutional. This House, under Thaddeus Stevens, not only wanted to cut the salary of President Johnson, but wanted his scalp as well. Many things can happen in this very Chamber if we do not beware and if we are not careful of what we do. If the pending amendment fails, we repudiate the judgment of our highest Court—the Court to which the opponents of this amendment would quickly repair if they got into trouble and needed its help. Yes; we have the power of the purse, as has been indicated this after-

noon, and we are given that power by the Constitution, but there is also the constitutional prohibition against bills of attainder and ex post facto laws. One part of the Constitution is as sacred as the other. The opponents apparently and deliberately close their eyes to those portions of the Constitution which protect the liberties of the individual and guard against undue encroachments upon those liberties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gwynne].

Mr. Gwynne of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, let me assure you I am not speaking at all because of any affection for Mr. Watson or Mr. Dodd or the type of government they apparently believe in. I am speaking because of a deep and abiding affection for sound principles of constitutional government. I would regret it if this amendment were not adopted. When we had the original amendment here to remove Dodd and Watson from the pay roll I voted against the amendment on the theory that it was a bill of attainder. The court has simply done its duty. It has recognized an obligation which I think we did not recognize when we adopted that amendment and has said that these people were not taken from the pay roll in a proper manner. In accordance with their duty as they saw it they rendered a judgment.

We must distinguish between the power to do something and the right to do it. Of course we have the power to refuse to appropriate the money. If we should disagree with the Supreme Court we have the power to refuse to appropriate the money for their salaries or to run their institution. Nevertheless, we have no right to do it, and we have violated our oath of office, in my judgment, if we put our conduct on the naked question of power regardless of the question of the right. The court is a coordinate branch of the Government. It has in the exercise of its power and authority rendered a judgment which I think it is our duty to uphold.

This is not similar to the portal-to-portal case. The right of Congress after a judgment has been rendered, after a decision has been made, to rewrite the law for the future is unquestioned. That is a question of policy. But the portal-to-portal bill, if you read it carefully, recognizes that we had no right to interfere with the judgment which was beyond appeal, and we specifically excluded that in that measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy].

Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the reason the Committee on Un-American Activities called Mr. Watson, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Lovett subversive was that these men favored a government that was totalitarian, a government that operated through the one-party system. The strength of America, it seems to me, is in the balance of power between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of our Government. If because we have the power in this chamber to do so, we should hold back payment of this money to these men

and not honor the decision of the Supreme Court we would be breaking down that division, which at this particular time is all-important. I therefore feel it essential to our integrity and to the integrity of our Government that this claim be honored.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keating].

Mr. Keating. Mr. Chairman, up our way the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations stands high in the estimation of everyone. His integrity and singleness of purpose are the objects of our utmost admiration. I know he is utterly sincere in the position he takes and the same remark applies to the committee which has favorably reported this bill. It is with great regret that I find myself in disagreement with my esteemed colleague. But I must join my distinguished colleague from Iowa of the Committee on the Judiciary in what he has so forcefully and so well said.

The amount involved here is only a little over \$2,000, so small, in fact, that one scarcely dares mention the sum in official Washington. But the principle involved, it seems to me, is basic and fundamental—more so, in fact, than any yet faced by this Congress. To deny this appropriation strikes at the very heart of our system of government. I do not know any of these men. I never heard of them until this bill was brought to the floor. So far as I have been able to learn, their conduct as employees of this Government was thoroughly reprehensible. I am entirely ready to assume that it is a fact, as stated by the chairman in his opening remarks, that the evidence showed that these men did not owe, or pay, their first loyalty to the United States.

Nevertheless, they went to court with their claims, were sustained in the Court of Claims, and the judgments which they recovered were affirmed in the Supreme Court of the United States. The only way whereby they can translate their piece of paper called a judgment, into cash in hand, is through an appropriation made by this Congress. No matter how violently I may disagree with the decision rendered by our highest court, I am unwilling to lend the support of my vote to the use of this process to render such a judgment ineffectual. If we seize the power to nullify this judgment, where are we to stop? What limit shall we set on the substitution of our discretion for the solemn pronouncement of our highest court?

My sincere and able friend defends the elimination of these items from the bill by saying that there is precedent for such action by Congress as is here recommended. I am not familiar with the case to which he refers. But my answer is unhesitatingly that if such precedents exist they are fundamentally wrong. No matter what some previous Congress has seen fit to do, I cannot support or vote for a proposition which does violence, in my judgment, to the doctrine of the separation of powers between the judicial, legislative, and executive branches of our Government. The very structure of the American political sys-

tem rests upon the mutual regard and respect of the three coordinate elements which compose it.

Accordingly, I shall support the amendment which has been offered to make provision for the payment of these judgments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us be cool and keep our feet on the ground. These are indeed serious times through which we are passing. Let us not do unlawful things and foolish things in a moment of caprice or a moment of madness.

The Supreme Court of the United States determines lawsuits. It has determined these lawsuits and has rendered its solemn judgment. In my judgment we have no right under our theory of government to deny these judgments by refusal to make sufficient appropriations to pay them.

I know nothing in the world about these men. I assume from what has been said that they are not in any way the type of men that I would approve of. I do not know anything about them, but it is not for this body to judge that in this instance. Their case was for the Supreme Court to determine. It was for the Court to determine whether or not they were entitled to their money. Since it has so determined, I believe we have no right to deny it. We have no lawful right to deny it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for 5 minutes to close debate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am so conscious of my limitations in the field of constitutional law that I am most reluctant to match wits with the very distinguished lawyers of this House. Yet, I find myself in disagreement with so many eminent gentlemen from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Let us look at the matter in this way, quite aside from the ideology that is involved and quite aside from the emotionalism.

You will remember surely those cases in the Supreme Court of the United States involving the gold clause, and especially the notable case of Perry against the United States, in which the Supreme Court said: "Why, indeed, you are in possession of a piece of paper. It has language in it that provides that on the tendering of this bond you can be paid in gold." But the Court said: "You are without a remedy. It is a charge upon the conscience of the sovereign"—and the sovereign might in this case be the Congress. It said: "Indeed, you have a valid contract; but, unfortunately, there is no remedy by which you can pursue your right. There is no way by which you can compel action on it and get payment in gold. You have to be paid in paper."

Now, here are three gentlemen who, in my considered judgment, in the first instance came into court with unclean hands. But the fact remains, they have a judgment. Now, the question is, What remedy is available to them? The Supreme Court said they are entitled to

the money. But that does not mean that the Congress must appropriate the money any more than the Congress was required to set up a procedure to pay the holders of every gold bond in the country. The Court said it was a charge on the conscience of the sovereign, but did the sovereign do anything about it? The sovereign did exactly nothing. Every holder of a bond that had a gold clause in it had to take paper money as payment. The sovereign did nothing. Now, must the sovereign do something in this instance? Must the sovereign now, notwithstanding the fact that here is a valid judgment, take action to honor that judgment? In my opinion, the sovereign in this case, the Congress, has no such obligation. Let us not forget that we did not take these gentlemen off of the roll. What we did was this: We put a proviso in the urgent deficiency bill in 1943 stating that they can have no money until they are confirmed by the Senate. They had to be appointed and confirmed by the Senate. They did not go and get confirmation from the Senate. What they did was this: They remained on the rolls in defiance of the Congress and in contempt of the Congress until there had accrued sufficient pay to make out a case, and then they went into the Court of Claims. But in the same proportion that the Supreme Court said in the Perry case, "While the Congress is under no duty to provide remedies through the courts, the contractual obligations do exist, and despite the infirmities of procedure, remain binding upon the conscience of the sovereign." So we have much on our conscience, because all holders of those gold contracts were never paid. I am willing to charge my conscience with one more thing and not appropriate money for this purpose.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RABIN. If the Supreme Court decided in the Perry case that we should pay in gold, should we not pay it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It said there was an obligation on the sovereign.

Mr. RABIN. Had they said we should have paid in gold, should we not have paid in gold?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely not, because we had taken away their remedy. In other words, there was no way for them to enforce it. But let us not forget that the Congress of the United States is, after all, a coordinate branch of this Government, made up of three separate and distinct and independent branches. Here is an element of discretion, and while our conscience is charged with it, yet we are under no obligation to pay it.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am very much troubled in attempting to follow the gentleman's judgment, whether two wrongs make a right. Is this not another wrong?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. This is wholly within the realm of rights of Congress. In other words, we have the discretion whether we are going to set up procedure and that procedure would have to go through all the necessary motions of

the Appropriations Committee to get the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOBBS) there were—ayes 86, noes 97.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. CANNON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 99, noes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this vote on whether a final judgment of our Supreme Court should be paid is a very difficult vote. I voted for the original law striking Dodds, Watson, and Lovett from the Federal pay roll. I thought then, and still think, that they were and are unworthy to be on the Government pay roll because of their subversive views. I disagree with the Supreme Court decision which held that law of Congress unconstitutional.

In voting to pay this judgment I am upholding a judgment I disagree with; these men have shown their willingness to overthrow the very Constitution which the Supreme Court invoked in awarding this judgment.

Nevertheless, I voted for the Hobbs amendment appropriating funds to pay this judgment. No one can sue the United States unless Congress grants the right. These cases were properly filed in the Court of Claims according to the laws laid down by Congress. A final judgment was duly obtained against the United States of America. We may have the power to refuse to pay that judgment, but I feel we do not have the right to do it. Congress should act to pay money judgments obtained by citizens against the Government, in accordance with the laws provided by Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Naval procurement fund," \$4,817,350.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 49, after line 9, insert:

"Pay, subsistence, and transportation, 1945.....	\$55,000,000
Pay and subsistence of naval personnel, 1946.....	130,000,000
Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1945.....	4,000,000
Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1946.....	12,000,000
Transportation of things, Navy, 1945.....	9,000,000
Transportation of things, Navy, 1946.....	40,000,000
Fuel and transportation, Navy, 1945.....	10,000,000
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery:	
Medical Department, Navy, 1945.....	5,500,000
Medical Department, Navy, 1946.....	7,000,000
Bureau of Ships: Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, 1945.....	100,000,000

Bureau of Aeronautics:	
Aviation, Navy, 1945-----	\$460,000,000
Aviation, Navy, 1946-----	6,000,000
Bureau of Ordnance: Ord-	
nance and ordnance stores,	
Navy, 1945-----	50,000,000
Marine Corps:	
Pay, Marine Corps, 1945...	7,000,000
Pay, Marine Corps, 1946...	36,000,000
General expenses, Marine	
Corps, 1945-----	14,000,000
General expenses, Marine	
Corps, 1946-----	55,000,000"

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, these are rescissions that have been submitted to us by the Secretary of the Navy and are items that appear in accounts that they might expend. They have felt and many of us here have felt that they would be better off with them wiped off the books. They do not intend to use any of them before the expiration date.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. May I ask the gentleman when these expire?

Mr. TABER. Some of them will not expire until the end of the next fiscal year. Every time the Navy has come up against something the suggestion is made that they have this block of funds available that might be obligated and it is embarrassing to them.

Mr. CANNON. As the items were read, I did not note any which would not expire this year. If that is true, and if, as the gentleman says, the Navy will not use them this year, it is only a matter of a few weeks, and nothing is to be gained by taking action at this late day.

Mr. TABER. It is simply an effort to clean up their books, and it puts them in a position where they cannot use the funds. On the other hand, it leaves them in the position where no one can say that they have in sight \$6,600,000,000 to spend after this fiscal year.

Mr. CANNON. Every year we have these odds and ends at the close of the fiscal year which expire automatically. We have never taken action of this kind before. It is merely a gesture, and might be construed as an attempt to leave the impression that we are making a saving when we are not making any saving at all. Does the gentleman think we can save any money by this procedure?

Mr. TABER. I think undoubtedly we will.

Mr. CANNON. In what items does the gentleman expect to save money?

Mr. TABER. Some may be obligated, as I understand it, up to the end of June, and I understand that \$286,000,000 of that may be obligated to the end of June next year, and the temptation is there where any of them might be used. Now, it would seem to me it was good business to cut them out.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment going in, although, on the face of it, it is of no force or effect whatsoever. It will not effect economies of any kind. It is merely making a bookkeeping entry in advance of the automatic rescission of the entire amount.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri last year brought in a rescission bill and thought it was a very proper thing to do?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I did not bring in a rescission of this character. I reported actual rescissions of sums which would be available after the end of the fiscal year. These will expire June 30. This amendment will not salvage a penny.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was the suggestion of the Secretary of the Navy to the chairman that there is herewith transmitted a list of balances available for immediate rescission.

Mr. CANNON. But all of them will automatically expire on the 30th of June, and the Navy assures us they will not be spent in the meantime. Nothing is to be gained by adding them to this bill. But I have no objection to including them. It does not mean anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the balance of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments 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. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Hobbs amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Dodd-Lovett-Watson amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS:

On page 46, between lines 8 and 9, insert as follows: "Federal Communications Commission, \$161.61."

Page 46, line 15, strike out "\$164,500.45" and insert in lieu thereof "\$166,496.85."

Page 46, line 16, strike out "and."

Page 46, after the number "45910" insert "46026."

Page 46, line 22, strike out "\$2,102,638.17" and insert "\$2,104,796.18."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 110, noes 97.

So 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.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Civil Service Commission regarding certain navy yard employees.

RENT CONTROL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 188)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Public Law 548 of the Seventy-ninth Congress provides:

On or before April 1, 1947, the President shall report to the Congress what, if any, commodities or classes of commodities, including housing accommodations, are in such critically short supply as to necessitate, in his judgment, the continuance of the powers granted by this act as to them after June 30, 1947, together with his recommendations as to established departments or agencies of the Government (other than the Office of Price Administration) which should be charged with the administration of such powers.

On November 12, 1946, price controls were eliminated on all commodities except sugar, sugar solutions derived from sugarcane or sugar beets, corn sirup and corn sugar, blended sirups, and rough and milled rice. Since the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947 has become law, it is unnecessary for me to repeat the views I have already expressed with respect to the subject matter of that act.

Despite the rapid upswing in residential construction during 1946, the Nation is still faced with a critical housing shortage. Dwelling accommodations, particularly rental units, are still radically out of balance with demand. In 88 cities surveyed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of the Census during 1946, vacancies in rental units were virtually nonexistent. The vacancy rates in habitable accommodations for these cities ranged from zero

to a maximum of 1 percent with an average well below one-half of 1 percent. Proper protection of millions of our American families requires that effective rent and eviction control be extended beyond June 30, 1947, for a further period of 1 year, and I so recommend.

As for the agency of the Government to administer rent controls, it was my original recommendation that the Office of Temporary Controls be assigned this responsibility. However, recent legislation requires the liquidation of that agency, and a bill now under consideration by the Senate would transfer these functions to the Housing Expediter. I raise no objection to this proposal.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 1, 1947.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include an article.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 1439, and include a statement by John J. Giltinan.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE GREEK AND TURKISH SITUATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this day I rise to speak as an American citizen deeply devoted to my country and filled with loyalty for her. Our country stands at a crossroad, the most hazardous in her history. What you and I do now will undoubtedly set the course of our national policy so inexorably that we shall be caught in a politico-military tide from which there is no escaping. True it is that the President sets the course of our foreign policy; but equally true is the fact that Congress must appropriate the money and therefore share full responsibility for the consequences of the policies toward Greece and Turkey, and other countries.

It has become customary to brand independent thinking on foreign affairs as isolationism. If my remarks are construed within that category, gentlemen, I shall accept the accusation with pleasure, because I speak as my conscience dictates. I am an American, a citizen of the United States of America and my first consideration is for my country. If that be treason, make the most of it.

We have thrown the gauntlet to one of the most powerful nations in the world and we propose to embark upon a series of international adventures that can lead only to heartache, human suffering and national bankruptcy. We have been asked—and appear to have accepted—the role of bankrupt Great Britain. Although she was the world's richest and most powerful state for over a century, she did not have wealth enough to continue her imperialism indefinitely and avoid economic disaster. And now with that object lesson before us, we propose to pour our good money into the same bottomless well. I say that rich as we are we do not have and never

can have enough money to fill the well of British imperialism.

We are told by the President that the money requested is to fight communism abroad. That is a worthy enterprise as far as that doctrine and its practice oppose our free institutions. But how does the President hope to fight communism abroad when it is rampant within our own country? Why did he not appear before us recommending measures for its eradication from our own governmental departments here in Washington long before he did? When does he propose to clean out some of our own domestic hotbeds? Surely, we are not so naive as to believe that we can fight a doctrine abroad and still have that doctrine preached to us by our own governmental departments here at home. How do we expect to carry on the fight against communism abroad when the boring from within menaces the foundations of our Government at home? The fellow travelers are found in high places. Secretaries of Commerce are not the only ones who are susceptible to these leftist doctrines.

But fighting communism is only a cloak for the more fundamental and underlying power politics which is being played. It is not food and relief which are in question. Everyone of us is for that, and Congress has already before it measures for the granting of relief. Nor is this simply a loan. Look at the matter in its broader implications. The \$400,000,000 is only the initial loan. We are to have the right to send American troops to Turkey and Greece. We are to combine loans and troops with relief and food. But in addition we have been asked to pass the President's budget with few cuts. We are asked to pass the Army and Navy merger, and finally to enact compulsory military service. Thus we are asked not only to embark on a hazardous foreign venture whose outcome none of us can envision, but we are granting to the military cliques complete control of our Government. In short, what is there to distinguish us in that respect from totalitarian regimes? Already the military rules our State Department. For the first time in history a general is the Secretary of State. Too many generals now fill our diplomatic posts.

If I read history correctly, this is alien to American ways of thinking. For we have always kept the military establishments in balance. We are become a war, not a peace state. What did we fight two world wars for—more war and the loss of our freedom? We are in the midst of setting our course along militaristic and imperialistic lines which contradict the bases of American thought and our beliefs. Equally disturbing is the fact that our contemplated conduct runs contrary to the foundations of our foreign policy. Hear what George Washington said in his Farewell Address. He saw more clearly than we do in an equally disturbed era.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let

them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements.

And then, of course, while President Monroe said:

We owe, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

Are we to do to Europeans what we forbid them to do to us? President Monroe also said:

In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries and make preparation for our defense.

On September 12, 1940, Senator Nye said of the Monroe Doctrine:

In very brief language, the two paragraphs together mean just this:

1. We want no part of anything in Europe and we aren't interested in interfering in Europe. Our best interests are served by staying out of European power politics.
2. But we intend that Europe shall stay out of the Americas; we will not stand for its interference in our affairs or the affairs of our sister republics, and any European nation attempting to so interfere in any of these nations will have us to reckon with.

And now because British imperialism has led that country to make commitments, which she no longer can fulfill, notwithstanding our billions to her, President Truman asks us to take up the burden, jettison the bases of our foreign policy, which have led us to greatness, and contradict the wisdom of our years. To all this, American interests dictate an emphatic "No." We have fought aggression in two major wars. Do we now propose to succumb to it ourselves? Where is the line of our true interests to be drawn? Did I not hear over the radio the other day that some of our military experts are already contemplating outposts on Mars and the Moon for the conduct of atomic warfare? Where do we propose to stop?

I said, and I repeat, the course the President recommends is dangerous, unnecessarily so. We were responsible for the League of Nations, and have been

equally responsible for the United Nations organization, to whose institution we have subscribed from the very beginning. Is there not an effective Food and Agricultural Organization and an International Bank which can handle much of the Greek relief which the President proposes? Russia is not a member of either one. Surely, if Greece needs help and we fear Russia, then the United Nations organization should now be used by us. We are reverting to independent national action which is a sure road to war, when there lies at hand an international agency whose use will lead to peace.

I think the President has already made a grave mistake in bypassing the United Nations in this matter. The United Nations is the only international organization we have today which can further the cause of peace. The United States has taken the lead in promoting the United Nations organization, and it therefore behooves us to aid in every way if it is ever to amount to anything at all. If we bypass the United Nations organization now we will brand it useless in the sight of the nations of the world.

The President owes it to our people and to the world to present the case of Greece and Turkey to the Security Council and to the General Assembly of the United Nations, and request them to act and do so now. They should assume the responsibility, not the United States as proposed by President Truman. Only one other alternative comes to mind, and that will be, give the money to the churches—Catholic, Protestant, and Hebrew—and ask them to send their communicants into Greece to alleviate suffering from hunger, cold, and disease. Religion is more vital than weapons. Religion is to be more welcome to a war-torn people than the form of government they have.

When men rule people in their own way and by their own methods, by force or otherwise, they are most likely to fail. When men join up with God and ask Him to lead the way they succeed if they will follow Him.

I believe the failure of the United Nations to date is because they did not nor do not ask divine guidance in their deliberations at their sessions. Men win with God—men fail without God.

What makes this matter of aid to Greece so urgent? Are we just becoming aware of the situation and would be panicked into action? Surely Greece has needed assistance for a long time. That war-torn country has been helped time and time again, both privately and publicly, by the Government and the citizens of the United States. If Russia disturbs us so much, where was our State Department when the treaties of peace were drawn up with Italy, Rumania, Hungary, Finland, and Bulgaria? Do we hope to contain the Russian State within its own borders when it is already surrounded by friendly neighboring states frankly distrusting the United States?

There is chaos and confusion in the recommended course of action, which can only grow more pronounced as we proceed along the path laid out for us. This is not a question of backing the

Government, or bipartisan policy, or even of party interests. This is a matter of the true and sound course of American policy, much broader than the interests of any individual or any official institution or group of people. It is as broad as our country itself.

Read the headlines of the news stories and editorials which appeared at the time the President delivered his address. Here are some: "Russia's bawling out," "Get ready for war," "Taft probes likelihood of Soviet war if United States aids Greece and Turkey," "America's new role." Can there be any question as to the significance of the course we are taking?

A little over a year ago we sent an international commission into Greece to observe the elections there. Was that the forerunner of much more expansive action to come? Greece is no democracy; to inject ourselves into her domestic affairs gives us the choice between, on the one hand, communism and its allied forces, and, on the other hand, an unpopular, dictatorial monarchy whose only excuse for living is that Britain established it there. Nowhere is democracy.

To vote the Greek and Turkish recommendations will commit this country to an impossible task and will convert it in the eyes of the world from a haven and refuge for the oppressed and, therefore, the most popular country, into the most unpopular country charged with interfering everywhere. The contemplated program is impossible to fulfill. Taking the world as a whole, we have only a comparatively small part of the manpower and a comparatively small part of the wealth. Let us not forget how near disaster we were just 4 short years ago. A little more weight on the side of the enemy, his election of different courses of action, might well have prolonged the war indefinitely. For the moment we are the most powerful state in the world. Let us not use that power to create conflict but rather let us use it to promote peace, understanding and good will. Russia can be fought with armies, but communism cannot be killed by bayonets or rifles; nor will a loan of \$400,000,000 kill it in Greece, Turkey or the rest of the world. And when will the American taxpayer stop having to contribute? After Greece and Turkey comes Korea, then Rumania, Yugoslavia, Finland, and all the border states of Russia. Such a program would commit us indefinitely to unproductive budgets of billions.

I would remind my brother Congressmen that while we like to think of ourselves as wealthy, almost a decade and a half of the New Deal and a World War have mortgaged our wealth in an unprecedented fashion. We are talking of balancing the budget and tax cuts in this session. I venture to predict that if we embark upon this course we may be the last Congress to talk in these terms.

There are so many reasons against this course of action that it is impossible to give them without exhausting your patience. May I close by quoting the reactions of one of my constituents:

I am all for helping any nation to feed its people and establish a democratic form of government, but Greece does not have a

democratic government. It has a feudalistic government, established at point of the British bayonets. Now it is proposed to back such a government as we have been backing reactionary governments all through the war years. If we were really sincere when we claim to want democracy and free government, we would long ago have helped poor Spain out of its present plight. We would not now, as we are, be a party to the tearing apart of Korea, and our munitions would not have been used in Java to keep the Javanese from their freedom.

Briefly, these are the reasons why I want to oppose with all my power this proposal:

It would make the United Nations organization worse than a scrap of paper; it would make our entrance into it a pure hypocrisy. With one hand we subscribe to it; with the other we play party politics.

It will align our country with reactionary governments in the eyes of the rest of the world. Our reputation for this is nothing to be proud of even before this proposal.

This means we are starting on the road of imperialism. The one and to my mind the only good reason for the past war is that imperialism was given a death blow. Now we propose to keep it alive a little longer.

This marks the beginning of an armament race between Russia and us that will bankrupt both.

It shows us the terrible consequences of leaving the military men to rule our Government.

It must lead inevitably and directly to war. Surely no sane person believes Russia will take such a blow lying down.

Let us send food to Greece and elsewhere to allay starvation. Let us back every decent democratic government that stands for freedom, but let us be done with any government that was established at the point of bayonets.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE GRECO-TURKISH AID PROPOSAL— "THE THIRD ROAD"

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to speak on the subject of the Greco-Turkish aid bill. On March 12 President Truman addressed a joint session of Congress. His address was virtually a public declaration of political war on Russia. On that date the President proposed a radical and startling change in our traditional foreign policy of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other nations.

The consideration of Mr. Truman's proposal does not involve partisan politics. It is a question that concerns every American citizen regardless of political affiliation. The charge of imperialistic warmonger and starry-eyed internationalist will be made against those who support intervention as proposed by Mr. Truman. The charge of isolationist, anti-British, and pro-Russian will be made against those who oppose the Truman proposal.

There is a great body of American people who do not accept any of the hysterical labels I have named. There are in this Congress many Members who refuse to be classified under any of the labels noted. I am among that number. Neither blind party loyalty nor fear of labeling from either the extreme right or the extreme left can deter many of us from viewing with great concern this proposal. A proposal which seeks to change our traditional foreign policy in such an abrupt and drastic manner.

TWO FATEFUL ROADS

Mr. Truman's proposal involves the choice of only two roads, and they might be posted as follows: Nonintervention and intervention. Down the road of nonintervention we see the old mud hole of isolation, with its attendant danger of refusing again to accept our world responsibilities in a rapidly shrinking world. Down the second road, which is posted intervention, we see the dangerous quicksands of imperialistic, unilateral procedures which have preceded every war. Before we make our choice between the two roads which stretch so fatefully before us we want to be sure there is not a third and more desirable road as yet undisclosed by our leaders. Maybe there is a third road which we can find, and maybe that road is named United Nations Way. I will return to this alternative road later.

There are many questions to be asked, and there must be many satisfactory answers given, before some of us can choose either the first road—nonintervention—which beckons the traditional isolationists, the Communists, the pro-Russian fellow travelers, as well as the timid group who draw back from world responsibilities, or before we can choose the second road of unconditional intervention, which lures the twentieth century American imperialists, the hate Russia warmonger, and the confused group who do not realize the meaning of the Truman proposal.

ONE HUNDRED AND TEN QUESTIONS ON AID PROPOSAL

On March 20, 1947, a letter was addressed to the Acting Secretary of State, Hon. Dean Acheson, by a highly respected Member of the other body. Appended to this letter was a questionnaire containing 110 important questions relating to the Greco-Turkish aid proposal. I have read the 110 questions. Satisfactory answers may be available, but I have not to this day been furnished with a full list of answers. Not being on the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, I have not had the benefit of hearing the testimony presented, neither have I read the testimony presented in the similar committee in the other body. I have only this to say, unless satisfactory answers are given, many of us who refuse to be classified as isolationists or labeled as Communists will not vote for the bill. I do not intend to take up these 110 questions in detail. Time on the floor and space in the RECORD would forbid. I do intend to advance a few important questions however and make a few observations. The first question which concerns most of us is the basic one of Why has the United Nations been bypassed? Regardless of the belated excuses and explanations by those who wholeheartedly indorsed the Truman proposal, the fact remains that the original proposal was belligerent in its tone, filled with hot generalities, and fraught with most startling and dangerous implications. It was as dangerous from the standpoint of what it left unsaid as it was for the things it said.

WHY HAS THE UNITED NATIONS BEEN BYPASSED?

The furor of public alarm and opposition to the President's approach to this problem is now forcing tardy explanations, ameliorating excuses, and sycophantic references to "a stopgap emergency program pending United Nations action." Which is, to say the least, suspicious. It betrays a policy of second guessing, which strives to cover up the initial mistake. That the original joint message to Congress justifies the question, "Why has the United Nations been bypassed?" cannot be denied. The reaction from every thoughtful person was immediate and shocking, when they realized that the United Nations was practically ignored. People from every walk of life began to wonder if the United Nations was being classified as a futile and functionless shadow. A careful reading of the part of the President's message which summarily dismisses the United Nations as being too slow and ineffective to merit more than a passing bow, or a careless backhand slap, brought consternation and alarm to many thoughtful people. The harm done throughout the world in crushing the feeble flame of hope which exists in the heart of many war-weary people was incalculable. We realize that the United Nations has not been brought to fruition; we know that many parts of the outline are yet to be filled. We will concede that there is no international police force which can be sent into Greece to maintain civil order in the emergency. We will concede that it might be difficult to aid Greece in a monetary way without special multilateral action such as obtained in the establishment of UNRRA. We will concede that a Russian veto might prevent a unanimous edict of policy by the Security Council delegates. All these concessions we are willing to admit, and they do present great difficulties to prevent emergency action by the United Nations in this hour of crisis.

But because they present great difficulties shall we use these arguments as an excuse for killing the United Nations in its infancy? Shall we use the element of short time between the President's proposal on March 12 and the British evacuation on March 31 as an excuse for weakening an organization which holds the hope of millions throughout the world, the hope of millions who pray for the obtaining of world peace?

Or should this Greco-Turkish problem have been used as an opportunity for revitalizing and developing the United Nations in the direction of its original goal; that is, the formation of a vital, functioning, world organization for the solution of international problems and the assurance of world peace?

WHY SUCH UNSEEMLY HASTE?

Let us consider some pertinent factors involved in the proposal. First, the appeal to act hastily on the grounds of the emergency conditions which would ensue immediately after the abrupt withdrawal of British troops on March 31. I would like to know why the British are being allowed to precipitate such an abrupt crisis. Is it not true that our State Department has known for many

months that such action was contemplated? If so, why was the proposed British withdrawal not publicized so that Congress would have an adequate period of time to study and debate the subject of American intervention? If the British notice of withdrawal was necessarily as sudden as we have been led to believe, I would like to know if our State Department protested the abrupt action, and whether they requested the British Government to postpone for 60 or 90 days their withdrawal. This would have been a reasonable request and within the possible bonds of British compliance. It would have given us time to explore multilateral action. Laying aside for a moment the ethical question of the subject of intervention, and assuming that external political, economic, and military aid is necessary for the welfare and protection of the Greek people, assuming also that the United Nations has not been developed to the point where it can function in the Greco-Turkish crisis, we are still confronted with this question, "Is there no alternative to unilateral action of the United States?" The Truman proposal in effect says "No." But many of us are not satisfied with this answer. We do not believe that it is impossible to develop an alternative procedure. A procedure which would not duplicate the unilateral imperialistic solutions which have been the basis of all previous wars. We believe that a procedure could have been and still can be developed which will have the moral and spiritual force of multilateral sanction. A procedure which will comply with the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the proposed goal of the United Nations.

IS THERE AN OVER-ALL FOREIGN POLICY?

Another very important question which I would like to ask is this, Do we have an over-all European, Middle East, and far eastern foreign policy? The reason I ask this question is obvious. The necessity of considering the Greek problem as part of an over-all European, Middle East, and far eastern problem is so plain that even a fool can see it. The solution of any of the various problems in these areas depends upon its relation to the other problems involved in adjoining areas.

Setting up a new procedure, a unilateral procedure on our part toward Greece, does two very important things: First, it ignores multilateral procedure as envisaged by the United Nations; and, second, it sets a precedent of unilateral procedure for not only ourselves, but for every other nation in the world. Once we embark upon this course of unilateral solution of international problems, we have no reason to criticize other nations for doing the same thing. That is why this proposal assumes an importance far beyond the scope of the Greek-Turkish aid proposal.

Our policy of piecemeal, spur-of-the-moment development of foreign policy, without regard to an over-all policy, has proven time and again to be a mistake. In this particular case—the Greek case—we know that the question of internationalization of the Dardanelles is involved, or at least Russian demands for egress and ingress to and from a

warm-water port in the Baltic. We know that this is the reason the Turkish military loan is tacked onto the Greek loan. It is to strengthen Turkey in her opposition to Russian demands. The excuse of starvation and maintenance of a quasi monarchist-democratic government, which clothes our Greek intervention with an aura of humanitarianism, has not been advanced to justify the Turkish portion of the appropriation. The reason it has not been advanced is because it is palpably untenable. Turkey is not starving, and by no stretch of the imagination can it be classified as even semidemocratic.

WHOSE CHESTNUTS ARE AT STAKE?

Another related problem, of course, is the oil problem. I say "related," but what I mean is it is one of our most important reasons behind our sudden interest in the Mediterranean. Now, lest

some of my anti-British friends say, "We are pulling English chestnuts out of the fire," let me make it very clear that in Iran, Iraq, and in Saudi Arabia, there are other chestnuts besides British chestnuts.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks at this point two tables of statistics, which show whose chestnuts are in the fire.

Table No. 1 shows the daily oil production and the estimated oil reserves in barrel units of the Persian Middle East countries.

It also shows that not only the British chestnuts, but American, Dutch, and French chestnuts are in the fire.

Table No. 2 shows the names of the petroleum-developing companies and their ownership, by nationalities, and the respective percentages of ownership involved.

Britain and give it the importance it deserves in the development of an over-all, Middle East foreign policy?

If we are going to embark on an over-all Middle East policy, why not include along with the Greek problem the internationalization of the Dardanelles, the equitable division of concessions in the Iraq, Iran, and Saudi Arabia oil fields? Also, why not include in the over-all discussion a solution of the Palestine question? There are other problems in the Middle East, but these three that I have mentioned are pressing enough and are related enough to demonstrate the fact that I first stated, that you cannot solve the Greek problem without taking into consideration other related problems in the Middle East.

MULTILATERAL SOLUTIONS IMPERATIVE

If we are to embark on a world-leadership program, as befits our position among the society of nations, let us be careful to exercise that leadership to give strength and being to the United Nations. We want to exercise that leadership in the full light of United Nations debate. We want to know when we embark on this venture of world leadership that we have the moral and spiritual force of at least the majority of the United Nations behind us. We do not wish to be in the vulnerable position of using our resources in an imperialistic way. We either move forward in the world of tomorrow, in concert with other nations toward multilateral solutions, or we move backward alone to the unilateral fiascos of the past.

THE RUSSIAN VETO

We have been told that one of the reasons why this matter has not been referred to the United Nations has been because of the certainty of a Russian veto. We want to discuss this point for the moment on the assumption that this prediction of a Russian veto is correct. First, let us remember that the veto provision in the Charter is not wholly chargeable to Russia. The United States was equally insistent that this veto provision be included. So in our criticism of Russia, for the misuse of the veto, let us not forget that she uses the tool which we helped to make.

The veto has been used 12 times by members of the Security Council. It was used twice by the United States and the United Kingdom voting in unison. It was used once by France and Russia voting together and it was used nine times by Russia alone. Many of us have come to the conclusion that the United Nations cannot be effective as a world organization if the nations comprising the "big five" retain the veto power. Let me point out, however, that we are probably no more ready to renounce the veto than Russia. If we find, however, that important international problems cannot be solved on the basis of complete unanimity, we must admit the futility of depending on the United Nations as now constituted to guarantee or facilitate world peace.

POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

What is the alternative? Referring specifically to the Greek problem, I notice that the morning papers report that a distinguished member of the other body

TABLE 1.—Petroleum production and reserves of Persian Gulf countries by nationality of corporate ownership

[U. S. 42-gallon barrels]

	Daily production ¹			Reserves ²		
	United States	British-Dutch	French	United States	British-Dutch	French
Iran.....		420,000			6,500,000,000	
Iraq.....	24,000	48,000	24,000	1,200,000,000	2,400,000,000	1,200,000,000
Qatar.....				250,000,000	500,000,000	250,000,000
Kuwait.....	20,000	20,000		4,500,000,000	4,500,000,000	
Saudi Arabia.....	200,000			5,000,000,000		
Bahrain.....	20,000			300,000,000		
Total.....	264,000	488,000	24,000	11,250,000,000	13,900,000,000	1,450,000,000

¹ Oil and Gas Journal, Dec. 28, 1946, p. 175.

² American Petroleum Interests in Foreign Countries, S. Res. 36, 79th Cong., p. 73.

TABLE 2.—Middle East oil companies—ownership by countries, 1947

[Information supplied by U. S. Department of State]

Country	Company	Ownership by nationality
Bahrain.....	Bahrain Petroleum Co., Ltd.	100 percent American owned—50 percent Standard Oil Co. of California and 50 percent Texas Co.
Iran.....	Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Ltd.	100 percent British owned.
Iraq.....	Iraq Petroleum Co., Ltd.	23.75 percent American owned—Near-East Development Corp., in which Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. share equally.
Do.....	do.	23.75 percent French owned—Compagnie Francaise des Petroles.
Do.....	do.	23.75 percent Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., Ltd., British owned.
Do.....	do.	23.75 percent Dutch owned—Royal Dutch Shell.
Do.....	do.	0.5 percent owned by "individuals."
Qawait.....	Qawait Oil Co., Ltd.	50 percent American owned—Gulf Oil Co.
Saudi Arabia.....	Arabian-American Oil Co. (Aramco).	100 percent American owned—50 percent Standard Oil Co. of California and 50 percent Texas Co. A deal is pending for Standard Oil of New Jersey to buy 30 percent and for Socony Oil Co. to buy 10 percent of these holdings.

I cannot develop at this time the true significance of these tables of statistics, but I am sure that there is enough information presented in these tables to adequately lay the ghost of "British chestnuts" only.

Let us be frank and admit that the Turkish portion of the loan has two great reasons behind it. First, preservation of the status quo in regard to the Dardanelles, and second, the protection of American, Dutch, French, and British chestnuts in the oil deposits of the Middle East. The subject of oil, therefore, cannot be divorced from our consideration of the Greek-Turkish aid bill and we should openly acknowledge its involvement.

PALESTINE, A RELATED PROBLEM

And then there is another great question which has been before the American people for many years, and that is

the Palestine question, a question which involves the life or death of millions of people of Jewish ancestry throughout the world. The Palestine question has been explored on this floor too many times for me to go into detail at this time. But suffice it to say that Britain is maintaining in Palestine, we are informed, 100,000 troops. Many of us believe that the British handling of the Palestine question has been wrong. We believe that she has violated the Balfour agreement, and that her handling of Palestine as a League of Nations mandate has not been just or fair. Our President has asked for certain concessions from the British Government in opening the gates of Palestine to the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons in Europe. This request has not been granted. Would it not be possible to include this part of the Middle East problem in negotiations with

proposes to offer amendments which will in effect give supervisory powers over our proposed venture to a procedural vote of the Security Council—not subject to veto—or a majority vote of the General Assembly delegates. This proposal, in my opinion, is a very important move toward multilateral approval. A substitute joint resolution has been offered in the House by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]. While I am not 100 percent in accord with this proposal, I do believe that it is worthy of very serious study as the main theme of the resolution points away from unilateral action and in the direction of multilateral action.

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL ALLIANCES

Addressing myself to the general problem of international organization, I would suggest that we encourage the formation of an adequate number of regional alliances consisting of as many nations as possible in each area who would be willing to work together on the principles of the United Nations. We have already done this in the Western Hemisphere and it has been approved as consistent with the world organization. The great advantage of the regional alliance would be that action could be taken on a policy or procedure without the paralyzing requirement of unanimity.

It may be necessary for the nations to learn to work together on a regional basis before we can function on the world level. We must admit that human nature has not yet attained that peak of perfection where unanimity is commonly achieved. Those functions of the world organization which are possible, and there are many, should still be encouraged and maintained. Many of these international subdivisions of the United Nations are making remarkable progress, without the participation of the U. S. S. R. I speak of the trusteeship council, the provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Labor Organization, and the Food and Agricultural Organization.

Every possible effort should be made to develop multilateral solutions as international problems arise, first on the regional basis and then on the world level. The principle of collective action must be maintained and unilateral action, such as the Truman proposal, avoided as we would avoid the plague. Like the bubonic plague, it is a virulent and contagious disease and a single case can start an epidemic that means certain death to the United Nations.

There is still time to return to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations.

In the first part of my speech, I described the choice between the two fateful roads of "nonintervention" and "unconditional intervention." I described the dangers attending the choice of either. I also suggested that there might be a third road which I called the United Nations way.

THE THIRD ROAD: "THE UNITED NATIONS WAY"

I believe that that third road is opening up before us. I believe that it can be developed and safeguarded by legislative conditions in the appropriation bills

and public commitments on the part of the President, the Secretary of State, and the United Nations delegate. To our delegate on the United Nations, the former distinguished Senator from Vermont, the Honorable Warren Austin, we owe a great debt of gratitude for pointing out the third road, "the United Nations way." The echoes of Mr. Truman's speech of March 12 had hardly ceased before the tide of public criticism began to mount, throughout the length and breadth of the United States. The people who had sacrificed so much in the great war just concluded, the people who saw the League of Nations scuttled after the First World War, the people who had pinned their faith to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations had asked again and again the question, "Why has the United Nations been bypassed?" Our delegate to the United Nations, Mr. Warren Austin, went before the United Nations Assembly on March 28 and said the things which the President should have said on March 12. Mr. Austin answered some of the important questions which have been troubling us, where Mr. Truman's proposal of intervention was based on one aim of the United Nations, that is, to prevent aggression against a weaker nation. It indicated that our action would be taken on a national basis, depending solely on our own strength and judgment. Mr. Austin's statement to the United Nations put the United States action on a very different basis indeed. Admitting that the United Nations was not ready, he made it clear that our intervention would be in line with the international principles of the United Nations, and that we welcomed the support of the other nations, both morally and financially. He admitted that the United Nations, as presently constituted, was lacking in financial resources. He pledged that our financial aid was on a temporary basis, pending the functioning of the United Nations on a long range basis through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. He further advised the Greek Government to apply for a loan of at least \$100,000,000 from this source. He promised that our temporary aid would be administered along the lines recommended by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, an international commission which has just completed a very fine survey of Grecian needs.

Mr. Austin pointed out that a United Nations commission is at the present time investigating territorial invasions by armed bands on the northern border of Greece. He asked that special efforts be made to expedite their report to the Security Council. And certainly, by implication, he pledged our support in their recommendation.

We see then that belatedly we are harmonizing our plans with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations.

CONDITIONAL CLAUSES AND PUBLIC COMMITMENTS

All of the questions have not yet been answered; we hope they can be answered in a satisfactory manner. The conditional clauses have not been enacted into legislation. We hope they can be enacted. The public commitments and as-

surances from our President and the Secretary of State have not been made. We sincerely trust and hope they will be forthcoming. Unless these conditional clauses can be written into the bill and unless proper collaboration on a multilateral basis can be developed, many of us cannot vote for the bill. Vigilance on the part of every patriotic person will be required to mobilize an enlightened public opinion to point the way down the third road indicated. An enlightened public opinion which will demand that this crisis be handled the "United Nations way."

It may be the deciding factor in the life of the world organization we call the United Nations. It may mean the difference between world peace and world destruction in this atomic age.

If we save the United Nations, it will be because the common people demand that our leaders walk down the third road, "the United Nations way."

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include two tables of statistics.)

SPECIAL ORDER

THE SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter here from a gentleman whom all of you know. I am not at liberty to reveal his name because I would like to talk to him before I do. But it is of little moment as to who he is. It is what he says that is important. I would like to read a few excerpts from his letter:

Byron wrote when he made his spectacular entry into Greece to help the Greeks throw off the yoke of the wretched Turks. The first four lines go like this:

"If a man has no freedom to fight for at home
Let him battle for that of his neighbors,
Let him think of the glories of Greece and of Rome,
And be knocked on the head for his labors."

Then the English were fighting against the infidel Turks. Now we are called on to fight for them. We have been denounced for not getting into the Spanish War on the side of the Communists, and are told if we had done so it would have stopped Hitler and prevented World War II. Now we must go into Greece against the Communists to stop Stalin and prevent World War III.

Meanwhile the poor American taxpayer has no freedom of choice and no money. He must not have a penny cut off his taxes or a penny in debt reduction lest this should threaten the security of his country. But it is all right to pour uncanceled billions into the rat holes of the whole earth.

This Greece-Turkey thing is exactly like the token force in World War I and the 50 over-age destroyers in World War II. I hate to agree with LaGuardia on any issue, but his testimony yesterday was 100 percent right. If we go into this Greek thing we shall be pouring in money and the blood of our sons for generations. This is a turning point in the history of our country.

No matter who may have said that, whether a lowly citizen or a man of high position, those statements, and especially that poem, are most timely.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. RAMEY. The question that is before the Congress is not the question of who is right but what is right.

Mr. BENDER. That is correct, and I think the gentleman who wrote this letter and who recited this poem from Byron hit the nail on the head—I wish I had the entire poem—let me read it again:

If a man has no freedom to fight for at home,
Let him battle for that of his neighbors.
Let him think of the glories of Greece and of
Rome,
And be knocked on the head for his labors.

Recently I had dinner with a young man who had just returned from the Philippines, a boy who was a draftee after the war. He said that we Americans are thoroughly despised. At least, the boys get that vibration from the Filipinos they met when they were serving in that country. Apparently, our role here is to be generous and kind and loving and considerate, and then we get knocked on the head for all of our good deeds. I think we ought to do some pretty good thinking about how we become involved in this Greek deal at this stage of the game.

A member of the other body—I am not supposed to mention his name because it would violate the rules of the House—said this matter should be referred to the United Nations, after we act on it here. I do not know just what the maneuvers are, but in any event, since we have a United Nations we ought to use it or else get out. The United Nations was most effective in the Iran controversy and even though Russia objected for a while, she yielded and went along with the program. I think it is entirely in order that this matter be considered by the United Nations and that we have no legislation here at all.

I believe the people of the world and the people of this country are sick unto death of government by emergency. We have had emergencies for 14 years, one after another. It is a sleight-of-hand performance under which you do not know what in the world you are doing except that you are following the path of least resistance.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. BREHM. If we would stop financing the various countries throughout the world they would come to an end immediately.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BREHM. The materials that are now being used are lend-lease and UNRRA materials. I maintain that there could not be another world war unless the American people financed it. If we would stop financing these conflicts it would do more to stimulate peace than anything I know of.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is right.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 18, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems

of small business the following Members of the House: Mr. FLOESER, of Missouri, chairman; Mr. STEVENSON, of Wisconsin; Mr. HOWELL, of Illinois; Mr. HILL, of Colorado; Mr. RIEHLMAN, of New York; Mr. PATMAN, of Texas; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mr. JACKSON, of Washington; and Mr. KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. DOLLIVER), until Thursday, April 3.

To Mr. WOODRUFF, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. ARENDT), indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. TOWE (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), for 2 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, indefinitely, on account of illness.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 169) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States has learned with profound sorrow of the death of His Majesty, George II, King of the Hellenes, and sympathizes with his people in the loss of their beloved King.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate this expression of sentiment of the House of Representatives to the Government of Greece.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of King George the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard to the consideration of the resolution.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 31, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 146. An act to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

513. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a request for withdrawal of the proposed deletion of part of the last paragraph in their letter of March 21, 1947, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred 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. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Un-American Activities submits a report pursuant to Public Law 601 (80th Cong., 1st sess.) on investigation of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 167. Resolution authorizing the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives to insure the funds of his office; without amendment (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2339. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 603. A bill to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries; with amendment (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1099. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; without amendment (Rept. No. 213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1584. A bill authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho; with amendment (Rept. No. 214). 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. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 341. A bill for the relief of the widow of Reuben Malkin; with amendment (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 437. A bill for the relief of Iva Gavin; with amendment (Rept. No. 216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 559. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Orville E. McKim; with amendments (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 704. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; with amendment (Rept. No. 218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 925. A bill for the relief of Therese R. Cohen; with amendment (Rept. No. 219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers, Elaine Powers Taylor, and Monroe W. Taylor; with amendment (Rept. No. 220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1221. A bill for the relief of Eva Bilobran; with amendment (Rept. No. 221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Gilda Cowan; with amendment (Rept. No. 222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1509. A bill for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo; without amendment (Rept. No. 223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1510. A bill for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine; without amendment (Rept. No. 224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1514. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman; with amendment (Rept. 226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2389. A bill for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley; with amendment (Rept. No. 227). 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. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2900. A bill providing for a Public Welfare Act of 1947, to protect the common welfare and maintain the sovereignty of government in labor disputes vitally affecting the public welfare, public health, and public safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2901. A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2902. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 2903. A bill to raise the limit on the amount of annual income from other sources which may be received by a veteran otherwise entitled to a pension by reason of a non-service-connected disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2904. A bill to extend the provisions of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act relating to fishermen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2905. A bill to amend section 325 of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2906. A bill to provide advice, counsel, and assistance from the Veterans' Administration to citizens of Mexico who served in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 2907. A bill to amend the act of May 7, 1941 (ch. 87, 55 Stat. 177), and to provide for health and safety in coal mines affecting commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2908. A bill to define partnerships and partners for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2909. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service," approved November 21, 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. R. 2910. A bill to authorize the United States during an emergency period to undertake its fair share in the resettlement of displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy, including relatives of citizens or members of our armed forces, by permitting their admission into the United States in a number equivalent to a part of the total quota numbers unused during the war years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 2911. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2912. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution making provisions for the refund of the processing tax on hogs marketed for slaughter by the raisers and producers who in fact bore all or part of the burden of such tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearing held on February 6, 1947; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. Res. 168. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation with respect to the cost of living, strengthening our national economy, and preserving the free-enterprise system; 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 New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to endorsement of the Hill-Taylor bill, which proposes the establishment of additional national cemeteries in each of the several States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 1770; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the necessary funds to meet all operating expenses of the public employment services subsequent to June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2913. A bill for the relief of Noboru Shirai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2914. A bill for the relief of Hassler-Ponder Toy Manufacturing Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Walter Vandahl and Esther S. Vandahl, Allabrada Adams, Lucile L. Rice, Mrs. Gladys Webb, and James E. Webb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 2917. A bill for the relief of Andrew Weininger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 2918. A bill for the relief of the Sumner County Colored Fair Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Ray G. Schneyer and Dorothy J. Schneyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2920. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alfonsina M. Corradini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2921. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances Long Caton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 2922. A bill for the relief of Charles B. Featherstone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

297. The SPEAKER presented a petition of G. H. Wells, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to aid to Greece and Turkey, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 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:

O God, who didst love us all so much that Thou didst send us Jesus Christ for the illumination of our darkness and the salvation of our souls, give us wisdom to profit by the words He spoke, faith to accept the salvation He offers, and grace to follow in His steps.

As Christ said: "When ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any," O God, give us grace now so to do.

As Christ said: "It is more blessed to give than to receive," O God, give us grace today to think, not of what we can get, but of what we can give.

As Christ said: "Judge not, that ye be not judged," O God, give us grace this day first to cast out the beam out of our own eyes before we regard the mote that is in our brothers' eyes.