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 nonservice-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.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

And when we find it hard to be humble, hard to forgive, O Lord, remind us how much harder it was to hang on the cross. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Tuesday, April 1, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MEETING OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair submits the request that the committee be permitted to continue in session during the remainder of the day. Without objection, that order will be made. The Chair hears no objection.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate from Thursday until next Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee appointed to investigate the Centralia mine disaster may be absent from the Senate this afternoon and until such time in the fore part of next week as it may conclude its labors in the field.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent is granted.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

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

ACCRUED ANNUAL LEAVE DUE GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES UPON SEPARATION FROM SERVICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the President of the Civil Service Commission requesting an amendment to the draft of proposed legislation transmitted by him to the Senate on March 21, 1947, providing for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of members of Townsend Club No. 22, Miami, Fla., praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Berthoud, Colo., 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.

RESOLUTION OF TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a copy of a resolution, H. R. 79, adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, and I request that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

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

Whereas Texas employers paid into the Federal Treasury last year approximately $5,537,000 in Federal unemployment taxes; and

Whereas those five and one-half million Texas dollars, along with sums from other States, were so paid into the Federal Treasury to finance the administration of an unemployment compensation law in Texas and the other States; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is by law charged with the duty of returning at least a part of those Texas dollars to Texas for the sole purpose of paying all administrative costs of the Texas Unemployment Compensation Commission in administering the Texas Unemployment Compensation Act; and

Whereas the administrative funds granted to Texas for the first 6 months of 1947, amounting to $640,948, are so inadequate that the commission must discharge more than 150 employees and is prevented from granting its remaining employees the salary increases which the Texas Legislature has just granted to other Texas State departments; and

Whereas Texas employers and workers, Texas veterans and other Texas taxpayers are being deprived, by the failure of Congress to grant sufficient administrative funds to Texas, of their right to a proper administration of the Texas unemployment compensation law including:

(1) Thorough examination of doubtful claims;

(2) Investigation of cases involving fraud;

(3) Opportunity for Texans living in smaller towns to file claims;

(4) Service to Texas veterans of World War No. II; and

Whereas because of the shortage of operating funds, the Texas commission has been required to cancel claims and investigation service at 99 itinerant points within the past 2 months and will, in all probability, find it necessary to stop service at additional itinerant points; and

Whereas this absence of service at these points is discriminatory against individuals living in and around those smaller Texas cities; and

Whereas the lack of funds to pay for proper investigation processes will inevitably result in higher taxes on Texas employers under the experience rates provided by the Texas Unemployment Compensation Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Texas House of Representatives strongly urge the Members of Congress of the United States to make available to the Social Security Administration adequate money for a grant of administrative funds to the Texas Unemployment Compensation Commission to permit the type of administration of the Texas Unemployment Compensation Act for which the employers of Texas have already paid; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate of the United States, and to the Members of the Texas congressional delegation in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 64. A bill granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina; with amendments (Rept. No. 83).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 814. A bill to provide support for wool, continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 85).

RENEWAL OF 5-YEAR LEVEL-PREMIUM TERM POLICIES—REPORT OF FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 1327) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period, and I submit a report (No. 84) thereon. I request that the bill and the report be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the bill and the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso of the first paragraph of section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (by the act of May 14, 1942; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 512), is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That at the expiration of any 5-year period a 5-year level-premium term policy may be renewed for a second or third or fourth or fifth 5-year period at the premium rate for the attained age without medical examination; and in case the fourth 5-year period of any such policy shall have expired between January 24, 1947, and the expiration of 5 months after the date of the enactment of this amendment to this amendatory proviso and the policy has not been continued in another form of Government insurance, such policy may be renewed as of the date of its expiration on the same con-

ditions upon payment of the back premiums within 5 months after such date of enactment; and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall cause notice to be mailed to the holder of any such policy of the provisions of this amendment to this amendatory proviso."

The report (No. 84) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDING EXISTING LAW TO PROVIDE PRIVILEGE OF RENEWING EXPIRING 5-YEAR LEVEL-PREMIUM TERM POLICIES FOR ANOTHER 5-YEAR PERIOD

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1327) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to authorize holders of 5-year level-premium term policies of United States Government life insurance to renew such policies for a fifth 5-year period, at the premium rate for the attained age without medical examination. The 5-year level-premium term policy was first authorized in 1926. There have been three renewals since authorized for periods of 5 years each, making a total period of 20 years during which such Government insurance may be carried on the 5-year term plan. A bill similar to this one was last enacted on May 14, 1942 (Public Law 556, 77th Cong.). The committee feels that anyone who has such a policy at present should not be denied the privilege of renewing this type of insurance if he so desires. The committee also recognizes that there are cases where protection of a veteran's family in the next few years is a matter of primary concern to him. From this standpoint, the renewal of term insurance may well have advantages over an attempt to convert to other types of insurance at the present time.

However, in the long run, the committee wishes to point out the marked disadvantages of a level-premium term policy to veterans as they become older in point of age.

At every 5-year period, as the veteran becomes older, the annual premium will sharply increase. And, furthermore, a veteran relying upon 5-year term insurance does not have the cash, loan, or paid-up values in his insurance which he would have if he converted to another type of policy.

Nevertheless, the committee takes the position that veterans who wish the protection of term insurance during the years of the immediate future and who simply cannot afford at present to convert their policies to other types of insurance should not be denied the right to continue their term insurance.

The report on this bill to the committee from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is self-explanatory and is as follows:

MARCH 19, 1947.

Hon. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MILLIKIN: Reference is made to your request for a report on H. R. 1327, Eightieth Congress, "An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period."

The purpose of the bill is to authorize renewal of United States Government life insurance on the 5-year level-premium term plan for a second, third, fourth, or fifth 5-year period at the premium rate for the attained age without medical examination. Under existing law such insurance may be renewed for a second, third, or fourth 5-year period.

The level premium legal reserve system was devised in order to overcome the objections to the renewable term plan. Under this system the yearly term premiums for the entire period of life are adjusted to provide for level premiums payable throughout the period. During the earlier years the insured under this plan pays more than the amount of premium required under the yearly renewable term plan, the excess being accumulated at interest to create a fund which will provide for the excess cost at such time as the cost of protection exceeds the amount of premium being paid. This plan of insurance is more advantageous to the insured than the renewable term plan for the reason that not only will the premium never increase but on the average the total amount of premiums which the insured will be required to pay will be less under the level-premium plan due to the interest earnings.

The comparative results under these two systems may be shown by considering the insurance status at the end of 20 years of two veterans A and B now aged 55 years, on the assumption that both veterans live to attain the age of 75 years. Veteran "A" takes out an ordinary life United States Government life insurance policy issued at age 55 for $10,000 paying thereon a level annual premium of $451.30 which will never increase during his lifetime. Veteran B takes out a 5-year level-premium term policy issued at age 55 for $10,000, and it is assumed for purposes of comparison that at the end of each 5-year period, he is permitted to take out a new 5-year term policy issued at his attained age. The annual premium on this term policy during the first 5 years is $207.90. During the second 5-year period the insured will be required to pay an annual premium of $306, during the third 5-year period $467.80, and during the fourth 5-year period $727.70.

At the end of the 20-year period, that is, at attained age 75, veteran A has an ordinary life policy under which there is a cash value of $5,401.10 or a loan value of $5,077. If he wishes to discontinue the payment of premiums he may secure a paid-up life policy in the amount of $6,747.30, or he may let his policy run under the extended insurance provision in which case his insurance protection will be automatically continued in the amount of $10,000 for an additional period of 7 years and 75 days without the payment of any further premiums. If he desires to keep his policy in full force after attaining age 75, it may be continued until his death by the payment of the original annual premium of $451.30.

On the other hand veteran B, upon attaining age 75, has no cash, loan, paid-up or extended insurance values. If he desires to continue his insurance on the 5-year term plan it will be necessary for him to pay the increased annual premium required, which for ages 75 to 79, inclusive, is $1,111.60. The annual premiums required under this plan for further periods are as follows:

Ages 80 to 84, inclusive	$1,769.60
Ages 85 to 90, inclusive	3,129.20

If veteran B, upon attaining age 75, desires to continue his protection under a permanent life plan it will be necessary for him to pay the premium at the ordinary-life rate for age 75 which is $1,449.40 per year.

An examination of the above figures and the comparative results under the two plans show the advantage in an average case of placing insurance under one of the permanent forms of level premium-life insurance at as early an age as possible, thereby securing the maximum benefit from interest earnings.

The group of term policyholders of United States Government life insurance is composed of a larger percentage of impaired lives than any other group, and death and disability experience of this group show a high ratio to the claims expected under the mortality tables. Many of the losses are not traceable to the extra hazard of service and must be borne by the United States Government life-insurance fund.

All United States Government life-insurance policies include a provision granting benefits on account of total permanent disability, without limit as to the age before which disability must occur, for which no additional premium is charged. The probability of becoming totally disabled increases with advancing age and at the older ages practically becomes a certainty. The liability assumed on account of the disability provision must be met from what would otherwise be considered as surplus earnings if no disability provision were included in the policy. It is, therefore, necessary to accumulate from these earnings a fund which will be sufficient to provide for the liability assumed. The margins available for this purpose are smaller under the 5-year level-premium term plan than under any of the other plans of converted insurance. The longer the holders of this plan of insurance are permitted to continue their insurance on the term basis, especially if evidence of insurability is not required, the more difficult it will be to make provision for the liability assumed on account of the disability provision, in fact in the case of the older policyholders it will be impossible to make provision for this liability from their own contributions.

Sound insurance underwriting requires that safeguards should be established to minimize the chances for adverse selection. Commercial life insurance companies grant total disability protection only to persons in a preferred classification as to risk who are below a certain age limit, and the protection generally ceases when the insured attains the age of 60 years. Under Government insurance there is no restriction as to the classification of risk or limit as to the age before which disability must occur and no age limit for the granting of new insurance. If the holders of 5-year-term insurance are permitted to renew their insurance on this plan without requiring evidence of insurability, it is evident that the adverse selection will be great and that the burden of this adverse selection will fall upon the other policyholders and not upon the 5-year-term group.

The United States Government life-insurance fund is a trust fund created and owned by the policyholders, the Government acting as administrator and trustee of the fund. In the administration of this fund the rights and interests of the great body of policyholders should be considered and protected. To grant special rights and privileges to one class of policyholders, known to contain a large percentage of impaired risks, at the expense of the other policyholders, would be unjust and discriminatory.

It is impossible to estimate the cost of this proposed legislation to the United States Government life-insurance fund, since such cost will depend upon the degree of impairment among the members who continue on the 5-year-term plan, but there is no doubt that the cost will be considerable and will extend over a period of years. The Government pays for the extra hazard due to military and naval service no matter what plan of insurance is selected, this cost being determined by the difference between the face amount of insurance and the reserve. Since the reserve on 5-year-term insurance is very small compared with the other plans of insurance, the cost to the Government on account of claims which have a service connection will be greater if impaired lives are permitted to continue on the 5-year-term plan than if they were carried under some other plan having a larger reserve. The increased cost will extend over a number of years and will continue even after the completion of the additional 5-year period, but it is impossible at this time to estimate the additional cost to the Government.

The following table shows the number of 5-year level-premium term policies in force as of December 31, 1946, the aggregate face values of such policies, and the periods in which such policies are being carried:

First period	10,998	$85,910,577
Second period	7,215	41,738,704
Third period	6,161	37,479,393
Fourth period	12,821	82,954,875
	37,195	248,083,549

It will be noted that only about one-third of such policies are running in the fourth period and would require legislation to continue on the term plan after their respective expiry dates.

For the foregoing reasons, the Veterans' Administration is unable to recommend favorable consideration of the proposed measure.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection by that office to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

OMAR N. BRADLEY,
General, United States Army, Administrator.

The committee is in accord with the purposes of the bill and recommends its enactment.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate reports for the months of February and March 1947 from the chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING NATIONAL DEFENSE

MARCH 1, 1947.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of February 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Walter E. Connell, 4632 Yuma Street NW., Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $5,905.20.

W. Harold Lane, 1436 North Inglewood, Arlington, Va., Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary, $7,102.20.

OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

APRIL 1, 1947.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of March 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Pearl Mae Leisinger, 1401 South Barton Street, Apartment 102, Arlington, Va., Office of Temporary Controls, Washington, D. C.; annual salary, $3,271.80.

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Chairman.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Federal employment during the month of February 1947, both continental and abroad, dropped 9,713 from the January total of 2,261,459 to the February total of 2,251,746. Of this reduction, all but 1,105 of it was in the War and Navy Departments, the remainder of the Government dropping from 1,276,404 in January to 1,275,299 in February. Inside the United States, Federal employment dropped 7,336 from the January total of 1,977,200 to the February total of 1,969,864. Excluding War and Navy again, there was a net reduction in the other agencies within the United States of only 873 employees. Outside the United States, there are still 281,882 employees, a reduction of 2,377 from the January total of 284,259.

Twenty-two establishments of the Government increased their personnel during the month. Three of these increases were substantial: The Treasury Department with an increase of 2,040 over the January total of 101,742, the Post Office Department with an increase of 1,224 over the January total of 457,924, and the Veterans' Administration with an increase of 965 over the January total of 229,874. During the same period, 27 establishments decreased personnel. The most substantial decreases occurred in the War Department, which dropped 6,077 employees from the January total of 608,601; the Navy Department, which dropped 2,531 from the January total of 376,454; and the War Assets Administration, which dropped 1,929 from the January total of 53,744.

A more comprehensive picture of increases and reductions in Federal personnel is accomplished by comparing present employment with that immediately after VJ-day. During the year and a half since then large-scale reductions occurred in the War Department which reduced 1,208,447 to the February total of 602,524, the Navy Department which reduced 347,419 to the present total of 373,923, and the other war agencies which reduced 137,033. Meanwhile other agencies have expanded. Veterans' Administration has increased 157,829 to the present total of 230,839, the Post Office Department increased 71,886 to the present total of 459,148, but this included approximately 53,000 employees previously employed but not reported until after VJ-day. The State Department increased 10,768 to its present total of 21,956 and the Treasury Department increased 7,974 to its present total of 103,782. During the same period there have been added 8 new agencies to the Government with a total personnel of 62,126, including 51,815 in the War Assets Administration.

Many other agencies have had substantial, if not so spectacular, increases in personnel since the actual cessation of hostilities. Thus in numerous instances such reductions as may now be taking place are in this category and do not represent a decrease below the wartime peak of employment, but rather a leveling off at that level without consideration being given to large-scale increases already made during the war. In order to reduce the national budget it is imperative that employment be reduced, not to the prewar level perhaps but at least to a level in which the necessity for economy is given recognition beside the necessary new functions stemming from postwar needs.

I ask unanimous consent that a report prepared by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, relating to Federal personnel, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, PURSUANT TO SECTION 601 OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1941 ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL, JANUARY–FEBRUARY 1947

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, FEBRUARY 1947, AND COMPARISON WITH JANUARY 1947

(All figures compiled from reports submitted by the heads of Federal establishments or their authorized representatives)

According to monthly personnel reports submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Federal personnel within the United States during January decreased 7,336 from a total of 1,977,200 in January to 1,969,864 in February. Excluding War and Navy Departments, personnel decreased 873 from the January total of 1,220,144 to the February total of 1,219,271. The War Department within the continental United States decreased 3,260 from the January total of 432,010 to the February total of 428,750. The Navy Department inside the United States decreased 3,203 from the January figure of 325,046 to the February total of 321,843. (See table I.)

Outside the continental United States, Federal personnel decreased 2,377 from the January total of 284,259 to the February total of 281,882. The majority of these employees are industrial workers. (See tables II and IV.) Exclusive of War and Navy Departments, there was a decrease of 232 from the January figure of 56,260 to the February figure of 56,028.

The consolidated table, presenting data with respect to personnel inside and outside the continental United States, shows a total decrease of 9,713 from the January total of 2,261,459 to the February total of 2,251,746. Excluding War and Navy Departments' reductions of 8,608, there was a decrease of 1,105 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government from the January figure of 1,276,404 to the February figure of 1,275,299. (See table III.)

Industrial employment during the month of February decreased 9,648 from the January total of 628,148 to the February total of 618,500. The War Department decreased 7,010 outside the United States and decreased 1,240 inside the United States in the industrial group, making a total reduction of 8,250 employees. The term "industrial employees" as used by the committee refers to unskilled, semiskilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government, who are working on construction projects, such as airfields and roads and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees. (See table IV.)

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1947, and comparison with January 1947*

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)			
Agriculture Department	78,477	77,812	−665
Commerce Department	34,726	34,810	+84
Interior Department	44,840	44,939	+99
Justice Department	23,882	23,939	+57
Labor Department	7,419	7,278	−141
Post Office Department	456,509	457,737	+1,228
State Department	8,627	8,485	−142
Treasury Department	101,045	103,060	+2,015
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	96	96	--------
Office of Scientific Research and Development	145	149	+4
Selective Service System	8,956	8,770	−186
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Council of Economic Advisers	27	28	+1
National Wage Stabilization Board	456	[1] 0	−456
Office of Government Reports	146	149	+3
Office of Housing Expediter	1,971	1,926	−45
Office of Temporary Controls:			
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	158	133	−25
Office of Price Administration	13,916	13,458	−458
Civilian Production Administration	4,032	3,835	−197
Philippine Alien Property Administration	2	2	--------
Price Decontrol Board	6	6	--------
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,119	4,280	+161
War Assets Administration	53,722	51,415	−2,307
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	3	3	--------
Bureau of the Budget	610	611	+1
Civil Aeronautics Board	499	518	+19
Civil Service Commission	3,503	3,523	+20
Export-Import Bank of Washington	115	117	+2
Federal Communications Commission	1,357	1,351	−6
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,167	1,184	+17
Federal Power Commission	794	783	−11
Federal Security Agency	30,894	31,003	+109
Federal Trade Commission	592	592	--------
Federal Works Agency	24,343	24,551	+208
General Accounting Office	11,442	11,045	−397
Government Printing Office	8,013	8,037	+24
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,281	2,287	+6
Maritime Commission	11,851	11,444	−407
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,624	5,617	−7
National Archives	399	396	−3
National Capital Housing Authority	284	283	−1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	17	--------
National Gallery of Art	313	310	−3
National Housing Agency	16,468	16,041	−427
National Labor Relations Board	888	883	−5
National Mediation Board	99	100	+1
Panama Canal	484	522	+38
Railroad Retirement Board	2,636	2,788	+152
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8,543	8,336	−207
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,204	1,195	−9
Smithsonian Institution	502	502	--------
Tariff Commission	224	224	--------
Tax Court of the United States	122	121	−1
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,535	13,566	31

[1] Agency terminated Feb. 23, 1947, Executive Order 9809.

TABLE I.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1947, and comparison with January 1947*—Continued

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Veterans' Administration	228,061	229,014	+953
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,220,144	1,219,271	−6,106 +5,233
New decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments	--------	--------	−873
Navy Department	325,046	321,843	−3,203
War Department	432,010	428,750	−3,260
Total, including War and Navy Departments	1,977,200	1,969,864	−12,569 +5,233
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments	--------	--------	−7,336

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1947, and comparison with January 1947*

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)			
Agriculture Department	1,388	1,283	−105
Commerce Department	2,505	2,498	−7
Interior Department	4,678	4,426	−252
Justice Department	545	521	−24
Labor Department	93	97	+4
Post Office Department	1,415	1,411	−4
State Department	13,752	13,471	−281
Treasury Department	697	722	+25
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Selective Service System	85	82	−3
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Office of Housing Expediter	3	3	--------
Office of Temporary Controls:			
Office of Price Administration	90	52	−38
Civilian Production Administration	21	20	−1
Philippine Alien Property Administration	55	[1] 62	+7
War Assets Administration	22	400	+378
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	75	75	--------
Civil Aeronautics Board	12	11	−1
Civil Service Commission	5	5	--------
Export-Import Bank of Washington	2	2	--------
Federal Communications Commission	36	37	+1
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	3	3	--------
Federal Security Agency	692	966	+274
Federal Works Agency	297	308	+11
Maritime Commission	346	339	−7
National Housing Agency	52	54	+2
National Labor Relations Board	2	3	+1
Panama Canal	27,458	27,234	−224
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	110	110	--------
Smithsonian Institution	8	8	--------

[1] Estimated.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during February 1947, and comparison with January 1947*—Continued

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Veterans' Administration	1,813	1,825	+12
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	56,260	56,028	−947 +715
Net decrease, excluding War and Navy Departments	--------	--------	−232
Navy Department	51,408	[2] 52,080	+672
War Department	176,591	173,774	−2,817
Total including War and Navy Departments	284,259	281,882	−3,764 +1,387
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments	--------	--------	−2,377

[2] As of Jan. 31, 1947.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1947 and comparison with January 1947*

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)			
Agriculture Department	79,865	79,095	−770
Commerce Department	37,231	37,308	+77
Interior Department	49,518	49,365	−153
Justice Department	24,427	24,460	+33
Labor Department	7,512	7,375	−137
Post Office Department	457,924	459,148	+1,224
State Department	22,379	21,956	−423
Treasury Department	101,742	103,782	+2,040
EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES			
Office of Defense Transportation	96	96	--------
Office of Scientific Research and Development	145	149	+4
Selective Service System	9,041	8,852	−189
POSTWAR AGENCIES			
Council of Economic Advisers	27	28	+1
National Wage Stabilization Board	456	[1] 0	−456
Office of Government Reports	146	149	+3
Office of Housing Expediter	1,974	1,929	−45
Office of Temporary Controls:			
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	158	133	−25
Office of Price Administration	14,006	13,510	−496
Civilian Production Administration	4,053	3,855	−198
Philippine Alien Property Administration	57	[2] 64	+7
Price Decontrol Board	6	6	--------
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission	4,119	4,280	+161
War Assets Administration	53,744	51,815	−1,929
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
American Battle Monuments Commission	78	78	--------
Bureau of the Budget	610	611	+1
Civil Aeronautics Board	511	529	+18
Civil Service Commission	3,508	3,528	+20
Export-Import Bank of Washington	117	119	+2
Federal Communications Commission	1,393	1,388	−5

[1] Agency terminated Feb. 23, 1947, Executive Order 9809.

TABLE III.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1947 and comparison with January 1947*—Continued

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—continued			
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,170	1,187	+17
Federal Power Commission	794	783	−11
Federal Security Agency	31,586	31,969	+383
Federal Trade Commission	592	592	
Federal Works Agency	24,640	24,859	+219
General Accounting Office	11,442	11,045	−397
Government Printing Office	8,013	8,037	+24
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,281	2,287	+6
Maritime Commission	12,197	11,783	−414
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	5,624	5,617	−7
National Archives	399	396	−3
National Capital Housing Authority	284	283	−1
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	17	17	
National Gallery of Art	313	310	−3
National Housing Agency	16,520	16,095	−425
National Labor Relations Board	890	886	−4
National Mediation Board	99	100	+1
Panama Canal	27,942	27,756	−186
Railroad Retirement Board	2,636	2,788	+152
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8,653	8,446	−207
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,204	1,195	−9
Smithsonian Institution	510	510	
Tariff Commission	224	224	
Tax Court of the United States	122	121	−1
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,535	13,566	+31
Veterans' Administration	229,874	230,839	+965
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	1,276,404	1,275,299	−6,494 +5,389
Net decrease excluding War and Navy Departments			−1,105
Navy Department (inside and outside continental United States)	376,454	373,923	−2,531
War Department:			
Inside continental United States	432,010	428,750	−3,260
Outside continental United States	[2] 176,591	173,774	−2,817
Total, including War and Navy Departments	2,261,459	2,251,746	−15,102 +5,389
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−9,713

[2] Estimated.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees*[1] *of the Federal Government, inside and outside the continental United States, employed by executive agencies during February 1947, and comparison with January 1947*

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (EXCEPT WAR AND NAVY DEPARTMENTS)			
Commerce Department	1,083	1,139	+56
Interior Department	4,827	5,408	+581
State Department	302	320	+18
Treasury Department	5,468	5,474	+6

[1] Industrial employees include unskilled, semiskilled, and skilled, and supervisory employees on construction projects. Maintenance and custodial workers not included.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees*[1] *of the Federal Government, inside and outside the continental United States, employed by executive agencies during February 1947, and comparison with January 1947*—Continued

Departments or agencies	January	February	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
National Housing Agency	19	16	−3
Panama Canal	2,703	2,625	−78
Tennessee Valley Authority	6,520	6,511	−9
Total, excluding War and Navy Departments	20,922	21,493	+661 −90
Net increase, excluding War and Navy Departments			+571
Navy Department (inside and outside continental United States)	260,546	258,577	−1,969
War Department:			
Inside continental United States	202,589	201,349	−1,240
Outside continental United States	[2] 144,091	[2] 137,081	−7,010
Total, including War and Navy Departments	628,148	618,500	−10,309 +661
Net decrease, including War and Navy Departments			−9,648

[2] Estimated.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1021. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Business Committee and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REVERCOMB (by request):

S. 1022. A bill to authorize an adequate White House Police force; and

S. 1023. A bill to amend the act of March 14, 1944, to include Coast Guard personnel in the exemption from payment of tolls on the Golden Gate Bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1024. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1025. A bill to authorize public improvements at Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1026. A bill to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1027. A bill for the relief of Severino Di Sandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself, Mr. STEWART, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. CONNALLY):

S. 1028. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1029. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Petrita P. Chavez;

S. 1030. A bill for the relief of Solly Manasse; and

S. 1031. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zamora, Mrs. Antonio Zamora, Antonio Zamora, Jr., Mrs. Juan Chavez, John Chavez, Jr., Roland Chavez, Selso Trujillo, and Dr. M. G. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY (by request) introduced Senate bill 1032, for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1033. A bill to authorize payment by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase price of automobiles or other conveyances purchased by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. McCARRAN) introduced Senate bill 1034, to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. CORDON) introduced Senate bill 1035, to provide for the acquisition of the hospital at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., for use as a domiciliary facility by the Veterans' Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1036. A bill to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1037. A bill to authorize the revision of the boundaries of the Caribou National Forest in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REVERCOMB (by request):

S. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, by request of the State Department, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States. I request that the bill, together with a letter addressed to the President pro tempore by the Department of State be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1032) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, introduced by Mr. WILEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following named persons the sums herein specified in full satisfaction of their respective claims

against the United States for compensation for the fair value of reasonable and necessary personal property lost by such persons as a result of war conditions: Ralph J. Blake, $958.00; William T. Turner, $100.00; Fulton Freeman, $40.00; John Frederick Zahoruiko, $126.35; John Duncan Sumner, $33.26; Liang Chen Yi, $18.57; Ming Chen Tai, $6.97; Harold C. Roser, Jr., $42.83; William George McCoy, $79.50; Philip D. Sprouse, $1,517.00; Franklin J. C. Liu, $168.74; John B. Burleson, $764.00; Sham-Tai Chau, $1,551.00; Wing-Tai Chau, $1,926.00; Barbara Schurman-Petro-Pavlovsky, $1,350.45; Charles B. Beylard, $369.50; Benjamin F. Middleton, $671.50; Florence Palmer, $325.00; Jacob D. Beam, $601.04; H. C. Furstenwalde, $6,500.00; Tigner Ogletree, $2,819.00; Edith Bland, $2,026.50; Alfred W. Klieforth, $77.50; Edward S. Parker, $2,270.05; James E. Parks, $4,494.63; Howard K. Travers, $3,880.00; Ivan Lavretsky, $5,500.00; Walter A. Foote, $3,764.00; Frank C. Lee, $4,847.12; Robert C. Burton, $261.75; William C. Affeld, Jr., $2,067.55; Marorie Callaghan, $200.00; Douglas Henderson, $790.50; James E. Mann, $95.00; Edward A. Rood, $177.07; Nelson R. Park, $1,865.33; Patrick J. Sheehan, $348.47; Edwin Schoenrich, $523.80; Carter Vincent, $623.00; Ann van Wynen, $29.70; Raymond Ziminski, $226.01.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 17, 1947.

The Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a bill the enactment of which is recommended by the Department, requesting an appropriation in the aggregate amount of $54,036.69, providing for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, who sustained losses by reason of war conditions prevailing in the world during recent years. There is also transmitted herewith a memorandum setting forth somewhat in detail the basis of the claims involved, indicating in each case the amount claimed, the amount disallowed, and the amount recommended for approval by the Department.

The Congress has on two previous occasions enacted legislation providing relief under similar circumstances, namely, Private Law 145, Seventy-eighth Congress and Private Law 13, Seventy-ninth Congress.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,
Acting Secretary.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution providing for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Social Security Committee. I request that the text of a statement which I have prepared on this subject be reprinted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Social Security (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee) to be composed of eight members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the need for and advisability of modification or enlargement of the present social-security program, and to consider any proposals submitted to the Congress in connection therewith. The joint committee shall report, from time to time, to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, or, in its discretion to the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, the results of its studies and investigations together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpena 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. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The joint committee is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON RESOLUTION TO CREATE JOINT SOCIAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

Mr. President, I am resubmitting today a concurrent resolution which I first offered 4 years ago, providing for the creation of a 14-member Joint Committee on Social Security.

The purpose of this resolution is obvious: It is to fill the need for more coordinated study, for more information, and for more authoritative recommendations on a subject on which every one of my colleagues each day receives countless anguished mail—correspondence from old folks, from blind folks, from widows, and others, pleading for an adjustment of the social-security system.

LACK OF ADEQUATE SECURITY TODAY

It is obvious, too, that in these years, when prices have gotten far out of line and the purchasing power of the dollar has declined, that our present system of old-age compensation, of unemployment insurance, of aid to widows and orphans, of aid to the blind, must be reevaluated. I call attention to the fact that throughout the country that there is an average amount of social-security aid to 60,000 blind persons of $33.67 per month. I ask how many indigent blind folks can survive in these years on such an income? There is an average payment per family per month for 887,000 dependent children of $55.42. I ask what family, without the breadwinner, can raise growing children on $55 per month?

AMERICA'S FORGOTTEN MEN

Years ago I spoke on the subject of the forgotten man here in the Senate. I referred to the man or woman living on a fixed income during an inflationary time—the white-collar worker, the professor, the clerk, the retired Federal worker living on a small annuity, the retired teacher, the retired policeman. I asked, How could we take pride in a society which deprives those who need it most of security in their elder years, or similarly deprives those in indigent condition through no fault of their own?

Through the Full Employment Act, the Senate created a Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Through the legislative-reorganization law, we created a Joint Committee on the Budget which I recommended 4 years ago. We already have a Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. Surely, the need for a Joint Committee on Social Security will be apparent to my colleagues. America cannot thrive and prosper when the security of our elderly and our blind folk and our widowed citizens is in jeopardy. I am, therefore, hoping that early action will be taken on my resolution.

THIS COMMITTEE WOULD BE BUT FIRST STEP

Surely, if there is any single issue on which the Republican Party or any party can gain the unyielding admiration of the American people, it is on the issue of promoting the security of our citizens in an insecure world, the issue, of course, of not making loafers of any Americans but productive workers who can enjoy reasonable security. My recommendation is but the first small step. Let that step be taken.

The effects of that step in helping to ease the worry, the anxiety, the care of countless folks throughout the Nation may be incalculable. At least, they will know that the Republican Congress is on its toes, eager to explore the whole subject of social security with adequate, integrated resources—with an open mind, with a sympathetic heart.

We know that the financial resources of our Government have been severely strained in recent years and we do not want to place an undue burden on our Treasury. But we know, too, there is still a vast field for further cooperation of Federal, State, and local Governments for social-security expansion—and that such cooperation is urgently needed for our "forgotten" men and women.

A piecemeal approach to social security will not do. Let us have the joint committee which I suggest.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

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, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, since January 8, I have had a collection made of the various editorials and columns that have appeared in the press of the country commenting upon the Economic Report of the President which was

transmitted to the Congress on January 8 of this year in accordance with the Employment Act of 1946.

I have been particularly concerned in endeavoring to ascertain the extent of public interest in the entire question of economic stabilization and in the problem of what can be done by the present Congress to avoid another great depression.

The information I have collected thus far has been extremely illuminating.

First of all, it is readily apparent that the President's economic report achieved more editorial attention than practically any other Government document that has been issued since the fall of Japan.

Second, it is also apparent that the great majority of the press supported the President's analysis of economic conditions and his proposals for Government action. This, I believe, is a tribute both to the judgment exercised by President Truman and the splendid work done by his Council of Economic Advisers.

But far more important to me is the fact that the press of the country has taken it for granted that the Congress of the United States would give careful and mature consideration to the President's recommendations. This point of view, I am sure, derived to a considerable extent from the fact that the Employment Act itself set up a Joint Economic Committee to analyze the President's Economic Report and to present its findings and recommendations thereon in a formal report to the Congress.

The New York Herald Tribune, a Republican newspaper, took the position that—

> Neither the Congress nor the people can afford to neglect the report itself, insofar as it is a factual analysis of the economic state of the Union at the turn of the year.

The Cincinnati Enquirer stated that—

> The factual data in the report are valuable and the recommendations in most cases are worthy of the most careful and sympathetic consideration from Congress.

The Baltimore Evening Sun predicted—and I am afraid that to date their prediction has proved erroneous—that—

> The President's economic report will encourage not only Congress but all the rest of us to do the kind of thinking that is needed on this subject.

The Washington Post made the following statement:

> It is extremely helpful to have the outline of a comprehensive legislative program designed to strengthen the American economy laid before Congress, so that it may be impressed with the fact that no one remedial program or even two or three, can insure maintenance of full employment.

The Washington Star commented that although many of the economic report's proposals are not likely to win Republican support, nevertheless it merits careful consideration.

The Louisville Courier-Journal states:

> It would be stubborn and heedless for the President's opposition in Congress or any pressure group to reject out of hand the prescription for prosperity that he and his advisers have written.

Mr. President, I could go on endlessly quoting from editorials that have appeared in eminent newspapers throughout the country. All I should like to say at the moment, however, is that the majority of these newspapers seem to take it for granted that the economic report would be given serious consideration in Congress. Therefore, it is my profound hope that in the very near future the Joint Economic Committee will make a careful analysis of the President's economic report and transmit its conclusions thereon to both Houses of Congress.

At this point, Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the editorials from which I have just quoted as well as a number of additional editorials also commenting on the economic report of the President.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 9, 1947]

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

The recommendations contained in the lengthy economic report that was read to the Congress yesterday in the President's name are already coming under fire from leaders of the Republican majority in both Houses. This was to be expected. The present mood on Capitol Hill is strongly against holding the line on taxes and rents. Nor is there likely to be much enthusiasm for the President's proposals to expand Federal programs in the fields of social security, public welfare, health, and education. Retrenchment rather than expansion of Government activities and expenditures will be the goal of the new Congress.

Nevertheless, neither the Congress nor the public can afford to neglect the report itself, insofar as it is a factual analysis of the economic state of the Union at the turn of the year. The President acknowledges the advice and assistance of his Council of Economic Advisors. It is apparent that the job of lucid economic reporting that makes up the major part of the report is mainly or entirely the work of this body. It was created by the Employment Act of 1946, which was passed by a bipartisan vote. Its members, whose appointments were endorsed by the Senate, are generally recognized as sound, cautious economists. Their findings are entitled to respectful consideration.

While these findings are favorable on balance, some serious dangers are pointed out. Civilian employment is at an all-time high, and production in 1946 set a peacetime record. It should be even higher in 1947 if employment is maintained. Consumer purchasing power, on the other hand, has fallen sharply with the rise in prices that followed the lifting of controls. Specfically, real earnings of workers and salaried employees have fallen.

On the other hand, it is reported that "business in general is receiving exceptional profits." Although this might sound like a statement made for political purposes, it is supported by Department of Commerce statistics which show that net corporate profits after taxes have increased by 33⅓ percent over 1945. In view of the decline in consumer purchasing power, the report asks pertinently whether consumers in 1947 will be able to absorb the anticipated increased production of consumers goods. Here it wisely emphasizes price reduction as the best method of restoring purchasing power, though it does not overlook the desirability of increases in pay rates in some sectors.

The inference is that it is up to industry to price its products low enough to avoid destruction of its markets, while the most constructive role for the Government would be to pursue antiinflationary fiscal policies, putting public-debt reduction and economies in Government spending before tax cutting. Mildly deflationary action now can help avert a sudden and disastrous deflation later.

The President calls the economic report "an opportunity for national self-examination and self-criticism" and "a challenge to the President and the Congress to determine the causes of whatever problems we face in our economic life and to find the solutions to those problems." The forthcoming budget message will make clearer the President's idea of a solution. The Congress and the country, while recognizing the limitations of all generalized economic analysis, must respect this serious attempt to establish a considered basis for action.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of January 11, 1947]

THE ECONOMIC PICTURE

The President's economic report to Congress is of particular interest because it is the first such survey of the Nation's economy submitted in pursuance of the act which began as a full employment bill. In the main, it is a careful and neutral study of the over-all economic position of the country. It also contains a good many recommendations, and these are of somewhat divergent character.

The picture presented is a favorable one—of unprecedented numbers of Americans holding jobs, of high production and of sustained demand for new construction in almost all fields. The outlook, likewise, is encouraging, with reasonably good prospects for increasing output of goods and services in the year to come.

Mr. Truman notes some danger signs, however, such as the possibility of excessive wage-increase demands, the expansion of purchases on installments, and the tendency to hold prices higher than necessary. All of these are danger signs. But one may doubt whether the decline in saving by individuals is such a warning signal. Most persons saved abnormally large proportions of their incomes during the war. They had larger incomes, and they had less opportunity to buy things—or services—they wanted. They also were under strong patriotic incentive to buy bonds.

It is natural that the rate of saving should drop off rapidly for people of moderate and small income. The accumulation of capital is not their job, although they ought to save something for their own future security. In fact, one might go further and argue that excessive saving would bring the very decline in consumer purchases that Mr. Truman feared in another part of his report.

Although it may be inconsistent with his plea for augmenting consumer purchasing power, Mr. Truman's strongest recommendation—and soundest—is that for continued heavy taxation in order to retire the public debt more rapidly. Ironically, a Democratic President is making the case here for sound, conservative finance, while the principal spokesmen for the GOP are taking their cues elsewhere and calling for drastic tax reduction.

This first economic report to Congress is not likely to become the foundation of national economic policy in the year 1947. The President and the majority in Congress are too far apart on economic questions for that. But it should be said for Mr. Truman that he has discharged his obligation conscientiously in preparing a careful, comprehensive, and balanced survey of the economic state of the Nation.

He does not give as much ground in this report as he did in the preceding state of the Union message delivered in person. That message was definitely a bid for cooperation. In the economic report he hews

closer to the line followed by him and his party prior to the November elections. But the factual data in the report are valuable and the recommendations in most cases are worthy of the most careful and sympathetic consideration in Congress.

[From the Evening Sun of Baltimore of January 9, 1947]

THE STATE OF THE UNION

The President's economic report to Congress yesterday was in reality a new form of message on the state of the Union. In pursuance of constitutional requirements, all Presidents from Washington on down have reported to Congress on this subject and have recommended measures for the Legislators to consider. In all cases, Presidents have had in mind the promotion of the general prosperity and welfare.

In the past, however, presidential discussion of the state of the Union had proceeded on a piecemeal basis. Presidents have treated production, employment, housing and taxes as if they existed as separate parts of a jigsaw puzzle that could never be fitted together. The interdependence of labor policy and tax policy and the connection between agricultural policy and the enforcement of the antitrust laws were too often ignored.

In discussing the state of the Union in his economic report, President Truman sought to put all the pieces of the jigsaw together. The result is for the first time in our history a message which undertakes to discuss all the factors affecting the economic welfare of the nation in a systematic and comprehensive way.

Material for the report was supplied by the Council of Economic Advisers set up under the Employment Act of 1946. The treatment is in some degree necessarily technical, but an attempt at simplification has been made, with the result that this document provides Congress in understandable form with most of the material necessary for a systematic study of the issues upon which continued prosperity depends.

This kind of report would be useful at any time. It is particularly appropriate at this juncture. We were a hundred-billion-dollar country in 1939. The wartime expansion of our productive capacity has made this a $200,000,000,000 country. We have not, however, fully or securely adjusted ourselves to the new and higher level upon which our economy operates. It is of the utmost importance that we think intelligently about the steps that are necessary to effect a full adjustment. The President's economic report will encourage not only Congress but all the rest of us to do the kind of thinking that is needed on this subject.

Obviously, such a report cannot be summarized within the space of a single editorial. Obviously, there is a certain distortion in picking out one or two points for discussion here. The only way to get the rounded picture is to read the document in its entirety. Members of Congress will do well to take this course, and members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report will need to study it with meticulous care in preparing to pass on its various recommendations.

Those of us who do not have time for such lengthy perusal will have to be satisfied with a few high lights. Recognizing the danger of viewing the report in this manner, it may be said that the main point which it makes as to the immediate future is that 1947 will bring an increased volume of consumer goods without any great increase in consumer spending power.

The rise in consumer goods will come about partly through the increase n productivity as industry and labor settle into their postwar stride. Another and more important influence making for more consumer goods will be the fact that industry will be largely over the hump of reconversion and will be able to devote itself more to production than to rebuilding and retooling. On these two points most observers will agree with the President.

The question which this increase poses is how the public will absorb this larger amount of consumer goods without increased purchasing power. The report indicates three ways by which this could be accomplished. One would be to increase wages. Another would be to reduce individual saving, thus increasing the proportion of income spent. Still a third would be by way of reduced prices, which would make the present income buy more.

The report chooses the price-reduction method as the best. It says that it would be dangerous to reduce the rate of saving. It says further that it would be impractical to raise wages. For one thing, the increases would not be distributed over a wide enough area to bring about increased consumption. For another, wage increases would tend to increase costs in some industries and produce bottlenecks and lowered output. So the President concludes that price reductions which would increase the real purchasing power of everyone are the best method.

In a free economy such as ours, this is a choice which Government cannot enforce. So the report urges business to reduce prices on its own initiative. Many factors will be conducive to this end, for, as the supply of goods rises above the power of the public to purchase, the law of supply and demand will operate to force down prices. The great question is whether the reductions are made promptly enough to assure a continuity of production.

There are many other points in the report and many other recommendations, some of which will raise debatable questions as to general policy. The main point is that here is a comprehensive survey of the economic state of the Union that deserved careful attention.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 9, 1947]

AN ECONOMIC BLUEPRINT FOR THE GENERAL WELFARE

The extent to which this session of Congress may be fateful for us all is revealed by the issues set forth in the President's economic report. This document charts a course to action for stability, higher living standards, and improved welfare. And there is an enormous importance in the manner of its acceptance or rejection by Congress and the public as well.

The report comes as the first demonstration of value in the so-called Full Employment Act which Congress passed last year, even though watering it down to a pallid thinness. The Council of Economic Advisers, which the act created, studied conditions, trends, and needs, then made its recommendations to the President. Upon these, Mr. Truman based his report.

Shining brightly is one of the clearest of facts. It rests on the foundation truth that there can be no fears for prosperity if purchasing power is kept high, and everybody lives well. But it goes on to show that purchasing power is not a matter of higher wages so much as of lower prices. With the latter, everybody may share in the supply of goods and services, not merely the minority which has the power to force its wages up—and thereby to force prices up so that the majority is even less able to get its share.

This is sound doctrine. It becomes the core of Mr. Truman's appeal to business for price reductions in many articles of food, clothing, housing and building materials, textiles and furnishings. It is part of his appeal to organized labor to refrain from asking excessive wage increases that might force higher prices or prevent lower prices.

But for all its truth, this appeal carries mainly a moral force. It underscores the fact that business, industry, commerce—the whole economic structure—are parts of society and therefore have a social purpose. This is to serve people, and the more people the better. Profits are not loot to be divided between owners and workers. The people also have a claim, and perhaps a prior claim, to lower prices.

More definite in their challenge are the council's recommendations for legislative action and policy as transmitted to Congress by the President. In the very first of these the issue is joined for a rousing political battle. Mr. Truman proposes keeping tax rates as they are for the present. He, or the Council of Economic Advisers through him, says it would be unsound fiscal policy to cut taxes while employment is high, income at a peak, and a debt to be whittled down. Much will be made of this. The opposition, tied to blithe campaign pledges to cut taxes, doubtless will undertake to change the subject to that of expense cutting. They will rave at the President's budget. They have raised already the vote-catching cry of firing a million Government employees. The President's budget message, due Friday, will come now as an anticlimax. The fight is on, and Mr. Truman has brought up his documentary weapons.

He is armed also with evidence to support a program more positive than anything proposed in his message on the state of the Union—extension of rent controls, higher minimum wages, extended benefits of social security and wage-and-hour laws, and bigger and better housing programs. He speaks now, thanks to the council's advice and the law's sanction, in the name of full employment. It would be stubborn and heedless for his opposition in Congress or any pressure group to reject out of hand the prescription for prosperity that he and his advisers have written.

[From the Nashville Tennesseean of January 13, 1947]

OLD GUARD'S TURN

President Truman's economic report, the first under the Full Employment Act, is a message of great significance despite the brush-off it has received from the opposition press. Because the President did not recommend stringent or revolutionary measures to head off an impending slump, many have professed to see it as a mild and innocent message capable of doing neither harm nor good. But the Nation can ignore the trends and facts pointed out only at its own loss.

The President pointed out that our high production is being sustained by shipment abroad of $15,000,000,000 of goods annually. Should this drop to even twice the total of prewar exports, as is likely, domestic buying power will have to make up the difference or production suffer a sharp decline. It is time now for the Nation to answer the question of where eight to ten billion additional dollars in consumer buying power is to be found to replace this prospective loss.

The report called attention to a decline in wages from $116,000,000,000 to $109,000,000,000 and an increase in corporate profits from $10,600,000,000 to $13,000,000,000. At the same time it showed a jump in food costs from an index of 140 to 187 this year. Thus money and real wages are down and profits are up. To complicate the picture further is the prediction of a decline in farm prices and therefore in farm purchasing power in 1947. Capital investment during the past year was shown to include many billions of high-priced inventories—inventories which can turn a slowly declining market into a plummeting one.

The President's recommendations of voluntary cuts in prices, moderate wage demands, measures to expand foreign trade, controlled consumer credit, aid to small business, vigorous enforcement of the laws against monopoly, continued rent control,

higher and expanded minimum wage coverage, wider social-security benefits, unchanged taxes, and more housing are all well calculated to hedge against the recession implicit in the abnormal economic conditions pictured in his report.

Chairman TAFT and the Joint Congressional Full Employment Committee are under legislative mandate to draw from the report a positive program to be submitted to Congress. The material is there. It will be both politically expedient and economically sound for the Old Guard majority to submit concrete measures designed to keep the national economy off the soft shoulders of the prosperity highway. If they fail to do so and a slump occurs, it won't be easy to escape the blame.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) News of January 10, 1947]

THE NEW PROCEDURE

Expressions of disagreement with many of the recommendations in the first economic report of the President have already been heard in Congress. More are to be expected when the President submits his fiscal proposals today in his budget message. But debate over specific issues should not obscure the significance of his review of the Nation's economy.

For the first time in history a President, with the aid of competent advisers provided by law, has considered the national economic problem as a whole. Along with his conclusions he has transmitted to Congress the data on which they are based. The document now goes to the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report to serve as a foundation for a program that will meet the need.

It may be taken for granted that Congress will not follow the President's wishes in every respect. But it is worth noting, at the same time, that the new procedure evidently has had a profound influence on the President's thinking. The contrast between the policies he followed a year ago and those he advocates today is sharp. He no longer advocates higher wages all along the line to maintain purchasing power, for example. He calls for only limited increases here and there while he puts his main trust in reducing prices or holding them stable through the cooperation of industry.

Time and experience, no doubt, have taught him much. Still, it seems reasonable to believe that the competent advice now available to him has had much to do with his changed attitude. So there is reason to hope that Congress, examining the facts now before it, will arrive at decisions that will be in the best interests of a Nation eagerly seeking a sound and expanding economy.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of January 9, 1947]

PLANNING FOR PROSPERITY

Last year the United States Government set out, for the first time, to frame and carry through a long-range program to avert depressions and keep the country prosperous. Congress set up the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which recently made its initial report. This document, with the President's comments, goes to a permanent joint committee of Congress for action.

The task thus set is an appallingly large order. It involves foreign policy, social security, taxes, Government spending, the activities of capital, management, and labor. The size of the job accounts for the great length of the message President Truman sent to Congress yesterday—first of a series which now must accompany the traditional messages on the state of the Union and the budget. The excerpts from the text, as sent out by the Associated Press, would fill a whole newspaper page of solid type. So it is necessary to confine comment to the general idea and the President's salient points.

Mr. Truman observes that America has "a fabulous wealth of resources." Its plant is larger and in many cases better than before the war. There are ample funds for business expansion. The labor force has been greatly increased, spending power is higher, and there are large accumulated needs, long-deferred public works, and a strong foreign demand for goods.

On the other side of the picture there is a decline in buying power because of high prices. If wage-price adjustments are not made soon enough, purchasing will falter, production drop, and unemployment will increase. A weakening of investment activity, or a new round of strikes could also cause a set-back.

Mr. Truman recommends that prices be cut wherever possible, and that labor recognize the need of high production and refrain from demanding "excessive wage increases that would require price increases or would prevent price reductions." He also has a very long list of recommendations for Government action along many lines. In some respects these differ widely—and wisely—from past policies with which the country has become all too familiar.

For example, the President asserts truly that public works have been overemphasized as a means of stabilization. They are not sufficient for a major depression, too slow in effect for a minor one. He urges planning public-works construction according to our long-term needs. The program could, however, be expanded in case of recession to give what help it can.

Mr. Truman would bring order into a great number of Government welfare programs which, like Topsy, just growed. He would measure the total amount spent for all against the total size of the economy. Some of these programs were "born of a depression psychology"; they should not, however, be regarded as depression expedients, but as "an inescapable obligation of an enlightened people," and should be tied in with our economic programs.

In a broad, detailed plan for agriculture, Mr. Truman puts a final period to the plowing-under folly by insisting that policy should be based upon the principle of plenty and not upon the encouragement of scarcity. He opposes restriction of production as part of farm policy.

The President gives much attention to foreign trade, probably because the Republican majority threatens the progress that has been made in that field. We can sell to other countries, he observes, only if we buy from them or invest in them. We need foreign imports, and needn't fear foreign competition if we have full production and employment. But he properly opposes indiscriminate reductions of barriers to imports; some tariffs must be kept.

In this connection Mr. Truman warns that other countries fear an American depression as a threat to their own stability. Despite these misgivings, 17 governments joined our own recently to work out a trade charter, "the first major effort in the field of trade to replace unilateral action—which often injured other countries and provoked retaliation—by cooperation and joint action under a set of common principles." Their willingness to go on will depend largely on our attitude in this year's reciprocal trade negotiations. In return for tariff concessions in these talks, we can eliminate a mass of restrictions, in particular, rigid import quotas preventing our access to foreign markets. If we don't cooperate, other nations will increase their own government controls and break up the world into trade blocs.

Success of the ambitious American effort to prevent depressions will be hampered by selfish actions on the part of labor and business groups, by striving for personal and partisan advantage in Congress and the administration, mistakes in both policy and practice, and popular unwillingness to make temporary sacrifices for future stability. (For example, Mr. Truman writes: "In the present economic situation it is clear that it would be unsound fiscal policy to reduce taxes"—but it is doubtful that he will have public support.)

Despite the difficulties, the effort is worth making. We must at least try to see that our own folly does not keep on causing disasters when we have the means for prosperity at hand. As the President concluded:

"Continuing policy cannot be extemporized from month to month or even from year to year; most policies designed to increase the stability of the economy are of long-range character. Fortunately, we have time in which to plan deliberately and wisely, and in which to secure the cooperation of all our citizens in driving toward our common goal—an expanding economy of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power under a system of free competitive enterprise, with full recognition of the duties and responsibilities of forward-looking government."

[From the Washington Post of January 9, 1947]

ECONOMIC REPORT

For the first time an economic report on the state of the Nation has been transmitted to Congress by the President as required by the Employment Act of 1946. The Council of Economic Advisers has, we think, proved its worth by helping the President to give Congress and the country at large a better understanding of the relation between specific legislative recommendations and the over-all long-range objective of maintaining a high level of production and employment. Painstaking objective analysis of the factors conditioning economic activity is the best possible safeguard against unpreparedness when depression threatens. It is also a safeguard against undue reliance on mechanistic devices for rescuing the country from depression, such as Government pump priming or attempts to maintain purchasing power by indiscriminate increases in wages and salaries.

Although at present civilian employment is at an all-time high level, the President and his advisers realize that there are certain unfavorable factors in the economic situation that call for remedial action to insure maintenance of prosperity. For example, the sharp rise in living costs during the past 6 months has brought about a pronounced drop in the real purchasing power of wages, giving rise to well-founded fears of a drop in consumer demand that may adversely affect business activity and slow down investment. Work stoppages caused by strikes and lockouts likewise constitute a threat to continued business activity and industrial expansion.

Threatening developments stressed in the report are not in the nature of discoveries. On the contrary, repeated warnings of a lack of balance in the economic structure have come from many sources. But the unique value of the report lies in the linking up of its analytical conclusions with specific recommendations for legislative action that the President has already indorsed. Major responsibility for bringing about necessary adjustments, however, rests with the people themselves, the report points out. Prices much be reduced wherever possible to bolster up market demands. If business makes these reductions in a timely and orderly way, it will help sustain markets rather than destroy them. Labor, too, must strive for increased productivity, and not demand excessive wage increases that would require price increases or prevent needed price reductions. Rejected decisively is the notion that there can be any universal rule governing price reductions or wage adjustments, although it is admitted that some adjustments in both prices and wages are essen-

tial. In both cases, account must be taken of the individual situation.

The role assigned to Government in preserving the needed balance between prices and wages is, therefore, secondary. However, the role is regarded by the advisers as extremely important, and also by the President. Continuation of rent control, a rise in statutory minimum wages, expansion of the social-security program, stimulation of a long-range housing program, and encouragement of a sound system of collective bargaining are among the legislative recommendations mentioned as contributing to maintenance of a high level of consumer purchasing power and well-being. Tax reduction programs likewise, the President states, should be framed with the view of providing the work and the business incentives essential for a high level of production. However, he makes it clear that in his opinion wise fiscal policy calls for a postponement of tax reduction.

Although the concluding section of the report is described as a long-range program, it deals with problems of agriculture, public works, welfare, and international relations that will engage the attention of Congress in the near future. This far-reaching program cannot, of course, be exhaustively discussed in any single report. Nor is there any expectation that Congress will agree with all the conclusions set forth, some of which are highly controversial. Nevertheless, it is extremely helpful to have the outlines of a comprehensive legislative program designed to strengthen the American economy laid before Congress, so that it may be impressed with the fact that no one remedial program, or even two or three, can insure maintenance of full employment. As the President well says, "Only by blending all practicable programs in wise proportions can we be successful in stabilizing our economy at the highest feasible levels."

[From the Washington Star of January 9, 1947]

THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

In his first economic report to Congress under the Employment Act of 1946, the President has reemphasized his opposition to tax cuts at this time. In addition, he has asked for a continuation of rent curbs, advocated legislation against racial discrimination, and urged an increase in minimum wages under the fair labor standards law. Apart from these and a few other controversial matters, however, he has confined himself to drawing a broad picture of the national economy in objective and rather conservative terms.

Taken as a whole, the picture is a cheering one. We have virtually full employment. Labor, agriculture, and business are better off than ever before in our history. Consumer demand for goods of all kinds remains high. The outlet for our production in foreign markets continues large. As against a hundred-billion-dollar economy in prewar years, we have a $200,000,000,000 economy now. In the President's words, "America has never been so strong or so prosperous. Nor have our prospects ever been brighter."

But there are unfavorable factors demanding serious attention. They include the marked price increases of the last half of 1945, the use of wartime savings by consumers for current purchases, and the danger of more industrial strife. These could cause "a recession in production and employment" if allowed to go unchecked, and the President has therefore called upon the different groups involved—labor, business, agriculture—to take their own corrective measures. Thus, he counsels against strikes and excessive wage demands, urges producers to cut prices wherever possible, and stresses the importance of having a free flow of world trade. As for the Government's part, besides such short-range steps as rent curbs, he recommends a long-range program for the fullest utilization of our great human and productive resources and for the encouragement of free competitive enterprise—a program free from illusory pump-priming projects.

Under the Employment Act, the President's report will be acted upon by a permanent joint congressional committee. Some of the points in it—especially the one against tax cuts—are not likely to win Republican support, but by and large, because of its lucidity and its persuasive general thesis, it merits careful consideration. Certainly, given cooperation, common sense and wisdom of the sort advocated by the President, the Nation can avoid major depressions and enter upon a period of unprecedented long-term prosperity.

[From the Chicago Sun]

THE FACTS OF LIFE IN 1947

Senator WHERRY, the Republican whip, dismissed the President's economic report as "just a campaign statement." If that is going to be the attitude of the majority party, the Employment Act which the Republicans helped pass last year will become a hollow sham.

The economic report is the work of trained economists brought into Government for the precise purpose of lifting some issues of public policy above the level of partisan wrangling. Their conclusions have been reached on the basis of objective facts and expert judgments, not by balancing political appeals or calculating the strength of pressure groups. If the Employment Act is to mean anything, those who oppose the measures recommended by the President's Council of Economic Advisers must prove their case by challenging the council's evidence or its reasoning. The council has framed a policy for facing what it finds to be the facts of life in 1947; Congress in considering the report has a duty either to find its own facts or prescribe a better policy.

What are the facts of life in 1947? The state of national prosperity will be determined basically by the volume of buying done by four kinds of customer—the Government, business, foreign countries, and consumers. The writers of the report appear to believe that business and foreign buying may remain close to 1946 levels, but that buying of government and of consumers will decline. That prospect clearly points to a fall in economic activity, yet the council seems to hope that maladjustments may be corrected in time to prevent or moderate the drop.

Greatest of all maladjustments, of course, is that between prices and consumer incomes. As every family knows, the rise in prices that followed the wrecking of OPA has steadily eaten into the public's ability to buy. The report measures that depletion of purchasing power and discovers that it has reached a disturbing pace.

In 1945 consumer incomes after taxes were running at the annual rate of $978 per person (in terms of 1944 prices). By the last quarter of 1946 this rate of disposable income had fallen to $880 per person. This means, roughly, that consumers today have $14,000,000,000 less effective purchasing power than they had in 1945; and $14,000,000,000 represents a lot of groceries, two-pants suits, house dresses, and refrigerators.

What to do? The report expresses a hope that business will reduce prices wherever possible, and reduce them in time; that labor will refrain from excessive wage demands that require price increases; that management will raise wages and salaries where they have lagged markedly behind living costs; that Government will raise minimum wages, keep rent control, stimulate low-cost house building, refrain from cutting taxes, and help maintain industrial peace.

This is something less than a precise economic blueprint for 1947. In view of the scuttling of controls, greater precision may have been impossible. But businessmen and political leaders will do themselves as well as the country an injustice if they fail to study the report carefully and guide their actions accordingly. Unless American capitalism can learn to take the general welfare into account in the millions of daily decisions that determine the economic state of the Union, real trouble lies ahead.

[From the Chicago Sun]

TAFT SEES SOME WHISKERS

Senator TAFT says that the whiskers of the New Deal peek around the corners of the President's economic report. But he concedes that it is an interesting and valuable document which deserves the most careful study. If Congress and the country receive it in that spirit, the report and its successors may become landmarks in American history.

No doubt it is the long-range recommendations of the report that arouse Senator TAFT's suspicion. In considering them, one should remember that the Council of Economic Advisers, which prepared the report, is a decidedly middle-of-the-road body. Its members, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, Leon Keyserling, and John D. Clark, were chosen by President Truman not for their opinions but for the qualifications which Congress specified. Each, as the Employment Act requires, is "a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments and to formulate and recommend national economic policy."

As Congress told it to do, the Council in the long-term section of the report took up the problem of maintaining at high levels of production and employment a national economy that was greatly expanded for purposes of war. Up to now, the backlog of exceptional consumer demand, accumulated while most of our production was concentrated on military effort, has enabled civilian output to reach a peak 50 percent higher than prewar. But if we are to stay on this heady plateau, as the Council says, "the extraordinary postwar demand that we enjoy today must be transformed into the sustained demand of an expanding peacetime economy."

A policy of drift, dressed up with suitable encomiums to free enterprise, will not be enough. We followed this line after the First World War, and inherited the depression of the thirties for our pains. This time it is essential that positive measures be taken—and taken soon enough—to sustain prosperity. Another crash would not only imperil the foundations of our democracy but by dragging much of the world down with us, undermine the peace that is now so laboriously being built.

Not for social reasons, not for humanitarian reasons, but for the hard, practical reason of maintaining full opportunity for jobs, profits, and private enterprise, the economic advisers propose their long-term program.

They urge that racial discrimination in employment be ended, not because this is justice (though it is), but because thus we can take one step toward the most efficient use of the labor force. They ask publicly financed school lunches and study of nutrition programs for low-income families not because these measures would aid the beneficiaries (though they would), but because they are steps toward a farm policy of plenty rather than scarcity, and expanded farm market which would make crop curtailment unnecessary.

In the same way, development of water resources is recommended in the interest of the full use of our productive capacity, which means expanded ability to consume. A long-range housing program and an expanded social-security system would provide reservoirs of purchasing power which

can be drawn upon when needed. To maintain a healthy foreign market for our goods we must have an intelligent foreign lending policy and keep trade barriers down.

Are these the whiskers of the New Deal? Senator TAFT may call them that, but others will see something else. The Employment Act acknowledged the Government's responsibility to promote "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." The economic council is trying to make good on that pledge, and those who disagree with its conclusions have an obligation to offer a program of their own—not just a policy of drift—that will serve the same purpose.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 9, 1947]

UP TO THE PEOPLE

President Truman's economic report to Congress merits wider, closer reading than it may get. It won't interest folks who think that by some magic formula Government can insure full employment and prosperity, now and forever. They're the ones who ought to study it.

Its gist is that the country can enjoy fine economic health this year if the people work and act wisely, and that the people, with help from the Government, can keep the economy healthy in years to come.

Here's what Mr. Truman and his Council of Economic Advisers think about 1947 prospects:

Consumers have much higher buying power than ever before the war. But at present or higher prices they may be unable to buy the huge volume of goods and services that can be produced if we eccape a new strike epidemic. Should buying falter, production would drop, unemployment would grow, and we'd have a "recession."

How to avoid that? Business should reduce prices wherever it can. Farmers should realize that many of their prices must come down. Labor should work for high productivity and refrain from excessive wage demands that force prices higher or keep them from being lowered. Management should recognize that increased productivity and good profits justify some wage rises as well as price cuts; should give the increases to workers whose wages are substandard or have lagged furthest behind living costs. All that is up to the people. The Government can't compel them to be wise.

But, Mr. Truman says, the Government's own policies can help. He wants vigorous antitrust enforcement, to keep competition free and active. He asks Congress to extend rent controls; continue present tax rates; authorize a big, long-range housing program; increase social-security benefits; bring more workers under the wage-hour law and raise the minimum wage; pass laws to help collective bargaining work better and prevent strikes.

This is the first such report a President has made. It was required by the Employment Act, passed by Congress last year. A newly created committee of Senators and Representatives is supposed to give it earnest consideration, and we hope they will.

We believe in free enterprise. Government planning and management of the national economy would restrict, and might destroy, the freedom of business, labor and agriculture. To avoid Government planning and management, the economy must be handled in a way to prevent skyrocket booms and disastrous busts. We welcome this first real attempt by Government to look ahead and show a way by which a free people can coordinate their own activities to keep American economic life on a steadily rising plane instead of a roller-coaster.

STATEMENT BY LABOR-MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CONCILIATION SERVICE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued on March 27, 1947, by the labor and management members of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee of the United States Conciliation Service, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY — EDITORIAL FROM THE PROGRESSIVE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Constructive Proposals," dealing with proposals relating to American foreign policy, published in the Progressive of March 31, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CUSTOMS BUREAU — LETTER FROM SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by him to Senator CORDON, relative to appropriations for the Customs Bureau, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING—EDITORIAL FROM THE SCRANTON TIMES

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Industry-Wide Bargaining," published in the Scranton Times, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOUSING SITUATION—LETTER FROM PHILIP MURRAY AND R. J. THOMAS

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relative to the housing situation, addressed to Senator TOBEY by Philip Murray, president of the CIO, and R. J. Thomas, vice president, United Automobile Workers, CIO, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has the floor.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield for that purpose?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is 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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

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 nominations of David E. Lilienthal and others to be 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] has the floor.

CONFIRMATION OF UNCONTESTED NOMINATIONS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for the submission of a unanimous-consent request, without prejudice to his right to the floor?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. There are on the Executive Calendar a number of nominations which are in controversy. There are also two nominations appearing under the general title "New Reports" about which, so far as I am advised, there is no disagreement whatsoever. I ask unanimous consent that, without prejudice to the pending business, the Senate may proceed to the consideration of these two nominations under the title "New Reports."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard C. O'Connell to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey to be Director of the Office of Selective Service Records.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President may be notified immediately of the ac-

tion of the Senate with respect to these two nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

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. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] advises me that he has a short speech on the Lilienthal case which he wants to make, and I am perfectly willing that he should make it now, if I may retain the floor when he finishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield the floor to the Senator from Virginia for that purpose only, with the understanding that the senior Senator from Tennessee will regain the floor upon the completion of the remarks of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, may I inquire how long it will take the Senator to complete his speech?

Mr. BYRD. It will take about 10 minutes.

Mr. McMAHON. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, without contradiction David E. Lilienthal has allowed the reputable Current Biography—1944 to quote him as saying: "Our Government and every government is and must be a government of men and not of laws," and the same biographical sketch continues with the statement that "He"—Lilienthal—"was expressing a thought which he is still paraphrasing today."

This expression by Mr. Lilienthal represents the fundamental difference in his philosophy of government and mine. With all my mind and heart I feel that only a rigid adherence to our fundamental conception of a "government of laws and not of men" will preserve our democracy. The founders, in their supreme wisdom, established for the people of America a government by laws enacted by their representatives in preference to a government by men, which they knew meant autocracy and dictatorship. John Adams summarized our philosophy when he concluded the Massachusetts bill of rights—"To the end it may be a government of laws and not of men." In the final essence, this is the difference between dictatorship and freedom; between totalitarianism and democracy. A "government of men and not of laws" can end only in the destruction of the freedoms that have made America great. In fact, the act we are going through today is to strengthen a "government of laws and not of men." The Senate of the United States is sitting in judgment on the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal. We have the power either to confirm or reject his appointment, and thus the legislative branch is given a curb on the appointment by the President of the United States of an official who will exercise a towering influence on the future of America and the world.

In my 14 years of service in the Senate I regard this as the most important nomination submitted to the Senate. The chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission can well determine the future security of America and the future course of the world. It is for that reason that the Members of the Senate should, with the utmost care, investigate the characteristics and the temperament of any person whose nomination for this position is submitted to the Senate for confirmation. The statement made by Mr. Lilienthal that he believes we should have here a "government of men and not of laws," is amply corroborated by a review of his public career. Time and time again he has resisted the control of Congress over the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He has opposed the auditing of the vast TVA expenditures by the Comptroller General as the expenditures of other Government agencies are audited. He has shown a contempt for any control by the representatives elected by the people and has arrogated to himself the power to make decisions of vital consequence and to conduct the affairs of the Tennessee Valley Authority as he himself desired, without regard to the fact that it was the funds of the United States Government derived from the taxpayers whereby $800,000,000 was invested in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The power of the Atomic Energy Commission, of which Mr. Lilienthal will be chairman, if his nomination is confirmed, presents a vast opportunity for good or evil. I know from long experience that a forceful and dominating chairman can greatly influence any commission over which he presides. America has never before been faced with such a problem as the control of the atomic bomb in all its implications. We brought the bomb into being and thereby created a weapon of such destructiveness that it may, in the end, be used to destroy us and even to end world civilization as we know it.

I served as a member of the Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, which prepared the legislation creating the Atomic Energy Commission and outlined its powers. During long and confidential hearings our committee was told of the frightful and appalling destructiveness of the atomic bomb and that future scientific developments would immeasurably increase the destructive power of such bombs as were dropped on Japan. Our committee, in preparing the atomic energy control legislation, wrote all the safeguards that could be conceived, but legislative safeguards can be rendered useless by a chairman of a commission who publicly proclaims that he believes in "government of men and not of laws." One mistake by the Atomic Energy Commission, intentional or otherwise, in handling the secret of the atomic bomb, may be irreparable. We may later remove or impeach Mr. Lilienthal, but the damage cannot be repaired.

I want to make it clear that I do not charge Mr. Lilienthal with any such intent, but I cannot vote to confirm any man to a position of such vast importance unless his philosophy of government and his previous official actions conform with what I believe to be true Americanism and the American concept of democracy. Dictatorship and totalitarian government are all synonymous with a "government of men and not of laws."

I do not charge that Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist. Such a charge, if made, cannot often be proved, as most Communists in America deny their faith, but I do say, and I say it with the utmost sincerity, that I believe Mr. Lilienthal has a tolerance toward communism, which in this case is just as dangerous as if he were an avowed apostle of communism. No man should be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission unless he has a passionate hatred of the slightest trend toward a communistic state and a will to cut it down.

Today in America the infiltration of communism, which is a serious menace to our Republic, is not coming from avowed Communists but from those who profess democracy, but at the same time are willing to do things that weaken our democratic form of government.

I have earnestly endeavored to reach a fair decision in accordance with my convictions. I have read the hearings and weighed the testimony. I have considered the public career of Mr. Lilienthal and the actions that he has taken in responsible offices. My duty is to do all I can to protect the future of the American people. With the thousands of able men from whom to choose, why should a selection have been made that has even a taint of some foreign "ism" abhorrent to the American people?

My study and knowledge of Mr. Lilienthal's activities as a public official demonstrate to me definitely that he believes in a government of men and not of laws, and that he has practiced this belief in his daily work in important governmental capacities. For more than 10 years in my investigation of governmental agencies, I have been impressed time and time again with the ruthless purpose of Mr. Lilienthal to dominate his colleagues and to conduct his public duties to serve his own wishes, regardless of the expressed acts of Congress.

I cite these concrete instances: He has invariably resisted any departure from lump-sum appropriations for his agencies, which means he can spend public funds without legal restrictions. For many years I have exerted my efforts to see that every single agency of the Federal Government be audited by the Comptroller General, an office established by Congress to conduct an independent audit of the disbursements of the executive branch. Time and time again Mr. Lilienthal resisted the auditing of the funds of the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Comptroller General, although the taxpayers have invested in excess of $800,000,000 in this agency.

On one occasion, the Comptroller General said in an official communication:

It is inconceivable to me that any agency entrusted with the expenditure of mammoth amounts of funds collected from the people of the United States should desire to evade responsible accounting and security by an independent office created for that purpose.

This reference was made to Mr. Lilienthal and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Again, in testifying before the House Military Affairs Committee, on June 18, 1941, Comptroller General Lindsay Warren said:

I am faced with the alternative of permitting the authority (TVA) indefinitely to continue to draw large sums from the Treasury for which no accounting is rendered, which I believe to be contrary to law and my official duties.

And, on June 27, 1941, Mr. Lilienthal said the proposal he was advocating "places squarely upon us the full authority in the expenditure of funds and holds us responsible for them," demonstrating that in his belief his agency and himself were alone to be held responsible for the expenditure of funds.

Instances could be multiplied time and time again showing the unwillingness of Mr. Lilienthal to submit to ordinary auditing by the Comptroller General. The Annual Report of the Comptroller General for the fiscal year 1942 discloses that under date of November 23, 1940, the officials of the TVA refused to submit to any further auditing. Mr. Lilienthal appeared also against provisions in the Byrd-Butler bill. It was only the passage of this bill last year that has enabled a proper auditing of his accounts. The bill required the auditing of all Government corporations, and its passage was the culmination of 10 years of effort.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to make a statement concerning the first report made by the General Accounting Office of the audit of TVA under the provisions of the Byrd-Butler bill. I thought I had a typewritten copy of it in the file I have with me. It is at the office, and I shall get it, if it is necessary. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the report was made more than a month ago, and was furnished to the Public Printer for printing probably longer ago than that. I have called and asked the Public Printer to complete the printing of the report and submit it to the Senate while the nominations to the Atomic Energy Commission are being considered by the Senate.

It contains many things which Senators ought to see. However, it has been absolutely impossible to get it from the printer. It is always "next Monday" or "next Tuesday," or "next Wednesday," or some other day. It has been promised a number of times. I called this morning, hoping that the document would be printed for the use of Senators in this particular connection. It is the first report, and it is a very enlightening report. I have a typewritten copy, and I know something about it; but there are not enough typewritten copies for each Senator to have a copy. The result is that the Senate does not know about the report. I have now been promised that the report will be ready tomorrow morning, and I hope each Senator will look for it and examine it. I am quite sure that Senators who are interested will find many important facts in the report, if we can get the printer to act.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Virginia to say that the accounts of the TVA have not been audited?

Mr. BYRD. I said that Mr. Lilienthal resisted the audit, and that for a certain period of time they were not audited. I can quote to the Senator the letter which was written by the Chairman of the TVA refusing to submit to an audit by the Comptroller General.

Mr. HILL. I have before me the report of the Comptroller General of the United States to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, which I presume is the same report to which the Senator from Tennessee has referred, under date of March 17, 1947, about 2 weeks ago.

Mr. BYRD. The statement of the Senator from Virginia was that the auditing was not done with the consent of Mr. Lilienthal until the passage of the so-called Byrd-Butler bill, which was passed last June, I think. It required all governmental corporations to be audited by the Comptroller General. The report to which the Senator is referring is in conformity with the Byrd-Butler Act.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The statement of the Comptroller General does not sustain the position of the Senator from Virginia, unless I am in error. If the Senator will yield, I will read what the Comptroller General says about the auditing. I read from page 14 of the report, under the heading "Methods of financial and accounting control":

The act requires that the Authority shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account, and shall file with the President of the United States and with the Congress, in December of each year, a financial statement and a complete report as to the business of the Authority covering the preceding governmental fiscal year.

Beginning with the fiscal year 1938, but covering the period from the beginning of operations (June 16, 1933) to June 30, 1938, the Authority's financial statements have been examined annually, to and including the fiscal year 1944, by independent public accountants.

Mr. BYRD. That is just the point I made.

Mr. HILL. Let me read the next sentence.

Mr. BYRD. He refused to be audited by the Comptroller General, and had independent auditors employed by the TVA to conduct the audit.

Mr. HILL. Let me read the next sentence:

The Comptroller General of the United States has made annual audits of the books of account of the Authority through June 30, 1944; and in accordance with section 236——

Mr. BYRD. Beginning with what date?

Mr. HILL. That was from the beginning of the Authority.

Mr. BYRD. How does the Senator reconcile that statement with the statement of Mr. Warren on June 18, 1941, before the House Committee on Military Affairs? Mr. Warren said:

I am faced with the alternative of permitting the TVA Authority indefinitely to continue to draw large sums from the Treasury for which no accounting is rendered, which I believe to be contrary to law and my official duties.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me read the next sentence——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will allow me to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the parliamentary situation so that Senators who arrived late will understand what is going on. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has the floor. He has granted time to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who now has the floor by unanimous consent for this purpose. Therefore, the Senator from Virginia technically has the floor at the moment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may finish reading this statement?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I continue to read from the report of the Comptroller General:

The Comptroller General of the United States has made annual audits of the books of account of the Authority through June 30, 1944, and, in accordance with section 236, Revised Statutes, as amended by the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 24), the General Accounting Office settles the accounts for all cash receipts and disbursements of the Authority.

The Authority's funds have been derived principally from appropriations by the Congress. Appropriations are applied for by the Authority on the basis of Budget estimates submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. The Authority also submits to the Bureau of the Budget quarterly and annual financial statements.

Mr. BYRD. In reply to that statement of the Senator, let me say that the Annual Report of the Comptroller General for the fiscal year 1942 discloses that under date of November 23, 1940, the officials of the TVA refused to submit to any further audit.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, while we are on that subject, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to read from the same page in the hearings on House bill 4961, on June 18, 1941, from which the Senator from Virginia quoted a while ago. This is what Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, had to say about this audit. He is the head of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. HILL. Can the Senator give the page?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is page 4:

We say the audit they rely on is merely in addition to the audit under the Budget and Accounting Act. Now, what kind of audit is this that they say is all we can make and all that they will permit us to make? Well, it is nothing more than what is known as a commercial audit. Under that, they can go ahead, if they please, and make every kind of illegal expenditure on the face of the earth, and there is nothing that we can do about it but report it. The horse then is out of the stable.

That is the kind of accounting we had until the Byrd-Butler law was enacted a year or so ago.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to give another instance, about which there can be no dispute or contradiction, to show how Mr. Lilienthal deliberately refused to comply with a congressional act.

Not only has he constantly resisted budget and accounting control, but he was the first to breach recent personnel ceilings set up by Congress. On September 30, 1945, Harold D. Smith, the late Director of the Budget, reported to the Speaker of the House of Representatives that Mr. Lilienthal, as Chairman of the TVA, exceeded legally imposed personnel ceilings by nearly a thousand employees.

These and other instances convince me that Mr. Lilienthal has practiced what he preached, namely, that he believes in a "government of men and not of laws."

Evasion or breach of legislative controls at this stage of atomic energy development would be treasonable, and a man with a tendency to resist such controls should not be entrusted with the tremendous responsibilities of this position.

When the Senate consents to an appointment of the Executive, it means that a majority of the Senate believes that from the standpoint of character, temperment, and qualifications the appointee is satisfactory. Senate confirmation does not mean a perfunctory approval of the appointee of the President. It is one of the safeguards of our constitutional democracy, namely, that the Senate has the power to check Presidential appointees by accepting or rejecting those nominated.

I have reached my conclusion after deliberate consideration, and for this position of such vast importance I do not feel I can vote for the confirmation of any man when there is any real and proper doubt as to his temperament, his ability, or his sincere belief in the form of America democracy which has made America the greatest Nation in all the world. In less important appointments a greater chance can be taken, but in this instance I, for one, do not intend to gamble with the future of America. I have never cast a vote in the Senate which is more in accordance with my sincere convictions and beliefs than the one I shall cast in opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal's nomination.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator spoke about Mr. Lilienthal's believing in a government of men and not of laws. In the hearings before the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, when Mr. Lilienthal was questioned by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on this very matter, Mr. Lilienthal stated:

I think we must have a government by law rather than by hearsay and suspicion and innuendo and rumor, but that we must also rely upon men. I think there is a major fallacy in the aphorism that this is a government of law and not of men, implying that by passing good laws and not having men of integrity and judgment to administer them we have thereby achieved sound government.

I think it is very clear, from reading the writings of Mr. Lilienthal, and not possibly taking one sentence out of the context, that what he is emphasizing is that we must not only have a government of laws, but a government of good laws, and we must have good men to administer them.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a significant quotation from Mr. Lilienthal's statement:

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

That statement in itself would not be of such great consequence to me, except that from my investigation and my familiarity with his career as a public official I am convinced that he believes in it, because he has been arrogantly taking unto himself authority which Congress never intended him to have, and has tried to add more and more power.

RESIGNATION OF GORDON T. BURKE, REGIONAL DIRECTOR, WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION, OMAHA, NEBR.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, at this time I desire to introduce into the RECORD a letter received by me from Mr. Gordon T. Burke, regional director for the War Assets Administration at Omaha, Nebr., and a front-page story from the Omaha World-Herald, announcing Mr. Burke's resignation.

Mr. Burke has resigned because, in his own words—

Month by month it has become increasingly difficult to operate the regional office in a businesslike and efficient manner because of the incompetent personnel at topside who insist in changing the rules and installing a lot of harebrained theories which have no place in a sales organization.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the letter in full be inserted, and also the article from the Omaha World-Herald.

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

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION,
Omaha, Nebr., March 26, 1947.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: I wish to advise you that I have submitted my resignation as Regional Director of the Omaha Office of War Assets Administration effective April 30.

I have taken this action because I am wholly and completely out of sympathy with the announced plans and policies of Administrator Littlejohn. The contraction of the regional offices at this period, when we are in the midst of the biggest selling campaign in the history of War Assets Administration, in order that all of the functions can be done in Kansas City, to me neither makes sense or reason.

For the last 9 months the Washington office has come up with a new plan, formula reorganization, or what have you, on the average of every 45 to 60 days, and each time surplus sales have been retarded and the entire program jeopardized. This latest move will, in my opinion, prolong the surplus disposal program a year or more, to the detriment of the public and consequent loss to the Government. The reason behind it is said to be economy, but I fail to see how transferring functions from one office to another and creating a wholly new organization known as the zone can accomplish this result. This office has consistently met and surpassed all of the quotas set for it, which is more than can be said for many other offices in the War Assets Administration set-up. Experience has shown that the big offices have failed miserably, while the smaller offices have performed the job assigned to them. The elimination of the smaller offices to make still bigger offices certainly sounds like poor reasoning. As I have been with the surplus program since its inception, I think I am somewhat qualified to at least express an opinion.

Not being a career Government employee, I have absolutely no personal interest other than that of a citizen and taxpayer. It has become increasingly evident to me that the Government operation cannot support or hold the interest of qualified business executives.

I wish to take this opportunity of thanking you for your considerations and courtesies extended to me during the period that I have served as Regional Director at Omaha.

With kindest regards, I am

Yours very sincerely,

GORDON T. BURKE,
Regional Director.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald]

WAA CHIEF QUITS AS STAFF CUTS ORDERED—BLASTS DREAM PLANS OF INCOMPETENT MEN—DECLINES BIGGER JOBS

Gordon T. Burke announced his resignation Tuesday as regional director of the War Assets Administration.

Doing so, he loosed a blast at "ivory tower" policies, unworkable operations, and dream plans.

Announcement of his resignation came on the first anniversary of his appointment as regional director.

Touching off his action was the transfer of a major part of the operations of the regional office to the zone headquarters at Kansas City.

Mr. Burke's resignation will become effective April 30. It was sent to Maj. Gen. Robert L. Littlejohn, WAA Administrator, February 28, when Mr. Burke heard of untimely plans to consolidate the Omaha and Kansas City offices.

HAREBRAINED THEORIES

General Littlejohn, in accepting the resignation, disclosed that he had offered Mr. Burke two higher posts.

One was in Washington to be in charge of capital and consumer goods. The other was to be administrator of the Kansas City zone.

The Administrator noted that "you do not agree in my philosophy or organization."

Mr. Burke said he declined both offers.

"I have never been a career Government employee. I have consistently tried to operate the regional office in a businesslike and efficient manner," said Mr. Burke.

"Month by month, it has become increasingly difficult to do so because of the incompetent personnel at topside who insist in changing the rules and installing a lot of harebrained theories which have no place in a sales organization."

MAKES BUYING DIFFICULT

"The skeletonizing of the Omaha office," said Mr. Burke, "is bound to result in inefficiency, a break-down in sales which are reaching peak proportions.

"It will make it difficult, if not impossible, for a local purchaser to obtain surplus merchandise."

"The regional offices have been thoroughly damned for their inefficiency throughout the entire surplus-property program," he said. "While it is true that some regional offices have had poor administration, the great wonder is that any of them have been able to accomplish anything in the face of the tremendous obstacles which have been placed in their way and the fumbling and bumbling of the Washington administration."

PUZZLED OVER PURPOSE

Appointment of a businessman as Administrator, Mr. Burke said, might lead to untangling the mess that WAA is in today. He added:

"In recent months, I have wondered whether the object was to sell surplus, or go through a series of reorganizations. Each of these has slowed sales and been detrimental to surplus disposal."

Since its organization 3 years ago as a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Omaha office has brought about $23,000,000 into the Treasury. It has sold surplus goods resulting from the war, which cost the Government $54,000,000.

HAVE TO SALUTE

The Omaha office has consistently topped sales goals. It is 42 percent through its second program, which ends May 31.

The program drew the praise of General Littlejohn for its efficiency.

But Mr. Burke has been outspoken in urging more businesslike methods.

"The thing has been so brass-bound that it has got to the point where you have to salute when you enter the room," he asserted.

General Littlejohn has been giving the WAA sales program the Army treatment, Mr. Burke added.

Letters and orders contain such phrases as D-plus-one, D-D, operations, target.

Mr. Burke added: "We're still playing soldier."

Mr. Burke thinks consolidation of offices is coming too early. He favors it. But, he added, the more efficient way would be to wait until inventories are down and easily handled.

FROM 551 TO 203

The consolidation program will reduce the Omaha region force to 203. There were 575 employees January 31. Tuesday there were 551.

The 203 would handle sales in Omaha, Des Moines, Casper, Cheyenne.

The Kansas City zone will have an employee ceiling of 2,800 June 1. That will mean cuts at St. Louis and Denver, said Mr. Burke.

The shifts will mean no saving to the taxpayer, he said, adding: "What they eliminate here, they will have to do in Kansas City."

Mr. Burke has been an Omaha resident since 1928. Before the war he was vice president and general manager of Waxed Paper Products Co. here. The next was in charge of the Loan Administration Division of the RFC office here. He set up the surplus property disposal program under RFC in Omaha in 1944. Later WAA was set up as a separate agency.

Mr. Burke said he is considering forming a firm to give sales assistance in distributing locally made products.

Mr. WHERRY. I have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate because I feel that the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] should be advised of this situation.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad the Senator from Nebraska has called it to the attention of the Senate and has thereby called it to the attention of the Senator from Michigan and the Subcommittee on Surplus Property, which has received many complaints. I wish to say to the Senators that if they will advise the committee and advise the Senate so that we can get into the official record the facts as to what is going on, I am satisfied that we shall be able to do a much better job. We have spent considerable time in getting prepared. We are just now in position to start on these matters. We hope to be of service to the entire Senate and to the country. I am glad that this subject has been called to our attention, because these are the kind of things which we must look into, and when there is an indication that there is something very seriously wrong, we must see that the situation is corrected. That is the purpose of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his observation. I offered an amendment to the budget resolution providing that the recaptured funds from the sale of surplus property should be applied to the national debt. Senators will recall that I said that I felt that if that could be accomplished it would be evidence to the public of how much money was being realized from the sale of surplus property. On that occasion I called attention to the fact that while in excess of $103,000,000,000 had been inventoried in the Baruch report, the indications were that the maximum amount recaptured would be approximately $3,700,000,000.

What Mr. Burke says would constitute a grave charge against the War Assets Administration, under any circumstances, but it is particularly serious because Mr. Burke is recognized as one of the most qualified business executives in the State of Nebraska, and it was at considerable personal sacrifice that he consented to remain in the Government service to establish the regional War Assets Office a year ago. Under his direction this office has functioned with outstanding success in comparison with the record in many of the field offices of the War Assets Administration.

I know from my personal acquaintance with Mr. Burke that he has been a conscientious and efficient employee in the Government service. Therefore I put stock in his statement that—

For the last 9 months the Washington office (of WAA) has come up with a new plan, formula reorganization, or what have you, on the average of every 45 to 60 days, and each time surplus sales have been retarded and the entire program jeopardized.

Mr. Burke states further that in his judgment the move to consolidate regional offices into larger zone offices will—

in my opinion prolong the surplus disposal program a year or more, to the detriment of the public and consequent loss to the Government. The reason behind it is said to be economy, but I fail to see how transferring functions from one office to another and creating a wholly new organization, known as the zone, can accomplish this result.

As will be noted from the newspaper story, Administrator Littlejohn, of the War Assets Administration, has offered Mr. Burke his choice of two highly responsible positions, one as Director of Capital and Consumer Goods Disposal in Washington, and the other as administrator of the new Kansas City zone office.

I bring this matter to the floor of the Senate today because I believe this action and these statements from a man of Mr. Burke's responsibility and reputation are a serious reflection on the method of handling our entire war-surplus disposal program. It is more than that. It is new and important evidence to lend further credence to past reports that the operation of our surplus disposal program is bogging down in inefficiency and red tape, and that many of its executive personnel are working at cross purposes.

The liquidation of vast quantities of surplus war goods and properties and the recovery of a maximum in dollar value for the taxpayers of the United States are subjects of the utmost importance to our economic welfare. I believe every Member of the Senate should give his personal attention to the gravity of this situation, and I am hopeful that the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to whose attention Mr. Burke's resignation and statement have been called, will give this matter prompt attention, will also give attention to the statement which now has been placed in the RECORD, and will lose no time in exploring this situation completely. Perhaps they will find it expedient to confer with Mr. Burke and to go more fully into the matter with him. I suggest now to the distinguished chairman of the committee that he subpena Mr. Burke, have him come to Washington, and let him tell his story to the subcommittee which is investigating the sale of surplus property under the War Assets Administration.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Without prejudging the matter, I think there is a great deal to the statement that some of the rules and regulations which have been promulgated delay the sale of surplus property and interfere with the accrual of income therefrom to the Government. It was called to our attention only a few days ago that in Cincinnati there was to be a sale of surplus Government property, and men stood in line all night,

waiting to buy it. When I say "all night," I should point out that they went into line at 4 or 4:30 o'clock in the afternoon, and remained in line all night, until next morning at 9:30, when they finally got into the plant. After 3 men had signed for purchases of some of the material, with approximately 120 men still waiting in line, someone called from Washington, and the sale was canceled. No reason was given; nothing was said about why it was canceled; but it was simply canceled. Those men had traveled from various sections of the country; some had come from Michigan; some had come from Chicago. If people are so anxious to buy Government surplus property that they are willing to stand in line all night in order to have an opportunity to buy it, it seems to me that there must be something wrong when on order from Washington an announced sale is canceled.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his observation. I make the further comment that what he has stated is one of the reasons why the Government will realize only $3,700,000,000 from the sale of surplus property which in the Baruch report was inventoried for as much as $103,000,000,000.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I simply wish to state that yesterday, in Cincinnati, the machine tools of the Wright plant, which had been advertised for sale a long time, were put up for sale at 9 o'clock. Bidders were there from all over the United States. The value of the machine tools was estimated at $25,000,000. But at 9:30, a telegram arrived stopping all sales, and the whole thing was called off. I have received protests about it from all over the State.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will permit, I simply wish to correct the record. Instead of being a telegram, I think it probably was a telephone call—which would have been quicker. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. TAFT. That may have been the case.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Some months ago when trucks were badly needed in North Dakota for the movement of the enormous crop harvested there, after a great deal of advertising a number of the dealers finally went to Georgia to buy trucks. But when they arrived there, they found they could not buy a single truck.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senators for their observations. They definitely reinforce my remarks.

Certainly something should be done immediately about this matter. Mr. Burke is one of the finest men I know. He is an exceptionally able executive. Of course, there are a number of able executives in Government; I do not mean to cast any reflection upon those who are doing this job, for many of them are fine men; but when Mr. Burke resigns his job and says to the world that it simply is not feasible to continue because of the red tape and the entanglements caused by various agencies, it is obvious that something is wrong.

I know that the action taken by Mr. Burke was not a pleasant one for him. He is not the type of man who would willingly take such a step if his conscience would permit him to do otherwise. Therefore, it is to be hoped that the unpleasantness and the sacrifice which he has incurred by his action will in part be compensated for by results which will accrue in the way of serving the public interest, through an improvement of the war surplus disposal program.

Mr. President, I submit that proper steps should be taken by the subcommittee so as to result in the immediate establishment of a businesslike program by which it will be possible to recover from surplus property a maximum number of dollars which may be applied to the national debt, the war debt, to which they should be applied.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for giving me this opportunity to speak.

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. McKELLAR. Mr. President, when I discontinued my remarks yesterday, in yielding to other Senators, I was speaking of the three Communists whom Mr. Lilienthal has already appointed, at very large salaries, to serve under the Atomic Energy Commission, although he himself has not yet been confirmed as a member of the Commission. I discussed with considerable particularity the first of those Communists who have been appointed. That is Herbert Marks. I did not discuss the other two, but I wish to discuss them now.

The second one is Mr. Richard O. Niehoff. As I shall say something about him, I shall first refer to his record. His age is 39. He is married. He was employed as training specialist—whatever that may be; I do not know whether it means physical training or mental training, or some other kind of training—by the TVA, from December 3, 1935, to June 5, 1942; he was with the OPA and National Housing agencies from 1942 to 1946; he was with the State Department for a short period late in 1946. He now is a training specialist for the Atomic Energy Commission. Niehoff, according to information contained in the security files of the Atomic Energy Commission, attended Communist meetings in the Knoxville area while employed at the TVA. It appears that if those were not Communist Party meetings, they were attended by Communists; and at the meetings, Communist affairs were discussed.

He is the second Communist who has been employed by the Atomic Energy Commission under Mr. Lilienthal, even before Mr. Lilienthal's nomination has been confirmed. We can hardly blame him for appointing Marks, because Marks, according to the testimony which was referred to yesterday, was one of the authors of the celebrated bill which created the Atomic Energy Commission. He helped to prepare it and he submitted it to the office.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that Mr. Marks had anything to do with the preparation of the domestic atomic-energy bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. If the Senator will look at the evidence, he will find the testimony of Mr. Bolt, who was an attorney employed by TVA at a salary of $6,500 a year. He speaks of conversations had with Mr. Marks and Mr. Niehoff, or with Mr. Marks and Mr. Ramey, I believe, in which they said they prepared a bill and brought it to Washington and turned it over to Senators, and that after they had prepared it, the Senator from Connecticut refashioned it and introduced it. That is what the testimony is.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say for the record at this point that there is not a scintilla of truth in that statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will simply say to the Senator, in that connection, that, of course, I do not know what the truth of that matter is; but that was the testimony of a man who was shown by everyone to be a reputable witness. Even the TVA showed that they believed him to be reputable, because they increased his salary eight different times before they found he was not a Communist, and they gave him a fairly good character.

He testified to that effect before the committee of which the Senator is a member, and the Senator did not deny it at that time. Mr. Ramey and Mr. Marks were both here in reach of the committee. They could have been subpenaed if they had told an untruth, as the Senator now says they did. If they had told an untruth, they could both have testified before the committee and cleared it up, and the Senator would not have had to deny it if it was not true.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The statement the Senator has made that that is in the record comes as a total surprise to me. I do not say that it is not there, I say that it comes as a surprise to me. It may have been that at that particular moment I stepped out of the room, or answered a telephone call. I can remember being there when Bolt testified, and if he had said such a thing at that time I would have cross-examined him on it, because it is not true.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read it here yesterday.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator read it from the record yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was not denied this morning.

Mr. McMAHON. I am denying it now. It is the first time I have heard of it, and I suppose the Senator's clerk will give me a reference to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to have the Senator deny it, if that is the way he feels about it, but I repeated what was said.

By the way, I have a telegram about it, and I shall read it at this time. It is addressed to me, dated March 26, and reads:

Joseph C. Swidler, TVA general counsel, has admitted in writing "James T. Ramey drafted the original Hill bill, Senate 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."

The telegram then continues:

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 Association bill. Later Ramey made several trips to Washington to work with Herbert S. Marks, now general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, on redrafts of the Murray MVA bill. Ramey frankly admitted to me the purpose of these trips, which was on TVA time and expense.

Over on the next page of the same telegram is this:

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. The above should have been included in my testimony.

That is signed "L. B. Bolt." So, evidently he made the mistake of not putting it in his testimony, but it is in a subsequent telegram. He is here. The Senator can examine him now. If he is delayed and he is not here, I will see that he is here so that the Senator can examine him as to whether Marks had a hand in preparing the atomic energy bill.

I will ask the Senator a question, if I may, with all due respect, and everything of the kind. I myself am not saying what the fact is, because I do not know; I am taking the testimony of other people.

Did the Senator see Mr. Herbert S. Marks or Mr. Ramey while this bill was being prepared?

Mr. McMAHON. No; I did not.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator never saw them at all?

Mr. McMAHON. At no time. Most of that bill was written, I will say for the Senator's information, at my house on Woodland Drive, after many laborious nights of work, and then it was submitted by me to the Atomic Energy Committee, for appointing which the Senator must take his share of responsibility, because as President pro tempore he appointed the committee. I spent weeks and weeks combining every line and every period of that bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator has said something about my appointing the committee. The Senator was anxious to get on the committee at the time, I remember. I appointed them all.

Mr. McMAHON. That is what the Senator did.

Mr. McKELLAR. There was not one man on the committee I did not appoint. Everyone of them knew that this man Lilienthal had so conducted himself in Tennessee as to be personally and politically offensive and objectionable, under the Senate rules, to both the Democratic Senators from Tennessee, and everyone of the committee, Democrats and Republicans, voted the other way. The only one who gave me an unbiased judgment in the matter seems to have been the new Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who has just entered the Chamber.

Now I shall proceed, if I may. If I may say so, when I remember how utterly discourteous some of the members of that committee have been to me in this fight, except the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I wonder whether I probably did not make the worst Presiding Officer the Senate ever had, or I must be the worst judge of men I ever knew of. It has not been that way in Tennessee. Tennesseans treat me fairly, and have always done so. But I have received the most offensive kind of opposition from a number of the members of that committee, everyone of whom I appointed, except the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], as I have said. Evidently, instead of returning good for evil, they return evil for good. That is all right, if they conscientiously believe that way. Since the Senator from Connecticut has brought the matter up, I am going to say something very frank to him. He could not wait to hear what the facts were. About a week after the hearings started, he went back home to Connecticut and gave out an interview. I cannot say exactly about the time of the interview, but he gave out an interview before he had heard testimony revealing one-tenth of the facts, and said he was going to vote for Mr. Lilienthal. It seems to me that under the circumstances the Senator might have waited to hear some of the facts, if not most of the facts. He had practically heard none at the time he gave out the interview, which I read in the papers. That is where I first learned of it. That is all right. The matter is not concluded, and I wish to proceed now.

A third man was appointed by this gentleman Lilienthal, who claims to come from Tennessee, but who I think, from the way he talks, is a citizen of the world. He testified before the committee that he was not a Democrat and was not a Republican, that he did not take any part in politics, and that he was not even a Communist. That was his testimony before the committee. So he is a citizen of the world, as I judge especially when I read his recommendations, namely, that we should give away this wonderful discovery our own citizens have made. He appears to be a citizen of the world, because he wants to give away free this secret which cost us perhaps $10,000,000,000. I have heard that statement made, and I am merely quoting it; but certainly $2,600,000,000 were appropriated, and there is a request for $500,000,000 more for this year, which has not yet been granted. It is certain that Mr. Lilienthal wants to give to the world the secret of atomic energy and atomic bombs; he wants to give it to Russia, Great Britain, and to any other nation which might have occasion to drop a bomb on us some time; he wants to share it with all nations. The remarkable part is that he wanted to let it go to Greece and Turkey, though there are Communists in Greece and Turkey, as is reported. Why he would want to turn this secret over to Russia, I do not know. Russia probably could raise the money to produce bombs after they got the plant.

Why should he want to do it? Why should he want to give away a secret the key to which the world has been trying to discover for more than 2,000 years? It has just been discovered through the brains and genius of America. Why should anybody want to give it away "free, gratis, for nothing," to use a colloquial expression I used a while ago? Why should he want to give it away? Why should my distinguished and very greatly beloved friend from Illinois want to give this secret away after we kept it so carefully for 5 or 6 years before it was utilized? This great destructive force might be used against us at any time if another nation learns the secret and has the money or can borrow the money with which to develop the necessary plants. I imagine such a nation probably could borrow the money from us through the UNRRA. Would it not be grand. We would be such a generous people to share this secret which had been hidden for all time up until a couple of years ago, and give it away to other nations, so that they could make war on us if we did not do right. Perhaps that would be a very generous thing to do; but I do not think so. I think it would be a very hazardous thing to do, not only for us, but for the very people who want it and there is no doubt about brother Stalin's wanting it.

Indirectly, he has endorsed Mr. Lilienthal. Why do I say that Mr. Stalin has endorsed Mr. Lilienthal? Who is Mr. Stalin's representative in the United States? What is the leading Communist newspaper? It is called the Daily Worker. The Daily Worker represents the Communist Party. It represents Mr. Stalin's party in this country. It is Mr. Stalin's representative. Nothing is ever said about Mr. Stalin in that newspaper that is unpleasant. They look to him as their great leader. The Daily Worker has endorsed Mr. Lilienthal. There are two other Communist papers in the United States, and they, too, have endorsed Mr. Lilienthal. Mr. Stalin is now engaged in a controversy with our Secretary of State, one of the greatest men in America, a man who fought for this country, who used his great talents and his great military ability to help win the greatest war that was ever won by men. He cannot agree with Mr. Stalin or rather Mr. Stalin will not agree with him. Stalin wants more of Germany probably than Mr. Marshall is willing to yield to him. But why? That does not make any difference to the Senate. A majority is now claimed to be in favor of Lilienthal. A newspaper majority; a

majority for Mr. Stalin. They stand 100 percent with Mr. Stalin and Mr. Stalin's newspapers in this country.

Is that not a remarkable thing? I have not known the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] for a great many years, but I have known him for a number of years. If somebody should ask me, "In connection with this matter is SCOTT LUCAS going to vote to give to Stalin and the Russian Government what they want; with all the differences that now exist between that Government and ours, is he going to vote to turn this secret over to one of the men supported by Stalin and by Stalin's newspapers?" I would not believe that he would.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I will never believe that, until he casts such a vote. I will yield to him in just a moment. I have too much admiration for the Senator from Illinois to believe that he would cast a vote on the side of the Communist newspapers. They are fighting every day for Mr. Lilienthal's confirmation, and therefore they are representing Mr. Stalin, and therefore they are putting matter right squarely up to my distinguished friend from Illinois. He will surprise me greatly if he votes for a man endorsed by Stalin and his three newspapers in this country, and endorsed by all world "progressivists," if I may use that term.

I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the fact that my dear friend is yielding just a little time to me, in view of the fact that he directed his remarks toward me on the question of communism. I do not know too much about the statements the Senator is making with respect to the fact that Stalin is endorsing Lilienthal. I read the testimony; I did not find where he had testified before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; the Senator could not find that. The Senator did not find that one of the editors of the Communist newspaper, the Daily Worker, who I think is Rob Hall, testified before the committee. He is the Washington representative of the newspaper. Let me continue a little further. There was discussion here yesterday about my having asked the Communists to come up to testify for the other side. I chided members of the committee time and again and asked, "Why do you not get Rob Hall here? His name has come into this hearing more frequently than the name of anybody else. Why do you not get him? He is the Washington correspondent of Stalin's newspaper. He is running it. Why do you not call him before the committee?" But they never did. Is it not remarkable that they did not call Mr. Hall, who represents Mr. Stalin in America? Why did they not call him? I have never understood that.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I cannot tell the Senator why they did not call him. I was not a member of the committee. Let me say this to my distinguished and able friend, whom I have admired so much all the years I have been in the Senate. The Senator talks about Lilienthal giving away the atomic secret to Russia. Of course, if the Senate did not confirm Lilienthal, I presume that if Lilienthal wanted to give away the secret to Russia, he probably would be able to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I doubt it.

Mr. LUCAS. He knows it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I doubt it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will admit he knows the secret?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not. I doubt it very much. I doubt if he will ever know the secret. I doubt if Mr. Lilienthal will ever know the secret of how this bomb is made.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator was arguing that one of the reasons he did not want to confirm Mr. Lilienthal was due to the fact that immediately he would give away to Russia the secret, and Russia would make the bombs that would be sent over here to destroy us. If that be true——

Mr. McKELLAR. That is in the open. That does not have to be done because Mr. Lilienthal knows the secret, but because he directs the secret to be given to Russia.

Mr. LUCAS. I may be wrong about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, the Senator is wrong I think, much as I like him I will say that he is wrong.

Mr. LUCAS. If Mr. Lilienthal does not know anything about this secret then it seems to me the Senator's argument falls by its own weight; The Senator has intimated, or implied, at least, that Mr. Lilienthal would dispose of it to Russia through the Commission—I undertake to say that if Mr. Lilienthal is the type of man the Senator thinks he is, if he is no good, if he is un-American, if he is a Communist, he would not hesitate a minute, if he could fly to Russia, to give away this secret to the Russian people. I am basing that statement, however, solely on what the Senator has said.

Mr. McKELLAR. He would be afraid to do that openly. I say that because I have known this man for some time. I know more about him than the Senator from Illinois does. If the Senator will look at his record in Chicago, when he represented the utility companies, the power companies, the telephone companies and at the same time was serving as regulator of them, as a member of the Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, he will know what kind of a man he is.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that he——

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator understands that, but he seems not to take it into consideration. I think when it comes to the question of endorsing a man by confirming him to be one of our representatives in a great organization such as the Atomic Energy Commission, such a thing as I have just stated should count in weighing his qualifications. Does not character count with the Senator? I am sure it does for the Senator is a man of such fine character himself. I ask the Senator this question: Does he approve of a man who while working for the utilities at $20,000 a year, at the same time worked for the opposite side, the public, in a public office, as Mr. Lilienthal did in Chicago and in Wisconsin?

Mr. LUCAS. No, I——

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator does not approve of that?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I certainly do not approve of that. But I certainly do not understand the testimony to be that way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; it is undenied. It is admitted. Mr. Lilienthal did not go on the witness stand until the committee called him, and Mr. Lilienthal brought the contract itself and added to the testimony against him instead of subtracting from it. Is the Senator from Illinois going to vote to endorse a man whom he thinks has committed a wrong of that kind against the public in Illinois and in Wisconsin? I cannot conceive how the Senator could do such a thing.

Mr. LUCAS. May I rejoin by saying to my able friend that there is apparently a very serious dispute—as to what the testimony shows along that line, and certainly the former Governor of Wisconsin, Phil La Follette, gave Mr. Lilienthal a clean bill of health through an affidavit he filed with the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; Governor La Follette was lecturing close by, and an endeavor was made to have him come to Washington and testify before the committee. The committee tried to get him to testify. Mr. Lilienthal tried to get him to testify. But Governor La Follette did not come and testify. He sent an enigmatical telegram which did not mean anything. It was not worth that much as evidence for anyone.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me to make one observation, and then I shall not trespass upon his time any longer. I desire to speak briefly about the alleged communistic tendencies of Mr. Lilienthal?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I doubt if there is anyone in America who despises the communistic doctrine more than does the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. LUCAS. I have made speeches all over this country denouncing communism long before I came to the United States Senate. But it is very easy to make a charge of communism against a man. Does the Senator know that in my campaign in 1944 the Chicago Tribune ran an editorial entitled "Comrade LUCAS"?

Mr. McKELLAR. We know that newspapers do not always tell the exact facts. I have found that out in the last month or two.

Mr. LUCAS. I wanted to bring that to the attention of the Senator. I think I did so once before, because the story in the Tribune went out all over Illinois that SCOTT LUCAS was a Communist and that my campaign was being financed by Earl Browder and the late Sidney Hillman. It is perfectly all right with me if the Tribune wants to make such a statement. All of us who are in public

life have to take these attacks; they are made every day. And I will say that, in my humble opinion, the Senator from Tennessee has been unjustly attacked by some of the newspapers of this country for his participation in the opposition to Lilienthal. I have not agreed with that. But we in public life all understand such things, and we are obliged to submit to such attacks.

Let me say further that such attacks form one of the reasons why many men in public life want to get out of public life. It is one of the reasons why many good men and good women do not want to have their names placed on the ballot. They do not want to do so because of what they are obliged to take through the press and over the air and from the opposition in a political campaign.

I only mention the allusion with respect to communism made concerning the Senator from Illinois to show the Senate how easy it is sometimes to get oneself classified with a subversive front in this country. Of course, I do not think anyone who knows me in my State or here in the Senate would ever say that I had the slightest Communist sympathies.

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly know a way for the Senator to——

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows that I do not have any such sympathies.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say that the easiest way in the world the Senator can show it is to vote against the nominee. The Senator has now the grandest opportunity to show that he has no such sympathies, the grandest opportunity he has ever had in his life or ever will have again, and that is to cast his vote against this man who has just appointed three Communists to be high up on the column he has just erected for himself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more observation, and then I shall be through.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator by implication is saying that, unless I vote against Mr. Lilienthal, perhaps such a statement as was made by the Chicago newspaper might be true; that I may be inclined a little along that line.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; that is not the implication. I will give the Senator a guarantee, and it will be ratified by the people of Illinois, that the greatest mistake the Senator will ever have made in the United States Senate since he has been a Member of it will be, if he votes for a man like Lilienthal, who has conducted himself in the way he has and who, without authority, already has appointed three Communists to high positions in this important Commission in connection with his plan of action for the future.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator that he may be correct. I do not know. It is difficult to tell here in the United States Senate how one's vote may affect his future political career. I never cast a vote in the Senate but that I step on the toes of some group in the State of Illinois, with all its divergent views and interests. Of course, one can make too many mistakes. But I will take my chances, I will say to the Senator, on this vote. It can be made an issue in the campaign if I am ever a candidate again. I think by 1950, if I should be a candidate for reelection, the Lilienthal case will not be an issue in Illinois. The issue will be something else.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think Mr. Lilienthal's nomination is going to be rejected, and for that reason he will not be an issue in the future. If the Senator is going to vote on this question simply to be on the safe side, for some reason, or because he may have made a promise—let me stop there and ask the Senator a question. Has he promised anyone to vote for Lilienthal?

Mr. LUCAS. I made a statement some time ago to the press that I was going to vote for Lilienthal.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator did?

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, yes; and the Senator from Tennessee knows that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator made that statement?

Mr. LUCAS. I made the statement to the press that I was going to vote for the confirmation of Lilienthal.

Mr. McKELLAR. And the Senator feels bound by that statement, regardless of whether this man has worked for two masters, as he did in the Senator's State and in the nearby State of Wisconsin? The Senator from Illinois is going to vote for that man, although he finds that he accepted money from both sides of the utilities situation?

Mr. LUCAS. I know the argument the Senator is making, but I want to impress the Senator with this thought: The Senator might well change his mind, too, since he is talking about people changing their minds, if he would follow the advice of the committee, which sat for weeks and weeks and listened to the testimony. Eight out of the nine members of that committee said that Mr. Lilienthal was not such a bad sort of fellow.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that all the Communist newspapers and all the Communists in America are supporting Lilienthal?

Mr. McKELLAR. All of them. I have not heard of a single Communist in America who is not supporting him. I have not heard of a single Communist newspaper that is not supporting him. I have not heard of a single Communist organization that is not supporting him. I believe there are a great many more Communists in this country than there are in Greece or Turkey.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that the Communists never support anyone they do not like?

Mr. McKELLAR. They will never support him unless they think he has Communist leanings.

Mr. CAPEHART. How can the American people or any Senator reconcile the fact that we are asked to go to Turkey and Greece in order to fight Communists with the fact that we are asked to confirm the nomination of a man to head the Atomic Energy Commission who is being supported by all the Communists in the United States? I do not know whether the man is a Communist or not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not either.

Mr. CAPEHART. But I do not know how we can get away from the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not see how any Senator can.

Mr. CAPEHART. To me there is a great deal of hypocrisy in the one position or the other.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not charging anyone with hypocrisy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Neither am I.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to add one word to what the distinguished Senator from Indiana has said. Is it not a fact that this Government and the President of the United States and all of us have determined to get the Communists out of our Government now?

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought so; but when I find certain Senators boasting about having a majority in the Senate to line up for a man who has had a host of Communists in his department in Tennessee, to the utter dislike of practically everyone on both sides of the political house down there, I do not know what to think of it.

Mr. HAWKES. I sometimes do not know what to think of it myself.

Either yesterday or the day before the Senator from Tennessee spoke about Herbert Marks, whom Mr. Lilienthal has appointed general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. At $14,000 a year, by special arrangement.

Mr. HAWKES. The $14,000 a year is almost meaningless to me, alongside of the other implications as to the man.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee referred to Mr. Marks several times the other day as "Communist Marks."

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. Does the Senator have grounds for making that statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. The proof is in the record that he attended Communist meetings. He admitted to this witness and that witness that he was a Communist. He did not appear to deny it, although he was in the City of Washington. Those who were interested in Lilienthal did not have him appear, and yet Mr. Lilienthal appoints him, a Communist, among the very first appointments in his organization.

Mr. HAWKES and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

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

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. If the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is true—and I do not believe he would make it if he did not think it was——

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly would not.

Mr. HAWKES. Is it not folly for us to be talking about having communism investigated in all the Government offices and administrative branches, and yet be taking a Communist into the most im-

portant organization in the United States today?

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator entirely. I should like to refer to the record.

Mr. HAWKES. It does not make common sense to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I refer to page 920 of the committee record, in the testimony of Mrs. Williams, who was a TVA Communist. She belonged to what is called a cell. We would call it an office or association, or whatever it might be; but in Communism it is called a cell. That is the Communist name for such an organization. Mrs. Williams testified that she was a Communist. I read from the examination of Mrs. Williams:

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. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment—

Mr. BARKER. You knew Nelson Travis Barr?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And you attended meetings with him?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. How about Niehoff? Did you know him?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. Niehoff is one of the men whose names have been mentioned in this debate.

Mr. BARKER. And you have attended meetings with him?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I used to work in Mr. Niehoff's office.

The majority of the committee have disregarded the evidence with respect to communism. There is no doubt in the world about there being a cell down there. I read from page 239 of the record. I was examining Mr. Bolt.

Senator McMAHON. What did Swidler do in the Navy?

Mr. BOLT. He was a Navy lieutenant stationed here in Washington, doing contract work, as I recall.

Senator McKELLAR. A lieutenant doing contract work in Washington. And when he returned to the TVA—when was it?

Mr. BOLT. That was about December 6, I think, 1945. Within a month he was working very closely with James T. Ramey, who was located off in the extreme left somewhere.

Mr. KNOWLAND rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator wishes to ask me a question, I shall be glad to yield to him in a moment. I continue reading from page 239 of the committee record:

I mean, Ramey generally—in thought, as I have heard him express—generally follows the Communist Party line. He doesn't talk very much.

This is the same man we have been discussing, who was appointed by Mr. Lilienthal even before his nomination was confirmed. He is not a real or de jure officer until his nomination is confirmed by this body.

In 1938 or 1939 he made an extended trip to Russia, but under whose auspices and for what purposes I do not know. We often asked him about it, but he wouldn't talk. Now, those two got together and began making grandiose plans about the fertilizer industry. Ramey immediately began research on the possibility of antitrust proceedings. Then they began to work on drafting and preparing strategy with reference to the Hill fertilizer bill.

This is the kind of man that Mr. Lilienthal is appointing, even before Mr. Lilienthal's nomination as an officer of this Government in this great position is confirmed. He is appointing Mr. Marks, a well-known Communist, who attended all the Communist meetings down there, Mr. Ramey, a well-known Communist, who attended all the meetings, and Mr. Niehoff, who attended all the meetings. By the way, I am informed that in a day or two another Communist who is now being scrutinized by the Department—secretly, of course—will be the fourth Communist in the Lilienthal outfit, if they can make out a good enough case for him.

Mr. HAWKES, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

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

Mr. HAWKES. After listening to what the Senator has said, and after listening to what has been said by such Senators as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and others, and with the deep cloud which has been thrown over this nomination, I can come to only one conclusion, and that is that we had better get our own house in order before we try to reform the rest of the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we ought to keep our own official household clean.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. Lilienthal has been referred to as the indispensable man. I have read that in a number of places.

Mr. McKELLAR. We people down in Tennessee would like to dispense with him. We would like to dispense with him instantly.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that he was the sixth or seventh choice of the President? Is there any testimony to that effect?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have heard it. There is no testimony with reference to it of which I am aware. If any Senator has heard of any testimony to that effect I hope he will call it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know whether this is hearsay or whether I read it. I think I read it. I think I even read the names of the men who were previously offered the position by the President, but they declined. If that be true, how can anyone say that Lilienthal is the indispensable man?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not see how it is possible.

I have had a very unusual experience. The other day the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] yielded to a dozen Senators all around him, and Senators on this side of the aisle, but declined to yield to me at all. I do not know what I have done to the Senator from California. If I have done anything to hurt his feelings I certainly apologize for it, because I do not believe in hurting people's feelings.

Mr. Lilienthal has had his way the whole time. In the Roosevelt administration he was appointed, over my protest, as a member of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and I made the statement that he was not acceptable to us in any way. Mr. Roosevelt paid no attention to either one of us. Mr. Truman never consulted either of us with reference to the appointment. The man claims to be a citizen of our State. It has been a well-known rule of this body for many years that Senators are asked whether or not an appointment of this kind would be satisfactory to them. But not a word was said to me; not a word was said to the junior Senator from Tennessee. This man was appointed to probably the most powerful office in the world, because he can drop a bomb on anyone if bombs are turned over to him. He was appointed to this position without the President's saying a word to either of the two Senators from Tennessee. That was disappointing to me. I am not hurt over it. I am able to take my medicine. I have done so for a great many years, and I expect to continue to do so. But I regret it very much.

The nominations of two Communists from the TVA were submitted for confirmation. One was a Mr. Clapp, who appeared before the Committee on Public Works. That committee fixed the hearings on exactly the same date as that fixed by the other committee. It was absolutely necessary that I attend those meetings if it was humanly possible, but I could not make two men out of myself. I had to divide my time as best I could and go from one committee to the other. I think that is the only inconsiderate thing I ever knew the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] to do. He is a very delightful gentleman personally. He set the meetings of his committee at exactly the same time as the hearings were set by the other committee, and therefore it was exceedingly hard on me—just as the Senator from California has made it hard by declining to yield. Therefore, I am not going to follow his example; I am going to yield to him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will do so. I think that in the course of this debate it is important that we keep the record straight and keep the facts before us.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator will do that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is very easy on the floor, under our congressional immunity, to make charges, but the fact of the matter is, as I pointed out the other day, that there is no reputable testimony in the record before the Atomic Energy Committee which indicates directly or indirectly that the three persons who have been appointed are Communists or Communist sympathizers. The committee heard all the evidence. The committee consists of nine Members of this body, all of whom are just as much interested in serving the United States of America

and its Government as are any other Members of the Senate. I do not claim that anyone who might disagree with me has not a perfect right to disagree in whatever choice he may make with reference to this nomination. But after hearing all the testimony before the committee—the Senate section of the committee consisting of five Republicans and four Democrats—the committee voted 8-to-1 to report favorably the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal.

The Senator from Tennessee has read from the testimony of Mrs. Williams. She had previously testified before the Dies committee. I say this because I believe the American people, in the interest of fair play, should have all the background. She testified that she had attended some Communist meetings. The evidence before the committee showed, I believe, six or seven persons in the TVA organization who were Communists. She said she had attended some of those meetings. She said she had also attended some labor meetings. Throughout the country labor meetings are being held, and perhaps a few Communists have infiltrated into some of them. But I am sure that the Senator from Tennessee will not charge that every labor organization is a Communist organization.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator stop there? He made the statement that there were possibly some Communists in the meeting. Is the Senator in favor of selecting Communists who attend labor meetings?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I certainly am not.

Mr. McKELLAR. If he is, I wish to know if he believes in giving such men $14,000 jobs and appointing them to very important offices under a commission which has been created to control this new discovery. To choose Communists who attend labor meetings I think is a reflection on labor. Does the Senator believe that he would be willing to vote to give a Communist $14,000 a year in an establishment of the kind we are discussing?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee, categorically, "No; I do not." I served in the Army of the United States for 3 years, and if I thought there was even a remote bit of evidence that any one of these men was a Communist I would not have voted in committee to confirm his nomination, and I would not so vote on the floor of the Senate. But I think, as a matter of fairness, we who enjoy congressional immunity should stick to the facts adduced before the committee and not draw conclusions wholly unwarranted by the record.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair admonishes the occupants of galleries that any expressions of approval or disapproval are strictly contrary to the rules. The occupants of the galleries will please refrain from demonstrations of any kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I say, Mr. President, that we have been waiting for weeks here—at least this is the second week—to get some opportunity to cheer the other side; and especially when the Senator states that he wishes to vote and will vote for a man whose organization in Tennessee, as the facts show, is virtually controlled by Communists, no wonder the Communists in the galleries like their first opportunity to cheer. I want to congratulate my friend on having Communist applause in the United States Senate. The Senator should get all of them from California the next time. The Senator should get all of them in California next time.

Mr. President, I wish to read now an editorial which appeared in the Daily Worker, Mr. Lilienthal's right-hand bower in the newspaper world. This editorial appeared in the Daily Worker for February 12, 1947, not very long ago. The heading is "From Eisler to Lilienthal."

Of course, we all know who Eisler is. Here is the editorial:

> With the ganging up on David Lilienthal, the country can see a little more clearly what is behind such hysteria-making devices as the Eisler case and the atom spy scares.
>
> Lilienthal is a well-known Roosevelt New Dealer sponsored by the multimillionaire Bernard Baruch, and even by the colleague of Martin Dies, Joe Starnes, of Alabama.
>
> But Mr. Lilienthal helped President Roosevelt in the TVA project.

Well, Mr. President, that was grand of him. As a matter of fact, he had no more to do with the building of the dams on the Tennessee River than he had to do with marking the Gulf Stream in the Atlantic Ocean. He was just a man on the Commission; that was all. He was a young lawyer who had never had a legal practice. That was Lilienthal's record up to that date. Also he had once taken both sides of a case in Wisconsin and Illinois.

I read further from the editorial:

> But Mr. Lilienthal helped President Roosevelt in the TVA project.
>
> And for this crime, he will not so easily be forgiven by the rough-riding muscle men of the GOP gang.

Ah, Mr. President, the Senator from California is looking at me. He can take heart. They will not hold him responsible.

I read further from the editorial:

> They have hated such competition with the Power Trust.
>
> Could they slash Lilienthal's reputation to pieces before public opinion because of his TVA achievement? Not so easily. The patronage-greedy Senator McKELLAR—

Mr. President, in view of that statement in the editorial, I digress long enough to say that I examined into my patronage the other day. I found that all the OPA officers had been appointed by others, not by me, and usually from other States. I found that all the positions in the CPA and the Public Works Authority and the various other authorities had been filled without any knowledge on my part. Yet I am talked about as a patronage-greedy man. Mr. President, what do I want with patronage? Heavens above! I have been in this office for nearly 31 years; it soon will be 31 years. I have gotten along fairly well with the small amount of patronage I have had. I have served under four Republican Presidents, and during their administrations I had no patronage at all. I was reelected, however. I served under three Democratic Presidents, and during their administrations Democratic Senators should have had some patronage, and I had a small amount of it, I reckon. I suppose there is hardly a Democrat in this body who got less than I did. But that is all right; I have no complaint to make. The truth of the matter is that patronage is the cause of much trouble; and other Members of the Senate, after they have been in the Senate as long as I have, will come to the same conclusion. Certainly the small amount of patronage that comes to a Senator is much more trouble than it is worth.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the testimony shows that during all the time Mr. Lilienthal has been with the TVA, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] never has asked him for a single appointment of any kind or character, whether the appointment of a clerk or the appointment of anyone else?

Mr. McKELLAR. He testified to that; but some of his friends on the committee—those who have made a favorable report regarding his nomination—say he was mistaken about that, and that afterwards they found some letters, although they are not in the record, in which either I or my secretary made such a request. I do not recall ever having asked him for an appointment in my life. I know I never received one. That is perfectly all right. If I could get rid of him on that ground, I would be willing never to ask anyone connected with the TVA for any appointment of any kind, nature, or description. I was delighted when he left the TVA last year; but having the President appoint him to the office for which he is now under consideration would surely not get rid of him.

Mr. President, Mr. Lilienthal is an unworthy man, wholly unfit for that job. He has caused the Government to lose great sums of money. If Senators will read the report, they will find that the TVA lost money even in as prosperous a year as 1945. The TVA pays no interest except the interest on $56,000,000 worth of bonds. The TVA does not pay the Government a single penny of interest on the nearly $1,000,000,000 which the Government has invested in it. The TVA does not pay the Government of the United States one cent in taxes—not one cent. Do Senators call that good management? Mr. President, any one of a number of men right around me here, whom I see in this body, if put in charge of the TVA, would have it pay the interest and pay a reasonable amount of taxes and make money every year, because the TVA is one of the best dam outfits in the world—and I do not mean "cussing" damns, either. I mean that there are no better dams than those of TVA. Were they created by Mr. Lilienthal? No, Mr. President; they were created by Arthur E. Morgan, whom Lilienthal kicked out of office, and took it himself, just as he has kicked General Groves out of the Atomic Energy office, and is trying to take it himself.

That reminds me, Mr. President, that when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] asked Lilienthal, "What do you mean, are you going to turn the military out?", Lilienthal replied, "Oh, yes. We cannot have two in charge." Both the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Colorado expressed themselves as being very much opposed to depriving the military of any say in connection with the greatest weapon in the world. Mr. Lilienthal replied, as I recall, "Well, I will think that over." The next day in the record he changed his statement, because he knew that otherwise he would lose two votes, and he did not want to lose two votes. That is the fact of the matter. If the Senators look at the record, they will see it shown there.

I shall try to finish reading the editorial which I began to read. As I have said, it appeared in the Daily Worker, run by a man who knew something about this matter, but would not appear as a witness:

And for this crime, he will not so easily be forgiven by the rough-riding muscle men of the GOP gang. They have hated such competition with the power trust. Could they slash Lilienthal's reputation to pieces before public opinion—

I wonder if the writer of the editorial means his reputation for serving both sides, as in the Wisconsin-Illinois incident, when Lilienthal served under Governor La Follette as one of the commissioners of the Wisconsin Railroad Commission and at the same time received a salary three times as large from the utilities themselves.

For some strange reason which I cannot fathom, that does not make an impression on all Senators. It seems not to have made an impression, for instance, on the Senator from Illinois. One of the reasons he gave was that he had already made a statement that he would vote for Lilienthal, and he would adhere to his statement. But does it indicate the possession of a good character for a man to have a job secretly, involving the gathering of information and making research for public utilities, and at the same time to hold an office in another State on a commission controlling those very utilities? It is said that is why money was raised for him: "He is a commissioner of utilities in Wisconsin, and we should raise this money and make his salary good."

Are Senators going to vote for a man who will stand on both sides of a proposition like that, at the same time drawing money from both sides? There are many lawyers Members of the Senate. There is not a lawyer in this body who ever took a fee on both sides of a lawsuit. Yet that is exactly what Mr. Lilienthal has done. How, in the name of heaven, a lawyer, in the face of this undisputed record, could vote for him I cannot understand. There is no doubt about the proof—not a particle. It is upheld by Governor La Follette. It is upheld by the evidence in the record. How in the world are Senators going to vote for a man who takes money on both sides of a proposition?

He claimed to be a lawyer at the time, too. He was not practicing; he was in the research business. He was preparing newspaper and magazine articles and books in favor of the utilities, and getting a salary of $20,000 a year for doing that. Then he allowed Governor La Follette to appoint him on a commission whose duty it was to regulate these very utilities. Has the Senate reached such a point that Senators are unwilling to consider that? Are Senators going to vote to put a man in a high place, such as the one to which this man has been appointed, who took money on both sides of a question? They would not do it for any other lawyer. They would not do it for one of us.

Suppose we should lose our places as Senators. Suppose we resigned, or suppose we were forced to quit for some reason. Suppose the people voted against us. If one was known as a lawyer who took fees on both sides, what would happen? Mr. Lilienthal was a lawyer. He took compensation on both sides. It might not be called fees, but it was compensation on both sides. If one of us had done such a thing he would receive no votes.

There is the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. He is not a lawyer, I believe.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes; I am.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not know the Senator was a lawyer. I congratulate the fraternity, because it has a good member in the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose it were the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Would Senators vote for him if they found him taking fees on both sides in a lawsuit? No; they would not vote for any man doing such a thing. Yet just a few years ago Mr. Lilienthal was taking $20,000 from one side of the house, and $7,000, plus, from the other side. That is a pretty impressive record of illegality. The law of Wisconsin absolutely forbade him doing it; and not only that, but the law of Wisconsin required that he hold up his hand to high heaven and take an oath that he would not do it.

I wish now to read the remainder of this editorial:

And if the GOP could first drench the Nation in a cloud of poison-gas concerning Russian spies and Soviet master minds allegedly hanging around back alleys in New York's family neighborhoods, then they could "get" Lilienthal easily.

They only had to mention his name along with the spies and Russia appeasers, and his goose was well on the way to being cooked.

The Lilienthal treatment grows out of the Eisler treatment.

Eisler was a Communist. Is it not wonderful how this Communist paper takes that kind of course?

The persecution of a German Communist refugee not only leads to, but has for its main purpose, the crucifixion of every American not ready to knuckle down to toryism.

That is what Mr. Stalin's representative in America has to say to those who are voting for Mr. Lilienthal in this matter.

Mr. President, before being asked to yield for a few moments, I must say something about the third Communist already employed in the Atomic Energy Commission by Mr. Lilienthal. I forget whether Niehoff or Marks came first, I believe it was Marks, and I have discussed those two, but I wish now to discuss the third for a moment.

James Thomas Ramey, age 32, married, member of the Tennessee Bar Association.

Mr. Lilienthal is now a member of the Tennessee Bar Association, but he does not practice law.

Employed 1941–47 by TVA, first as an assistant to the public manager, later as senior attorney.

Remember, he was an attorney there, but it seems that the attorneys in the TVA do not act. When they want action, they employ Mr. O'Brian, at $25,000 per employment.

According to a report in the Atomic Energy Commission security files, Ramey, in making application for a passport on or about April 20, 1937, crossed out the words—

In his application for a passport—

"and defend"—

Mr. Lilienthal is appointing this man who, when he wants to go to Russia, leaves out the words indicating that he will defend the United States—

and inserted in longhand following the words "United States" the words "and will so far as my conscience will allow defend it."

Is that the kind of citizen of the United States Senators want to honor with this fine $14,000 job? If so, vote to confirm Mr. Lilienthal, and that will be accomplished.

Listen to this language. When this man comes to taking an oath to defend the United States, he strikes that out and inserts "and will so far as his conscience will allow defend the United States."

We are voting on his confirmation at the same time we are voting on that of Lilienthal, because Lilienthal has already appointed him. Is that what Senators want to do? Is that the kind of man they want to represent America? He was going to Russia at the time.

The report also discloses that as a student at Columbia University Law School, he became involved in an argument over the administration of the moot court, during the course of which he caused to be printed inflammatory matter concerning the dean. Ramey admitted the statements were untrue. It was also reliably reported that while in the TVA legal department, Ramey urged that certain evidence, which by the preponderant weight of authority was inadmissible, be brought to the attention of the court through some accidental extrajudicial method.

I want to read to the Senators a description of how Mr. Ramey practiced law. He is the man the Senate is asked to confirm. I am sorry my good friend from Illinois is not now present, because I would like to call it to his attention. This is the way Mr. Ramey did it, and the Senate is asked to confirm him to a $14,000 office, as I recall. He may get the office. This is the way to get results. If the Senate confirms Mr. Lilienthal, it

will at the same time confirm Mr. Ramey, because Mr. Lilienthal has already appointed Mr. Ramey. Most of the Senators here are lawyers. When something extrajudicial arises, how do Senators handle it? Let me show how Mr. Ramey did it—not that Senators need the information for themselves, because they are not lawyers of that kind. Mr. Ramey wrote a letter about it.

It also depends on whether or not the offer could be brought to the attention of the judges via—

He did not say "by way of," but "via," which is a Latin word—

some accidental extrajudicial method.

I see my friend from Kentucky looking at me. I wonder if he is willing to vote for the confirmation of Lilienthal when it means the confirmation also of a man like that, who under his own signature—and here is the letter—who under his own signature wants to bring something to the attention of a court, or the judge, in an extrajudicial way. It cannot be told to the judge, of course; it cannot be argued to him; but it must be gotten to him in an extrajudicial manner.

How often will this distinguished gentleman be getting things across to people in an extrajudicial way if the Senate confirms Mr. Lilienthal? If we confirm Mr. Lilienthal, we confirm the appointment that he has already made of Mr. Ramey. There are three that are already appointed. They are drawing salaries now under the Commission through Mr. Lilienthal's having appointed them, although the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal himself has not yet been confirmed.

How can Senators possibly vote for a man of that kind? The only justification in the world for such a vote would be that Senators have been asked to commit themselves and have promised to do so, and have promised to vote for this man, regardless of the facts. That is the only way in the world that Senators can vote for "confirmation in the second degree" when voting for the Lilienthal "confirmation in the first degree."

Mr. President, I have been asked to yield the floor at this time. I have not finished my speech, but I have been speaking for nearly 2 hours. I am somewhat tired, and if the leader on the majority side wants me to yield the floor to a Senator on his side, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Ohio desired to discuss the matter at this time. If agreeable to him, it is perfectly agreeable to me that the Senator from Tennessee yield the floor temporarily without prejudice.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator from Ohio as long as he wishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, 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:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to state the reasons why I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination of David Lilienthal. On February 22 I issued a statement summing up those reasons, which have been only intensified by a further study of the record, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT ON FEBRUARY 22, 1947

I have decided to vote against the Senate advising and consenting to the appointment of Mr. David Lilienthal as head of the Atomic Energy Commission. I believe he is temperamentally unfitted to head any important executive agency in a democratic government, and too "soft" on issues connected with communism and Soviet Russia.

This is no party issue. It is an issue of governmental philosophy. The question of confirmation, therefore, is not like that of a member of the President's Cabinet. The Senate has equal responsibility in selecting the right man, because to him are delegated wide legislative powers. There are qualified men from among whom a man of less questionable leanings could be chosen. Mr. Lilienthal has always been a very able propagandist in his own behalf. I have seldom seen cleverer or more carefully organized propaganda than that which is now flooding Congress in behalf of the ridiculous proposition that Lilienthal is the indispensable man.

I see no reason why any Senator should vote for Mr. Lilienthal unless he would have been willing to appoint him, and I think there are few Senators who would ever have made this choice.

This was a proper case for the exercise of that cooperation which President Truman has promised but, although he delayed for 3 months in making the appointments authorized by Congress, he never consulted Congress in any way as to the men, or type of men, who should have been appointed.

The Atomic Energy Commission is the most important agency created in recent years. It was necessary to give it tremendous discretion in exercising power over the atom-bomb field and many related activities. It can extend its regulations into many industries. Furthermore, the Chairman of the Commission is bound to have a tremendous influence in determining our international policy relating to the atom. Mr. Lilienthal is a typical power-hungry bureaucrat, one of the group of men who, in recent years, dominated the thinking of perhaps half of the Government departments and bureaus in the manner seen so clearly in the administration of OPA. They have defied Congress. They have attempted to stretch their powers far beyond the limit of statutes. They have sought vast sums of money from the public purse to help them carry out their plans, concealing as far as possible what the money was really to be used for. They created the conception of the bureaucrat, against which the people revolted in the last election. They have been unprincipled crusaders for what they perhaps thought were the public interests.

Mr. Lilienthal has conducted the affairs of the TVA in a secretive and arbitrary manner. He attempted to build it up into a little independent, but all-powerful, government. For instance, in his district he has always excluded the Department of Agriculture from the activities it conducts in every other part of the United States.

His treatment of Dr. Arthur Morgan, former president of Antioch College, clearly revealed his character. While Dr. Morgan was TVA Chairman, Mr. Lilienthal undermined his authority until he finally brought about his dismissal and obtained the position himself. The TVA investigation was whitewashed by the appointment of Mr. Francis Biddle, another member of the inside group, as counsel for the committee. The minority of the committee found that Mr. Lilienthal had followed methods of concealment, manipulation, and lack of candor. In the matter of the Berry claims, Mr. Lilienthal testified that he thought questions of ethics should be disregarded in making the decision. He repeatedly had the TVA minutes changed—months later—to paint a better picture of his own action. I agree with Dr. Morgan's testimony of last week that Lilienthal has a "personal desire to be irresponsibly in power," and was guilty of dishonest practices at that time.

He always fought bitterly any investigation into his actions as an official of the TVA.

Like the group of which he was a part, Mr. Lilienthal was soft on the subject of communism. Members of this group were not Communists, but like the CIO they accepted the Communists' strength and assistance, particularly the Communist propaganda which supported many of their plans. As a result of this attitude, Communists were permitted to infiltrate into many of the bureaus and departments in Washington which they dominated. There is no doubt that a Communist cell was tolerated for a while by Mr. Lilienthal in the TVA.

The same general softness appears in the Lilienthal report on the atom bomb. All atom manufacture is to be turned over to an international authority to duplicate our atom manufacturing plants throughout the world, including Russia. No practical suggestions for safeguards were included. If Communists could infiltrate into the Government and into TVA, is there any reason to believe that they could not infiltrate into such an international authority? After all, the Russians claimed only recently that the United States and Canada are conspiring against them. No suggestion was made in the Lilienthal report of any method of nullifying Russia's veto against action by that government in seizing the new plants or violating the rules. The whole emphasis in the report had to be changed by Mr. Baruch in presenting a plan to the United Nations.

I do not want to see a man as muddled in his thinking on questions of international

power as Mr. Lilienthal in charge of our atom bomb policies. I would consider his confirmation a real threat to our national safety.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the first place I should like to discuss the basis on which the Senate confirms or refuses to confirm individuals appointed by the President. It seems to me that the mistake of the Senate committee in this case lies in the fact that they have approached the whole problem from the wrong angle. For a number of years the Members of the Senate, perhaps because of the fact that a majority of them usually stood with the President of the United States, seem to have approached appointments from the point of view that they should be confirmed unless it was proved that the appointee was a thief or a criminal or was involved in a scandal so serious that he was clearly incapable of exercising the office to which he was appointed. I do not think that is the consideration at all in determining the selection of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission. I feel very strongly that, as the Constitution says, these men should be appointed "with the advice and the consent of the Senate." The advice of the Senate, if you please, is involved. We should not confirm them unless we ourselves would be willing to appoint them to the office, if we had the appointing power. Particularly in the case of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission I believe that our responsibility is equal to that which the President of the United States has, and that we ought to reject the nominees unless we ourselves were willing to appoint them. Personally I would not be willing to appoint Mr. Lilienthal to such a position.

In the case of members of the President's Cabinet, the custom has arisen, properly, I think, that in the absence of very serious objection, the President should have the right to have his own personal advisers as he wishes to select them.

In the case of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission there is no particular connection with the President. The members of the Commission are entirely independent. They make the policy under the act. Not only that, but the act is so broad that in effect they exercise legislative authority. They exercise legislative authority just as much as they exercise administrative authority, and the legislative body, in delegating such legislative authority, should retain control over those who are in fact its agents in exercising it.

We have been criticized, I think, for passing an act as broad as is the Atomic Energy Act. I think perhaps it was a mistake to pass an act which is so broad. But that only makes it more important that the men who administer the act shall be men who will not press the powers given to the very limit. They should be responsible, and should feel themselves responsible, to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, we were urged to delegate legislative authority because atomic energy was a subject which was so new; so few people knew anything about it; it was so important that some action be taken that it was absolutely essential that this broad power be given, and certainly the broad power is given in the act. The Atomic Energy Act passed last year provides in the first place for the issuance by the Atomic Energy Commission of many regulations having the force of law. In section 12 (2) it provides that the Commission shall—

> (2) Establish by regulation or order such standards and instructions to govern the possession and use of fissionable and byproduct materials as the Commission may deem necessary or desirable.

The Commission practically makes the laws governing atomic energy, and that may be a very wide provision, because the Commission may reach out to all sorts of things that atomic energy gradually comes to affect. The act is studded with provisions for licenses, and no one can do anything without a license. It provides that no one can possess any fissionable material without a license.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Would the Senator change the provision of the law which requires that no one can have fissionable material in his or her possession without a license?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. I am only pointing out the fact that when we give the Commission power to license—and there are five or six such provisions in the act—we give it the power to make the law on the basis of which those who are licensed must operate. I am merely calling attention to that fact because it shows that we are delegating legislative power, and therefore that we have the primary responsibility to determine whether the men who are appointed are proper men to conduct their affairs. It is not a case where the Senate looks at a presidential appointment and says, "Well this individual has not committed any crime, he is not a Communist, and therefore we will confirm him."

Such it seems to me has been the attitude of the committee, however. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] said:

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

Mr. TAFT. I prefer not to yield at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] said:

> The Senator from New Hampshire had asked me whether I thought Mr. Lilienthal 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. Lilienthal 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.

That is not the proper basis upon which to determine whether or not we are to approve a nomination—because he is not the worst man.

It seems to me that that shows the approach of the committee, and it seems to me that that approach is fundamentally wrong. It seems to me that we ought not to confirm the nomination of anyone unless we would be willing ourselves to appoint him.

In the Atomic Energy Act we set up a joint committee which has very substantial duties, which has to maintain a continuing supervision. We recognize that the authority granted herein is largely a legislative authority.

Of course, it is also an administrative authority in very wide respects. The authority in paragraph 5 of section 12 gives the Commission the power to—

> acquire such materials, property, equipment, and facilities, establish or construct such buildings and facilities, and modify such buildings and facilities * * * and construct, acquire, provide, or arrange for such facilities and services (at project sites where such facilities and services are not available) for the housing, health, safety, welfare, and recreation of personnel employed by the Commission as it may deem necessary.

Under that provision the Commission is now operating a city of 45,000 people at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and other cities throughout the United States. That tremendous authority, as will be seen, goes into every field of housing, health, safety, and welfare. Recently we heard the complaint that all the concessions in Oak Ridge, Tenn., were being canceled and that the Authority itself was to operate all the restaurants, soda fountains, and anything else that related to housing, health, safety, and welfare of the personnel. Tremendous discretion is given those men. Perhaps we should have given it, and perhaps we should not. That is not the point. The point is that, having given it, we are looking to these men, in effect, to do some of the things we ought to do. It is all the more important, by reason of the fact that we have recognized the tremendous powers in this growth, that we now ask that the men who are appointed to that job exercise those powers in a conservative way.

MR. LILIENTHAL BELIEVES IN CONSTANT EXTENSION OF GOVERNMENTAL POWER

The fact that the law is radical is all the more reason for refusing to appoint a radical who will press every advantage to the very limit, whose philosophy throughout shows that he is in favor of Government operation if it can possibly be had, whose philosophy shows that he is in favor of pushing the powers and activities of Government to the very limit. We give these men discretion as to how far some part of atomic energy may remain with private enterprise. We ought to have persons who believe in private enterprise, and not those who are opposed to private enterprise.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The distinctive thing about Mr. Lilienthal's administration of TVA has been the help and encouragement which he has given to private enterprise. Instead of operating in a bureaucratic fashion to try to have the Government do everything, he has sought himself to

have the Government do as little as possible, encourage and stimulate private enterprise, and work and cooperate with other governmental agencies and private associations.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read a letter from Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, under date of March 4:

Mr. Lilienthal constantly preaches local autonomy, but he absolutely dictates the terms under which municipalities must sell TVA current. Today one city has a suit with the TVA. It wanted to pledge electric department earnings as additional security for a loan to build a school building. TVA undertakes to contravene this in court.

The point is not which policy is better, but the fact that TVA takes this position as to policy while Lilienthal widely proclaims the opposite. What the Senator says today is not true. Mr. Lilienthal has pressed public enterprise as far as he can press it. In his towns he operates as many of the municipal services as he can operate. He does not permit the people in his towns to conduct their affairs as the people of a city in Ohio would conduct theirs.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. While Mr. Clapp was on the stand in the hearings with respect to his nomination, before the committee having his nomination under consideration, Mr. Clapp, reflecting, I think, very closely if not altogether, the views of Mr. Lilienthal, stated that it was his view that the Tennessee Valley Authority should forever remain a Government organization, controlled by the United States Government, and that after the TVA had paid back to the Government what the Government had expended on it, it should continue to be controlled by the United States Government and not by any private enterprise.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is correct. I do not think Mr. Lilienthal himself will deny that he is in favor of public ownership. He is in favor of the Government doing many things which the rest of us do not think the Government ought to do. A number of years ago he wrote an article in the Harvard Law Review, stating that he thought that policy should be extended, and that Government corporations were the best way to handle it, that they ought to be allowed a wide latitude in the operation of their business, just exactly as a private enterprise might operate its business. I do not think Mr. Lilienthal will deny that he believes in that kind of philosophy. He has a perfect right to believe in it. I am only saying that he is not the kind of man that we ought to give tremendous discretion to push the powers of Government to their very limit.

There have been various quotations from Mr. Lilienthal's remarks. Perhaps the most enlightening book is his book on TVA, entitled "Democracy on the March," in which he sets out his views. I think the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] quoted the statement that—

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

He further states:

We cannot think of atomic power as apart from those who direct its course and use and define the purposes for which it is put. That is a towering responsibility—

The point is that Mr. Lilienthal thinks it depends entirely on men, and not on laws.

He further states:

As new problems grow to national proportions the people of the country will find it necessary to grant further powers to their Central Government. The trend is unmistakable; it cannot be denied.

He further states:

The policies of lawmaking in the immediate past have been largely regulatory and negative: "This shall not be done." The atmosphere of the legislature has therefore been heavy with this regulatory spirit, expressed in carefully limited responsibility, lack of trust, and forever setting one man to watch and checkmate another.

Mr. Lilienthal favors giving someone else the power to regulate, and not regulating clearly by law which the people can read.

Mr. Lilienthal further states:

The tradition and climate of the skill of management are remote from all such negation. Management is affirmative and initiatory. "This is to be done." It is in the process of defining with skill and sense, what is to be done, and with it the fixing of responsibility for results, with wide freedom for judgment in the managers as to how it may best be done, that you have the essence of the best modern management.

He further states:

To see each citizen thus as a "human being" is easy at the grass roots. That is where more of the functions of our Federal Government should be exercised.

He wants the power of Federal Government extended down to the grass roots, at every point to which the power of the Federal Government can be pushed.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Is this not a fair interpretation of the passage which the Senator has just read: Mr. Lilienthal was talking against the centralization of government in Washington; while he recognized that there was an inevitable growth due to our industrial revolution and the events in Washington during the last three decades, nevertheless he was speaking for a principle which I believe the Senator would not disapprove; namely, that the dealings of the Government with the people should not be handled from Washington, but only the broad policy should be established by the agencies here, and then it should be administered on a local level.

Mr. TAFT. I think undoubtedly what Mr. Lilienthal wants is to have the Federal Government run everything, and delegate to all its lackeys and satraps throughout the United States power to act as they choose to act under Federal law, and with Federal power behind them. That is exactly what I think this Congress does not want, and, in my opinion, Congress does not want to put that kind of a man in a place where he can push that power to the very limit. Whether it is spread out, dissipated throughout the country, or exercised from Washington, does not make a great deal of difference, because in the ultimate analysis, the power behind the operations is the power of the Federal Government, which operates from Washington.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Is that the Senator's final opinion of what Mr. Lilienthal meant, or will the Senator now read a passage from Mr. Lilienthal's writings which indicates that he wants greater and greater power to be administered from Washington, but operating on the local level?

Mr. TAFT. I think that is the whole trend of everything I have read. I think that is what he believes. I do not think he would deny it for a moment. He believes in a constant expansion of Federal power. His statements on that subject have been read. Other statements of his have been read. I do not want to repeat everything that has been said before. That is what he believes should be done. He believes in the decentralization of power only because, in the case of the TVA, for instance, he wants to have it all in the TVA, so that no one in Washington can interfere. But he wants to exercise the power over the local authorities, in defiance of the local and State authorities; and he is there with the Federal law behind him, and he does not want anyone in Washington to interfere with what he plans to do.

Mr. McMAHON. Is not the Senator aware that the former Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, wished to have all such power centralized in Washington, and was not that bitterly resisted by Mr. Lilienthal because he thought it would result in the concentration of too much power in Washington in the hands of one person or department?

Mr. TAFT. It was bitterly resisted by Mr. Lilienthal because he did not want Mr. Ickes to take that power away from him. In the same way, he bitterly resisted efforts of the Department of Agriculture to operate in the TVA the same kind of fertilizer program and improvement program that the Department of Agriculture operates in every other section of the United States. He bitterly resisted it because he did not want the power to be taken away from him. It is merely a question of whose ox is gored. He had the power, and he did not want it taken from him and placed in Washington. I think the Senator will find that as soon as Mr. Lilienthal is in charge of the Atomic Energy Commission in Washington, he will be in favor of having all the power concentrated or centered in Washington, where he then will sit.

Mr. McMAHON. Without attempting to judge Mr. Lilienthal's motives—the Senator can do as he pleases about that—I take it that the Senator at least would agree with Mr. Lilienthal's opposition to the plan that Mr. Ickes developed at that time, or to the trend at that time. Let us forget his method. The Senator does not disagree with his point of view at that time; does he?

Mr. TAFT. I am sorry to say that I did not go into all the details of the controversy. I read Mr. Ickes' statement and Mr. Lilienthal's answer, and that is all I saw. I am not exactly an expert on the details of Mr. Ickes' proposals for the control of power in the United States. Whether I agree or disagree has not the slightest bearing on the question before the Senate.

Mr. McMAHON. But the Senator from Ohio is trying to make the point that Mr. Lilienthal is in favor of concentrating all power in Washington. If the Senator chooses to ascribe an unworthy motive to him in advocating that, he may do so; but I have demonstrated to him that when Mr. Ickes tried to have all power over our water and other power resources concentrated here in Washington, Mr. Lilienthal opposed it. Whether his motive for doing so was mean or base is for the Senator from Ohio to interpret to suit himself. At least he will agree with me, I think, that Mr. Lilienthal was opposed to the concentration of power in Washington, which is the point the Senator is trying to make to the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. It is perfectly clear; Mr. Lilienthal is on record. He wants one Government corporation after another established. He wants such Government corporations given full power, and to have complete freedom, so far as they can be free from Federal control. Later on I shall point out that he wants the same kind of freedom for the International Atomic Energy Commission. I do not think it is worth disputing, because it is perfectly obvious that that is the kind of man Mr. Lilienthal is. He wants an extension of Federal power, and he would like to exercise the power himself. There is no question that that is his philosophy. I do not criticize it. I think he sets it forth very clearly and effectively. I only point out that that is the kind of man who wants to be put in charge of the administration of a law which confers tremendous power to regulate in some way almost everyone in the United States.

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

Mr. TAFT. I decline to yield at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the subject has been covered. That is the reason I decline to yield.

Mr. President, my opinion in this matter has been partly made up perhaps by my acquaintance with Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, former president of Antioch College, in Ohio, and now a resident there. No one can talk with Dr. Morgan for any length of time without being convinced of his complete honesty. He probably has had more to do with Mr. Lilienthal than any other man has ever had. He saw him at close range. I intend to quote at different times things Dr. Morgan has said.

On this one subject, in summing up on this same point, Dr. Morgan said this in the record:

> The difficulties that I found in dealing with Mr. Lilienthal were of two kinds. One arose out of his personal desire to be irresponsibly in power.

That is the essence of Mr. Lilienthal's character; and I think it is a very fair conclusion from everything that has happened—"his personal desire to be irresponsibly in power." Wherever he has been that has been his effort. He succeeded, after some time, in ousting Dr. Morgan from the chairmanship of the TVA and assuming it himself. He retained that power for a long time. He is now seeking broader and wider powers, and anyone who has read his report on international atomic energy can only conclude that he would like those powers to go on into a still wider field.

There is another objection to Mr. Lilienthal, besides the fact that he believes in the extension of Government power; but before coming to that I should like to call attention to other respects in which Mr. Lilienthal has pushed the power of TVA beyond what seems to be reasonable and beyond what I think good practice would have required. I mentioned the Department of Agriculture. The minority views of the joint committee which investigated the Tennessee Valley Authority says this on that subject:

> All agricultural activities should be transferred to the Department of Agriculture. This Department is well equipped to carry on the work. Indeed, the Department of Agriculture already has an adequate nitrogen laboratory at Washington and has carried on experiments with phosphates. There is no need to try to build up a new regional Department of Agriculture in the Tennessee Valley. To return these agricultural functions to the Department of Agriculture, where they belong, would avoid duplication and waste and result in very material economy in operation, without loss of efficiency.

But Mr. Lilienthal has fought every effort to return any agricultural power to the Department of Agriculture.

On the question of civil service the report says:

> The refusal of TVA officials to recognize the civil-service laws as having any application to the employment and dismissal of employees is another glaring example of TVA's aloofness to Federal law. As a result, "favoritism" of a most vicious type is prevalent. By such system, employees are dependent upon the "favor" of department heads. A feeling of uncertainty and dissatisfaction has been created.

The question of accounting has already been covered largely by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. But the minority said:

> TVA has arrogantly defied the General Accounting Office when that agency sought to discharge its statutory duty with respect to TVA. This defiant attitude might be slightly less reprehensible if the TVA accounting technique was of such character as not to require any supervision or control from the General Accounting Office.

It seems to me that that is exactly the attitude we do not want to have in the Atomic Energy Commission. We want a commission operating in cooperation with Congress, endeavoring to carry out the wishes of Congress, and not barring the door, as it has barred the door to military advisers, and as it has barred the door to the joint committee, apparently. At least, from Mr. Lilienthal's testimony we learn that he is very dubious as to how far they can be admitted into the interior consultations of the Atomic Energy Commission.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Inasmuch as the Senator from Ohio has read from the views of the minority of the joint committee which investigated the TVA in 1938, I wonder whether he realizes that those statements by the minority applied to the TVA at the time when Dr. Arthur E. Morgan was chairman. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. HILL. The minority of the joint committee was composed of two Members of the Senate and two Members of the House of Representatives. Two of those four members of the minority party did not even join in the minority views. Nevertheless, the statements apply, as I have said, to the TVA under the chairmanship of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan. That was before Mr. Lilienthal ever became chairman of the TVA.

Mr. TAFT. Let me read what was going on before the committee went there:

> Months before the removal of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan from the TVA Board, efforts were made by his colleagues on the Board and their adherents in effect to oust him from active connection with the affairs of the TVA. An order was issued by the general manager to all employees in December 1937, that any information supplied to Chairman A. E. Morgan must be transmitted through the general manager's office, and Chairman Morgan had to ask permission from the general manager to get certain information from TVA engineers. This order was issued after it was generally known that there were sharp differences among the directors of TVA. At about this same time, after Mr. Hoffman had furnished Dr. A. E. Morgan with copies of TVA minutes for use in the Berry Marble case condemnation proceedings, Mr. Fly—

Then the general counsel—

> gave Mr. Hoffman instructions to refer all requests from Dr. A. E. Morgan to him before complying with them.

So although Dr. Morgan was Chairman, he was Chairman in name only. The other two members of the Board had taken all power from him and were concealing all information from him.

Mr. President, that majority report was the usual type of whitewash report. The committee was appointed and went there. First of all, it appointed Mr. Francis Biddle as counsel for the committee. Mr. Biddle ran the committee and wrote the report. As a result of his good work in that respect, he was subsequently appointed to be Solicitor General of the United States, and later to be Attorney General of the United States. Subsequently he was dismissed by President Truman. Mr. Biddle was on the inside with the same group of which Mr. Lilienthal was a member; and when that investigation had started, the whole thing was a set-up. It was set up under Mr. Biddle, as counsel. Orders were issued that no TVA employee could talk to any member of the committee.

Every effort was made to hush up and reduce the charges which had been made. Anyone who cares to read the hearings and then read the report of the committee and the minority views will find, I think, that what I have read from the minority views was, practically, not answered or contradicted in the report of the majority, except as to the conclusions which might be drawn from the facts thus set forth in the minority views.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that two members of the minority party did not join the other two members of the minority party in signing the minority views?

Mr. TAFT. My impression is that only one member of the minority party did not sign.

Mr. HILL. If my memory serves me correctly, two members of the minority party did not sign.

Mr. TAFT. There were only four members of the minority party on the joint committee, and three of them signed the minority views.

Mr. HILL. Well, one member of the minority party did not sign; is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. Senator Lynn J. Frazier, of North Dakota, did not sign the minority views. He was quite an advocate of public power; and although he was a man of the highest character, I do not think he paid much attention to the whole proceedings, any more than did my then colleague, the late Hon. Vic Donahey, who was a member of the majority.

I may say that the minority views were signed by James J. Davis, of Pennsylvania; Charles A. Wolverton, a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of New Jersey; and Thomas A. Jenkins, a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Ohio. I may also say that it is impossible to conceive of anyone less partisan than Mr. JENKINS. He has been a Member of the House of Representatives for many years. He himself was once a miner. He had no particular prejudice against the TVA, but I do not think it is too much to say that he told me that after that investigation he never in the world would think of voting for Mr. Lilienthal for any office under the Government of the United States.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Ohio has said that the chairman of that special committee was the then distinguished Senator from Ohio, the late Senator Donahey. If the Senator will examine the hearings I think he will find that Senator Donahey very patiently and very devotedly attended practically all the hearings—not only those held in Washington but also those held in the Tennessee Valley. If there was one man who seemed to be devoted and indefatigable in his work, particularly in that work, it was the late Senator Donahey. Knowing Senator Donahey as I did, and knowing his reputation—he was called "Honest Vic Donahey" in the State of Ohio—I am sure he would never be a party to making any sort of report that was not absolutely fair and square. Of course, I realize there are always differences of opinion; but certainly the Senator from Ohio would not imply that the late Senator Donahey did not do his full duty as chairman of that committee.

Mr. TAFT. I have the highest respect for Senator Donahey. I remember that after he came back from that investigation, he was very uncomfortable in his mind. He had nothing to do with writing the report. He went along with it. Many of us go along with things which we are not prepared to get into a general battle about. I do not think the Senator from Alabama will find that Senator Donahey was a very strong advocate of the present appointee.

Mr. President, the point I wish to make on this question is that, after all, today in the United States there are only a relatively few men who have the philosophy that Mr. Lilienthal has. Even at the time of the TVA investigation, the group was small. Mr. Francis Biddle was one of them. It was a small group of men who largely dominated the so-called New Deal departments in Washington, and have dominated them for the last 8 years—men who have been opposed by the great majority of the Members of Congress, both Democrats as well as Republicans. There has been a little knot of such men in each department, and they have actually run the departments and have brought about the policies which today the people have disapproved. They always were a small group of men, and in my opinion they never received the support of more than 25 percent of the entire membership of either the House of Representatives or the Senate, although a majority often went along with the plans they prepared. Today that group is a still smaller percentage of the total number of people of the United States. Why we have to go to that group to get the chairman for the greatest enterprise this country has undertaken for many years, why we should go to them and give them the unlimited authority which is granted by the Atomic Energy Act, I cannot understand. Why a Congress which today wholly disagrees with the philosophy of this gentleman should vote to confirm him, I do not understand.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. It has been intimated that Mr. Lilienthal is of an autocratic disposition. Has the Senator from Ohio read the statement of the seven governors whose States are affected by the TVA? I think the St. Louis Post-Dispatch collected the statements of those seven governors, and in that statement they say that the TVA management has been cooperative in every way, shape, and form, and has not sought in any way to override State or local rights.

Mr. TAFT. I read the statement. The more people who sign a statement, the less attention I pay to it, because a large number of signatures usually indicates that the statement has been circulated among various persons, and of course it is easier to sign such a statement than not to sign it.

I must say that in this case more propaganda of that kind has been circulated for Mr. Lilienthal than in the case of any other appointee of whom I have knowledge. Never before have I seen put forward so much propaganda as has been put forward in the case of Mr. Lilienthal. Many people have signed letters, in my opinion without thought, without looking at the record, without going back to find out what went on. Mr. Patterson, the distinguished Secretary of War, testified that Mr. Lilienthal never differed with the War Department, when he had a constant battle with the War Department from the very beginning right through the war as to how power should be obtained, whether it should be public power or private power. Yet that never came to Mr. Patterson's attention, apparently.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I may point out that the particular statements of the seven governors to which I have referred were not in a circular letter; there was an original statement from each governor setting forth his views in the matter, and all the governors were high in their commendation of the TVA, what it had done for their States, and the cooperative attitude of the director and the personnel of TVA in dealing with State and local governments.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to proceed from a discussion of Mr. Lilienthal's character, to another feature, which certainly has come to our attention in many respects. It is found again in the minority views. I refer to Mr. Morgan's statement. After his one objection that Mr. Lilienthal had a personal desire to be irresponsibly in power, he said:

> But I was known to the world as Chairman of the TVA, and representations were made to the public by the TVA as the TVA, which I considered to be, to use a short word, dishonest.

I do not think I need go through all this record. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] referred to the testimony of Mr. Morgan in the record, and every Senator can read it.

I think I might refer to one or two of the incidents, the Willkie episode, for instance. Mr. Lilienthal first came to Dr. Morgan with a letter which he proposed to issue to the press, a letter he was writing to Mr. Willkie, then head of the Commonwealth & Southern, in which he said:

> Confirming our recent conversation, you do not agree to cooperate with us except on the basis that you have a monopoly of power distribution in all the vast area of the four States in which you operate. The only condition under which you will cooperate is that we do not compete with you in the great areas in the four States in which you operate, and you insist on maintaining a monopoly in that area.

Dr. Morgan raised some questions. He said, "Did Mr. Willkie say that? Is that

his position?" Mr. Lilienthal finally agreed that Mr. Willkie might be summoned, and asked whether it was, in fact, his postion. Mr. Lilienthal agreed to write and asked Mr. Willkie to come.

Mr. McMAHON. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. TAFT. Page 331 of the record of the hearings. Dr. Morgan stated:

At the time of the meeting, Mr. Willkie told me that after sending that letter Mr. Lilienthal called him by telephone and told him that letter was a mistake and there was no meeting necessary.

He tried to put Mr. Willkie off, but he came anyway. He was suspicious of something peculiar, and finally came.

According to Dr. Morgan, the offer of the Commonwealth & Southern was to—

Sell to the TVA its whole system, or the system in any State, or any part of any system in any State.

I quote from the letter to which reference was made:

It will sell part of it now, and part of it later. The fact that some is bought now doesn't prevent other parts being bought later. It will sell any part at any time, with these three conditions: First, that if a part is bought, it shall be a normal part.

In other words, Mr. Willkie did not take the position that was alleged in Mr. Lilienthal's letter, but later Mr. Lilienthal insisted, in any event, on using the statement.

Dr. Morgan points out that Mr. Lilienthal was distinctly misleading the public; that Mr. Willkie's statement was correct; that no such conversation as described previously in the letter took place.

Dr. Morgan cites another case of a letter written by Mr. Lilienthal to Bessemer, Ala. They had an agreement with the Commonwealth & Southern that they would not compete in the same territory, but the Commonwealth & Southern was willing to sell out when they wanted to buy. This letter was sent to the city of Bessemer, Ala., by Mr. Lilienthal:

We are estopped from pushing the extension of power while this agreement with the Commonwealth & Southern is on, but we can accomplish the same purpose in another way. If you will write to us and ask us for questions and ask us for help, we can't refuse those requests. And so long as the initiative comes from you, then we can get the same results without formally violating that agreement.

Here is a public official of the United States saying, "I made an agreement with Mr. X, but if you will push me hard enough, I will violate it." That is the type of general deception in which Mr. Lilienthal apparently has continuously engaged.

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

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that as I read in the record, on page 333, the alleged letter just referred to by the Senator from Ohio, it is the statement of Dr. Morgan as to his interpretation of a letter as he remembered it. It does not purport to be a direct quotation of a letter, but only his understanding at that time of what he thought he had read in the letter some years before.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know anyone who has a better memory than Dr. Morgan, and I would say it was almost certainly accurate.

When the committee went to Knoxville Dr. Morgan told them of this letter, and they tried to get it. I now read from Dr. Morgan's testimony:

The return came back that no such letter was in existence. The man who then had charge of the files was a Mr. Pierce. He had charge of the TVA files.

After the hearing, some months afterward—he left the TVA service—he told me that during that hearing the files were practically empty of any communications from Mr. Lilienthal or Mr. H. A. Morgan. He said: "My material was there, but H. A. Morgan's communications and Lilienthal's communications were just not there. They weren't in the files when they were called for. They just didn't exist in the files."

In other words, when the committee went there, the material was taken from the files, and that was quite in line with the general order issued, that no employee of TVA should talk to any member of the committee.

Dr. Morgan cites another case, that relating to Tupelo, Miss., which was cited as a great example of public power, the statement being that it was making a great deal of money. Dr. Morgan said:

I can't go into detail. If you want to find the detail, you can go to our hearing. In my opinion, that publicity was explicitly misleading and false, for the reason that a very large part of the cost of the development at Tupelo was hidden, did not appear in the records.

And it would take all day to go into that, but you will find some of the records of it. That was a chase that gave me a very clear opinion.

I have already read the portion which indicates the methods pursued to keep Dr. Morgan out of power, the fact that Mr. Lilienthal was constantly undermining him at every opportunity, was constantly going to the President in opposition to him. I think that if Senators will read Dr. Morgan's testimony they will come to the conclusion that Mr. Lilienthal constantly misrepresented to the President the attitude of Dr. Morgan.

In the minority views, to which I have just referred, there are a number of other instances which cover about the same kind of action on the part of Mr. Lilienthal when he was a member of the TVA Board. The minority report says:

We find from the evidence that there was a fundamental reason for the division in the Board. The Chairman—

That is, Dr. A. E. Morgan—

wanted the business of the Authority to be conducted in the open and upon the highest plane of competence and integrity. He wanted candid representations made of the failures as well as the successes of the whole TVA. He objected to indirectness, concealment, manipulation, and indeed to all methods of carrying on the business of the TVA which, while within the pale of the law, could not be justified by a high standard of fair dealing.

On the other hand, the majority of the Board were determined to make a favorable showing for the TVA without always giving all the pertinent facts. They insisted on taking short cuts to make a showing for the TVA, as, for example, Mr. Lilienthal's insistence on using the byproduct theory of allocation to determine the investment in power facilities.

There is an interesting extract from the evidence in which Mr. Lilienthal stated his defense against the fact that he was willing to go through and make a settlement with Berry for the so-called Berry marble deposits, the good faith of which Dr. Morgan questioned. Mr. Lilienthal said:

I tried to make the point * * * that all we could be concerned with were legal rights, that the question of morals and ethics had not been conferred upon us by law, and that as administrators we were concerned only with legal rights.

Mr. BIDDLE. You mean you were not concerned with Major Berry's ethics and morals, is that your point?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Yes.

* * * * *

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Whatever might be our opinion and my opinion has never been a mystery before the Board as to the proprieties in the matter, but that those were personal matters. Matters of personal opinion and questions of ethics are not submitted to the Government to determine. I never could make that clear and I think there is a fundamental cleavage in philosophy between Arthur Morgan and Dr. H. A. Morgan and myself on that point.

The question was, Were these claims made in good faith, or had the claims been bought for the very purpose of selling them to the TVA? I think it was a proper question. I think it was a reason why they should not settle these claims, which were settled, in my opinion, for a grossly excessive sum, considering the fact that the marble was undeveloped and uncertain, and certainly the question whether or not the plaintiff was acting in good faith was a question to be considered. Mr. Lilienthal says that he has nothing to do with any question of ethics in the Berry case.

There is a more serious matter. Mr. Lilienthal constantly changed the minutes of the TVA after the event; in some cases, many months after the event. The minority views show, and it is not contradicted in the majority report, that Mr. Lilienthal himself admitted the responsibility for deleting paragraphs from the original drafts of two corporate minutes of the TVA Board at a meeting held on November 2, 1933. One of the paragraphs so deleted summarized the negotiations which Mr. Lilienthal had undertaken with the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., for the sale of certain Alabama and Mississippi properties of that corporation to the TVA. These negotiations ultimately resulted in the contract of January 4, 1934, but the minutes of the Board of Directors were not changed by Mr. Lilienthal until some months after the contract of January 4, 1934, had been executed.

Here is a man who goes back and changes the minutes more than a year after they were written, and apparently for some purpose—to prevent an investigation or to prevent an attack on the contract such as was finally made.

Another paragraph deleted from a TVA corporate minute of November 2, 1933, stated that Mr. Lilienthal had consulted

with Secretary Ickes, requesting that immediate action be taken on the applications of Tuscumbia and Sheffield, Ala., for PWA loans to build municipal electrical distribution systems.

Mr. Lilienthal would make no explanation of the purpose of those alterations in the TVA corporate minutes, but merely stated that the Commonwealth & Southern was not prejudiced by the deletion concerning his negotiations with them.

The deletion from the corporate minutes of the summary of his consultation with Secretary Ickes with respect to PWA loans and grants, Mr. Lilienthal admitted, and he testified that evidence of such cooperation between TVA and PWA, in the TVA corporate minutes, could not be used as evidence in a lawsuit between the power companies and TVA, because the trial court had refused to receive any evidence concerning such cooperation and conspiracy. But he obviously removed the minutes for fear they might be used in a later suit. He changed the record, and I think that is very typical of his later attitude.

He is a man who does not care what means he uses to reach the end which he thinks happens to be desirable. So, Mr. President, entirely apart from the question of Mr. Lilienthal's general philosophy of government, it seems to me that his methods, and what Dr. Morgan calls his dishonesty in the sense of being willing to misrepresent conditions to other people to accomplish his end, constitute a sufficient reason to bar our acceptance of his nomination.

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

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

Mr. HAWKES. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Ohio has pointed out about the disappearance of letters from the files, and I should like to ask the Senator if the fact that minutes, which are presumed to set forth what happened at a meeting of the Board of Directors, were changed months after they were made does not check and dovetail with the removal of the letters from the files? It demonstrates very clearly, it seems to me, to everyone who is looking for the truth, that this man wanted to cover up, and so he resorted to any minor tricks which might be within the law in order to prevent a disclosure of the real facts; he wanted to represent things only as he desired others to see them.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is correct, and I think it shows his desire to have complete power over the operations of any organization of which he is a part. In the event of his confirmation as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, I think as soon as that occurs we may expect a repetition of exactly the same kind of thing that was done in TVA.

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

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

Mr. McMAHON. I would assume that the Senator from Ohio is well acquainted with Mr. John Lord O'Brian, who certainly had a very fine opportunity to become acquainted with the characters about whom we are talking. I wondered if, in his reading of the record, the Senator from Ohio had come across Mr. O'Brian's description of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, upon whose character and testimony the Senator has in large part erected his case. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that when Mr. O'Brian was asked about his contacts with Mr. Morgan——

Mr. TAFT. Just a moment. I want to point out that the matter about the minutes was brought out, without Dr. Morgan's cooperation, by the minority members of the committee. It was not denied; and there are one or two other things that do not rest on Dr. Morgan's testimony. However, go ahead.

Mr. McMAHON. In any event, I think the Senator will agree that most of it does on Dr. Morgan's testimony.

Mr. O'Brian said:

> Now, I would simply like to add this touch, that in all my contacts with Dr. Morgan, that I have referred to, I was impressed in every instance with this feeling of his distrustfulness toward everybody, and the fact that he was under apparently great strain and very greatly overwrought. These wrongs had grown in his mind to such an extent that I felt his judgment was colored by it, and that is the criticism that I have to make.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I might say that Dr. Morgan is certainly a distinguished engineer, and all one needs to do is to know him to appreciate that he is honest and straightforward. He is so particular that undoubtedly it is hard for a man like Mr. Lilienthal to get on with him, because he wants to tell the truth, every minute, and he wants everybody else to know it.

Dr. Morgan, as I say, was the president of Antioch College. He was chief engineer of the Dayton Conservancy District, one of the great flood-control projects undertaken in the State of Ohio. He had no difficulty whatever there. He was the chief engineer of the Pueblo Conservancy District, in Pueblo, Colo. He had no difficulty there. He never had any difficulty until he came into contact with a man of Mr. Lilienthal's character.

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

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

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like the indulgence of the Senate while I read sentences from my remarks on yesterday:

> 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. TAFT. I thank the Senator for the quotation, which supports the statement which I made.

Mr. President, I have only one other point to make. I do not purport to pass on or claim even that Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist or a fellow traveler. I do think that the group of which he was a part took an unduly friendly attitude toward communism. Like Mr. Henry Wallace, they felt that communism was merely another form of democracy, and, as Mr. Wallace often implied, a little better form of democracy than our democracy. I think most of them have seen that that is not the fact, but that was the condition, that was the attitude of many of this group throughout the Government, and it was for that reason that they were soft toward the admission of Communists into Government departments. The fact that many Communists are here is not evidence of Communist ability, Communist aggressiveness; the fact is that we had plenty of people in the Government who thought that communism was just as good as American democracy. Therefore when a Communist came along they did not exclude him, and just as in the TVA, there was a Communist cell for a while, Mr. Lilienthal not doing much about it, so the same attitude existed in the Government until the President of the United States himself recently was forced to issue an order in which he said that now the time has come when we must get rid of Communists. He admitted that many of the departments of government have proceeded to admit Communists. Why? Not because perhaps the heads of those departments were Communists but because they were soft on the subject of Communists, because they did not regard Communists as being threats to the American security. That was exactly Mr. Lilienthal's attitude.

I think that is the only way to explain the report known as the Acheson-Lilienthal report on the subject of international control of atomic energy. It is a very interesting report. Senators will find copies of it on their desks, placed there today by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON]. I think it is said that many others joined Mr. Lilienthal in this report. That is true. But if Senators will read it, I do not think they can have any doubt that Mr. Lilienthal wrote the report. The others went along with him in the report. The others, for the most part scientists without great experience in the subject of power, without great experience in governmental questions, and inclined at the time to believe that the only solution of the whole problem of atomic energy was in effect to give it away to Russia or any other country that wanted it.

The report in essence proposed that we set up an international atomic development authority, which is described as something as like TVA as two peas in a pod, except it is on an international scale. This atomic development authority is to take over all mines of uranium and thorium; it is to take over all plants; to operate the plants; to conduct all atomic research of every kind, and all atomic manufacture of every kind except some vaguely denatured products at the end of the process which might be left to the individual nations to develop. That atomic development authority was to be substantially independent.

On page 45 of the report, Mr. Lilienthal does recognize the desirability of having it responsible to somebody; he does not know exactly to whom. He says:

There are many ways of assuring this necessary degree of accountability on the part of the Authority to the nations and peoples whose instrument it will be. Some integral organ of the United Nations, perhaps the Security Council itself, will need to serve as the overseeing body for the Authority. But it could do so in ways generally comparable to those employed by congressional appropriations and investigating committees and the Bureau of the Budget in relation to governmental institutions in the United States.

In other words, he envisages the same independent authority that he had as chairman of the TVA.

Detailed measures would have to be worked out to assure the proper connection between such overseeing or "accountability" body and the Atomic Development Authority itself.

Of course an international Atomic Authority would be even more independent, I think, than the TVA, because the rather vague Security Council control would be something exceedingly indefinite. Certainly this authority would be completely independent of the United States. It would be so far away from the United States that there would be nothing we could do about it. We would not control the personnel. We would have only one voice among many in deciding what its powers should be, or how they should be changed. We would have only one voice among many in selecting the personnel. As Mr. Lilienthal says in his report:

One of the important problems will be the question of personnel. It will be of the essence to recruit that personnel on a truly international basis, giving weight to geographical and national distribution.

That means that the great bulk of the personnel would be foreigners so far as we are concerned, and would not be Americans. The head of the organization might be a Russian; he might be a Yugoslav; he might be a Frenchman, a French Communist; or anyone else that the United Nations might conceivably agree upon. We have seen recently that an attack was made on Mr. Trygve Lie. The charge was made that the members of the secretariat or commission which Mr. Lie sent to Greece to look into the Greek problem is dominated largely by Soviet members.

When Mr. Lilienthal has set up this organization, it is to move in and take over all our plants. It is to take over Oak Ridge, Tenn., with 59,000 acres and 49,000 Americans. Apparently it is to take over the Hanford Engineering Works, with 400,000 acres in Pasco, Wash., and take over 45,000 acres at Los Alamos, N. Mex., and a number of smaller plants throughout the United States. I suppose in making the deal we might cut down the acreage somewhat, although if the organization is to conduct the necessary experiments which it is prepared to conduct, I do not see how we can help turning over all this land to an international authority conducted by an international force to operate the plants existing in the United States, or how we can prevent foreigners from other nations having full access to all those plants.

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

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator mind withholding his request until I have proceeded a little further so that I may present a picture of what this international authority would do?

Mr. McMAHON. I will let the Senator himself indicate when he is ready to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I shall yield to the Senator when I have concluded this part of my statement.

Furthermore, this body would have complete regulation of a growing industry in the United States as well as in the other countries throughout the world. The organization would, in effect, have to say what possible activities with some denatured products, if there is such a thing, could be conducted by American business, and under what conditions, and that international check would exist, of course, throughout the United States. That may be necessary. I have some doubt as to whether there is really any field for denaturing.

The whole report is based on the theory that after a certain point of dangerous manufacture the stuff can be denatured, and then other people can have it and use it without any danger to safety. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] in the hearings said that denaturing is a completely fallacious scientific theory. I do not know whether it is or not.

But in any event, no one can tell the limit to this regulatory power, or what the limitation respecting this international agency may be over the whole subject in the United States outside the actual operation of the plants which the authority takes over.

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

Mr. TAFT. I shall ask the Senator to wait until I have finished one more point. I wish to present the whole picture.

The other side of the picture is that the Atomic Development Authority would build in Russia, and in other countries throughout the world, plants exactly like our plants. On page 47 the report says:

In strengthening security, one of the primary considerations will relate to the geographical location of the operations of the Authority and its property. For it can never be forgotten that it is a primary purpose of the Atomic Development Authority to guard against the danger that our hopes for peace may fail, and that adventures of aggression may again be attempted. It will probably be necessary to write into the charter itself a systematic plan governing the location of the operations and property of the Authority so that a strategic balance may be maintained among nations. In this way, protection will be afforded against such eventualities as the complete or partial collapse of the United Nations or the Atomic Development Authority, protection will be afforded against the eventuality of sudden seizure by any one nation of the stock piles, reduction, refining, and separation plants, and reactors of all types belonging to the Auuthority.

This will have to be quite a different situation from the one that now prevails. At present with Hanford, Oak Ridge, and Los Alamos situated in the United States, other nations can find no security against atomic warfare except the security that resides in our own peaceful purposes or the attempt at security that is seen in developing secret atomic enterprises of their own. Other nations which, according to their own outlook, may fear us, can develop a greater sense of security only as the Atomic Development Authority locates similar dangerous operations within their borders. Once 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. It is not thought that the Atomic Development Authority could protect its plants by military force from the overwhelming power of the nation in which they are situated. Some United Nations military guard may be desirable. But at most, it could be little more than a token. The real protection will lie in the fact that if any nation seizes the plants or the stock piles that are situated in its territory, other nations will have similar facilities and materials situated within their own borders so that the act of seizure need not place them at a disadvantage.

Except that the other fellow will have all the bombs he does not now possess.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, that is in substance the plan. Before I proceed to the implications of the plan, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut. I ask him whether I have misstated the plan.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me. Of course the Senator realizes that he, and the Communists, the Russians, and Joe Stalin have this in common: Apparently none of them like the plan.

Mr. TAFT. Wait a moment. The plan, of course, was rather substantially changed before the Communists finally turned it down. What they objected to was the surrender of the veto. They liked it all right, so long as there was the veto.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator stated yesterday that there has been considerable change by Mr. Baruch in the Acheson-Lilienthal report. I intend, if I ever obtain the floor in my own right, to answer that contention specifically, and I think accurately. The change which was made by Mr. Baruch was not a change at all, but merely an addition of a political phase of the plan which was not entrusted to the Acheson-Lilienthal Commission.

I ask the Senator if he does not think that this is a good point in the debate for him to outline to the Senate and to the people of the United States—in fact, to Warren Austin, who is advancing this very policy in New York with what he thinks is the support of the United States—what he believes should be our atomic energy policy with regard to its international control. Or does he believe that there should be no policy at all?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think I am called upon to develop the whole atomic-energy policy by myself, but I shall be glad to indicate the general ideas which I have on the subject.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator intend to indicate them in this debate?

Mr. TAFT. As to Mr. Baruch——

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator intend to indicate his theories of international control in this debate?

Mr. TAFT. No; I intend to indicate what I think we ought to do. I think we ought to withdraw our offer immediately. That is my belief as to what we should do at the present time.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me get this straight. The Senator feels that we have a complete blunder and a mistake in advancing the proposals which we have advanced in the United Nations; that the declaration which was entered into by Messrs. Truman, Attlee, and King on November 15 was a mistake. That declaration announced that we would have to seek international control. The Senator feels, I take it, that we should rely upon sitting on a stock of ever bigger and better bombs as our protection of the Nation at this time.

Mr. TAFT. I did not say that. What I said was that I think we should work out some plan of international control. But I believe that is impossible at present. I think so long as the Russians have taken the position which they have taken—which I think anyone might have guessed they would take—on the whole subject of peace in the world, we had better withdraw the plan at present. I hope that in the future we may be able to devise a better plan.

Mr. McMAHON. As I understand the Senator—and I am really trying to get this straight, because I think it is of tremendous importance to the Senate and to the country that we sharply define at least this issue—he would withdraw our plan, and he has no plan to suggest as an alternative at this time, but possibly at some future time he may work out a plan.

Mr. TAFT. I think the atomic question involves the subject of disarmament. The only possible way I can see for us to hope that peace may ultimately come in the world is through a general agreement for disarmament, enforced by military forces sufficiently strong, with the assistance of the majority of the nations of the world, to attack any nation which violates its disarmament agreement, whether it relates to atomic energy or any other limitation on arms. Until that comes, I do not see how we can do anything special with atomic energy.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question. He is looking for a program. He is looking for a way to handle this problem. Why is it not a sensible program, in view of the Greek-Turkish situation and the world conditions, to return atomic energy to the military forces, where it belongs, and where it should be today? Why is not that the practical thing, and why is it not consistent with what we are asked to do in Greece and Turkey?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut for the purpose of answering the question.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. I hope I shall not unduly trespass on his time in making the reply.

The question which is phrased by the Senator from Indiana is one with which I hope to deal a little later in my own time. Let me say this to the Senator: There were two primary reasons why the committee which reported the bill which later became law, and which now governs the domestic control of atomic energy, was impelled to set up a commission——

Mr. CAPEHART. The motives which impelled the committee to take certain action 6 months ago have no bearing today in the light of the present world situation.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will permit me to finish; I do not agree with him.

As I say, there were two primary reasons why the committee was impelled to establish a commission under the terms of the bill which it reported. The Senator must realize that the first reason is one which is imbedded in the traditions of our country. It has been traditional in our history that we are a civilian government. We are not a people who believe in the military exercising any unnecessary authority. The Senator will say, "But it is a necessary authority." I shall now demonstrate to the Senator—at least to my satisfaction, if not his—that it is not necessary.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me say this——

Mr. McMAHON. Let me finish, please. In fact, the situation is quite the reverse. Let me say to the Senator, as I stated upon the floor of the Senate yesterday, that unless we succeed in getting an agreement for effective—and note that I say "effective"—international control of atomic energy, America's only defense is the making of more and bigger bombs as quickly as we can.

Mr. CAPEHART. May I——

Mr. McMAHON. Just a moment, if the Senator will permit me. Military men do not make bombs. They do not make B-36's. They have not been responsible for the invention or development of any great weapon of war in the past century. I will say to the Senator that bigger and better bombs will be made by two classes of people—the nuclear scientists and the engineers who have made the present bombs. The Senator probably was not present last night when the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] attacked certain scientists because of their concern over whether or not the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal would be confirmed by the Senate. In harmony with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] he launched an attack upon the scientists and said that they were on a sit-down strike. I do not undertake to defend the scientists. I will say only that if Shakespeare were living and were brought into this Chamber we could not point a gun at his head and say, "Write a sonnet." If Rubens or any of the other great masters of old were living, we could not put them in a room and say, "Paint a picture, and have it done by 5 o'clock."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that we are a little off the track. I prefer not to yield further.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make reply to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a brief reply.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the able Senator from Connecticut that the Army does not necessarily make bombs and guns, just as I admit that policemen in the city of Washington or any other city do not make guns or ammunition. But the Senator must agree that after the guns and ammunition are made, they are placed in the hands of the policemen, or in the hands of the armed forces. The Senator has stated that some of these days he might be in favor of returning the control of atomic energy to the armed services, if we are unable to establish an international organization satisfactory to him.

Mr. McMAHON. I said no such thing; I said directly the contrary. It is because I am interested in better defense through atomic energy that I wish to put it in the hands of those who have to do the work.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator admit that there is today no organization in the world to which it can be turned over, and will the Senator not admit that until such an organization is established the smartest thing to do is to return it to where it was originally, that is, the Army and the Navy?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further. I would favor returning it to a military commission. The Panama Canal was to be built by civilian engineers, but before we got through with it, we said to the Army, "You build the Panama Canal"; and the Army built it. I think the Army is competent to handle a job that civilians are competent to handle. But at the moment I am not discussing that particular question.

The Senator from Connecticut has raised the question as to whether I am opposing the whole plan submitted to the United Nations. I think at the present moment I would withdraw that plan, at least until the world is in a more peaceful state. I want to show, however, that when Mr. Baruch presented this plan on June 14, 1946, to the United Nations, he described in about seven lines what the Lilienthal report was. He said:

> I offer this as a basis for beginning our discussion—

He was not accepting it with any tremendous enthusiasm—

> But I think the peoples we serve would not believe—and without faith nothing counts—that a treaty merely outlawing possession or use of the atomic bomb constitutes effective fulfillment of the instructions to this commission. It would be a deception to which I am unwilling to lend myself were I not to say to you and to our people that the matter of punishment lies at the very heart of our present security system. It might as well be admitted here and now that the subject goes straight to the veto power

contained in the charter of the United Nations so far as it relates to the field of atomic energy.

The very heart of the problem was ignored by the Lilienthal report. It assumed, apparently, that all we were going to do was to set up an international authority and everything would be wonderful. No man could have had such a belief except a man who naively believes in the good faith of the U. S. S. R. and their willingness to enter a peaceful world. I say that it is Mr. Lilienthal's softness toward communism which led him to make this report, which got us into the position in which we now find ourselves.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able and distinguished Senator from Ohio that some of the same questions and misgivings he has expressed were expressed by me in the committee during the early days of the sessions. That will be found by referring to pages 285, 286, and 287 of the hearings. Finally Mr. Acheson made this reply:

That is correct. Now, what I have said several times is that the Attorney General's committee—

He said, "Attorney General's committee," but it was the Secretary of State's committee—

and the Board of consultants undertook to limit what they were doing. In my judgment it is a wise court that limits its own jurisdiction. We undertook to deal with the basic physical problems; what had to be done if you are going to control it. We did not undertake to go into the questions of international law, international finance, the use of international armaments to repress aggression.

Subsequently the able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] confirmed the theory expressed by Mr. Acheson.

I wish further to point out that in the so-called Lilienthal-Acheson report, in the letter of transmittal to the Secretary of State there appears this paragraph on page IV:

In our opinion it furnishes—

Speaking of the Lilienthal-Acheson report—

the most constructive analysis of the question of international control we have seen and a definitely hopeful approach to a solution of the entire problem. We recommend it for your consideration as representing the framework within which the best prospects for both security and development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes may be found.

The letter of transmittal is signed by Dean Acheson, Vannevar Bush, James B. Conant, Leslie R. Groves, major general, United States Army, and John J. McCloy, who had been Assistant Secretary of War.

I point out that even Major General Groves, who, we all agree, made a mighty contribution to this effort, recognized that the Lilienthal-Acheson report, in his opinion, furnished the best basis for both international control and domestic control on this subject.

Mr. TAFT. That is an explanation, but not an excuse. This report discusses the question of other nations seizing plants. It discusses the question of security, but it does not say a word about any nation giving up the veto. It does not discuss in any way the manner in which we are successfully to enforce this control, except for one thing. It says that if we build a plant and it is seized, that is a danger signal. Then we will know that the enemy is going to war. Of course we will know it. We will know that they are going to war with the bombs which we let them build and for which we built the plants. The report discusses the question of security, but it wholly fails to realize the seriousness of the problem, the difficulty of an international agency, the fact that an international agency is shot through with every kind of nationality. If Communists can infiltrate into TVA they can certainly infiltrate into any international agency. They will know every detail of the atomic bomb. Those who come into the United States and operate the plants can arrange to blow them up at any time the Russian Government tells them to do so.

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

Mr. TAFT. No; I shall not yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

If this international authority happens to be more Russian than American there is no way by which we can restrain them from developing in Russia bigger and better bombs than in the United States. It seems to me that this is the most naive report that could be made by any man who has ever dealt with an international problem, and it can only arise from the fact that Mr. Lilienthal considered communism just another form of democracy. He considered Russia a nation like ours, desiring to reach every possible agreement and eliminating every possibility of war. In that Mr. Lilienthal was completely mistaken.

Let me read what President Truman said this year:

This is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples by direct or indirect aggression undermines the foundations of international peace, and hence the security of the United States. The peoples of a number of countries of the world have recently had totalitarian regimes forced upon them against their will.

By the U. S. S. R., of course—

The Government of the United States has made frequent protests against coercion and intimidation in violation of the Yalta agreement, in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria. I must also state that in a number of other countries there have been similar developments.

How foolish a report looks which was made about a year ago, when we were proposing not only to turn over all bombs to Russia but to build plants in Russia so that they could construct them to carry out the plans described by the President.

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

Mr. TAFT. No; I decline to yield.

That was no new thing at the time Lilienthal made his report. All this violation of the Yalta agreement and all the results on the other nations were occurring at that time.

It seems to me there can be no defense or explanation for that kind of report, that kind of operation, that kind of give-away-the-bomb theory that dominated this report. Why? Because at that time I think every left-wing source of propaganda was to the effect that there could be no possible defense against the atomic bomb; there could be no possible way by which we could prevent Russia from building bombs, and for that reason we must give them the bomb immediately and take in return their promises, which the President says they have not kept, and probably never will keep. That is the naivete of the Acheson-Lilienthal report.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If I correctly understood the able Senator from Ohio, he said today that he has absolutely no faith in the position that this country and other countries are now taking toward making an everlasting peace in the world.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I say that until the situation changes, and certainly until the position of Russia, as described by the President, is changed, we cannot undertake to give them the atomic bomb. That is all I have said, and that is the fact. It is perfectly obvious today. I have talked to scientists, and even they are beginning to say, "We had better withdraw this whole report until we can work out with the Russian Government something better than we have today."

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator says that he would withdraw the report and would do nothing toward establishing an international commission for the control of atomic power. In other words, that means, if we should withdraw from any international organization and cease trying to find a way to control atomic power from being exploited for military purposes, we in the Congress must begin to appropriate more money to build up our defenses in the United States. Under such conditions we serve notice on Russia and every other country in the world that that is exactly what we intend to do. In fact, it is what we must do if we are to defend ourselves in the future.

Mr. TAFT. I ask the Senator what he thinks is the logical conclusion to be drawn from the President's statement about Russia and the fact that we are requested to make a loan to set up armies in Greece and Turkey against Russia?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the President's statement is decisive in character and demonstrates what he believes to be our position with respect to communism in Greece and the possible effect of communism in Turkey. I commend him for his courage in bringing the question before the Senate and the country.

But that hardly answers my question about atomic energy at this time. In talking about the Greek and Turkish loan, as the Senator from Indiana and other Senators have been trying to do. I

think we get away from the real meat of the situation in connection with atomic energy. If we do not try in some way to control atomic energy through some kind of international commission, in my humble opinion there will be a race to see who can make bigger and better bombs, as the able Senator from Connecticut has said. I hope we will not have to come to that, and I am one who still has faith that we shall some day find the answer. As a Senator I am willing to try and to keep on trying to reach some agreement with the other powers of the world to control this death-dealing instrument.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that I, too, shall be glad to have negotiations continued, but I would not begin by putting atom-bomb plants in Russia. That would seem to be the limit of all asininity on our part at the present time.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be true, from the Senator's viewpoint. But he himself must admit that if we are going to control it, we must give and take. We cannot forever keep this atomic secret in our power. If we are to believe the scientists who have testified time without number about atomic energy, 3 to 5 years is the limit before some other nation will get the know-how.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me say further, with reference to what I said yesterday, that the final action or general findings and recommendations approved by the Atomic Energy Commission on December 30, 1946, and incorporated in its first report to the Security Council, seemed to be very different, indeed, from the Acheson-Lilienthal report. In addition to dealing specifically with the veto power, there is no mention of an international atomic-development authority. The emphasis is that an international agreement to outlaw the international production and use of atomic weapons is an essential part of any international system of control and inspection. There is no particular suggestion as to what the control is to be; but it is stated that there is to be a unified international system of control and inspection. The ownership of mines of uranium, which was proposed in the Lilienthal report, is expressly denied in the first report to the Security Council. Certainly, anyone who read the Lilienthal report and then read the final agreement would be very dubious as to whether we were not just entering into a general agreement to do what we could to prevent the manufacture of atomic weapons. I do not think what we now have before the United Nations is at all the Lilienthal report, in many important respects.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to call my able colleague's attention to the first report of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission to the Security Council, dated December 31, 1946, published by the Government Printing Office. I call his attention to page 20, where the recommendations to the Security Council are set forth as follows:

1. There should be a strong and comprehensive international system of control and inspection aimed at attaining the objectives set forth in the Commission's terms of reference.

Then, turning to the next page, at the bottom of the page we find subsection (b), reading as follows:

Affording the duly accredited representatives of the International Control Agency unimpeded rights of ingress, egress, and access for the performance of their inspections and other duties into, from, and within the territory of every participating nation, unhindered by national or local authorities.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator see anything there about operating plants? On the contrary, as I read the recommendations, the implication seems to be entirely against the operation of plants, except insofar as conducting research operations is concerned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask the Senator to let me finish reading at that point, please:

(c) Prohibiting the manufacture, possession, and use of atomic weapons by all nations parties thereto and by all persons under their jurisdiction.

(d) Providing for the disposal of any existing stocks of atomic weapons and for the proper use of nuclear fuel adaptable for use in weapons.

The recommendation primarily made by that group, and with it I agree 100 percent, as I am sure the Senator from Ohio does, is the following:

Once the violations constituting international crimes have been defined and the measures of enforcement and punishment therefor agreed to in the treaty or convention, there shall be no legal right, by veto or otherwise, whereby a willful violator of the terms of the treaty or convention shall be protected from the consequences of violation of its terms.

That is substantially the meat of what was added by Mr. BARUCH to his proposal.

As I have said heretofore, I raised this same point in the committee. But I believe Mr. Acheson very clearly outlined that the job of the so-called Lilienthal-Acheson committee was not to go into all the details of the security provisions, but, rather, to present a report as to whether it was practicable to control atomic power.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to point out that these two plans are different. Even the Administration, even Mr. Acheson, the Under Secretary of State, who approved it, has moved away from the Lilienthal report, as being impossible. They have at least inserted the provision for the veto power. Furthermore, let me read what the regional report said. This is what Mr. Lilienthal said:

The facts preclude any reasonable reliance upon inspection as the primary safeguard against violations of conventions prohibiting atomic weapons, yet leaving the exploitation of atomic energy in national hands.

Yet, these recent proposals are based entirely upon control and inspection; and there is far more emphasis on inspection, as I see it, than there is on control, except as each nation agrees that it will renounce the manufacture and use of atomic weapons.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The able Senator from Ohio quoted a very distinguished member of the Democratic Party a few minutes ago. I wonder if he would permit me to quote very briefly a distinguished Member of his party, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], regarding the Lilienthal report and veto. I read from page 287 of the hearings:

Senator VANDENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to make a brief observation at this point to help clear the record.

I happened to have been with the Secretary of State at the front and in the trenches at the particular time this Commission was launched. We had been rather glibly discussing international inspection and control, with the constant question in the back of our heads as to: Just how do you do it when you get around to it? And it is my opinion that the Commission to which you refer was created for the specific purpose, and the purpose only, of answering the physical question: How do you do this thing if you get a chance to do it?

It did not occur to me, I must say, that the absence of a discussion of the veto in your particular report was any reflection on the report. I quite agree with Senator KNOWLAND, as I know you do, that in the final show-down the veto becomes perhaps exhibit A in connection with the entire affair. But I think I would have to testify from my own association with the development of the enterprise that the problem presented you was purely an answer to the question: Can you physically, factually, mechanically, actually, control atomic energy?

Mr. ACHESON. That is the way we understood it, Senator VANDENBERG.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is nothing in the new proposal which carries out the Lilienthal idea that we should distribute plants all over the world in order to get security. There is no suggestion in the final proposals to the United Nations that we build plants in Russia. So far as I can see, there are many respects in which the Lilienthal report and everything in it has simply faded into the background, because people knew it was not a conceivable thing, that it was proposing to give away things without any return, that it was creating great danger for the United States instead of less danger. I think anyone who cares to read and note the gradual change in the various proposals discussed in the United Nations will agree with the conclusions to which I have come.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. The Senator is a very good lawyer, I think one of the best in the Senate, but I find it very difficult indeed to follow his argument.

Mr. Baruch, in testifying before the committee, said, speaking of Mr. Lilienthal, after praising him:

You know, he was one of the authors of the report, which was a very excellent report.

I do not think Mr. Baruch at any time has claimed that he has changed that opinion one iota, except by adding the veto provision.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know that Mr. Baruch did it. It was done by the joint committee of all the nations that got up the final declaration and finding.

Mr. McMAHON. My point is that Mr. Baruch has recommended—and I think the Senator has denied it—exactly the declaration of the Lilienthal report. In his speech on June 14 Mr. Baruch advocated:

1. Managerial control or ownership of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to world security.
2. Power to control, inspect, and license all other atomic activities.
3. The duty of fostering the beneficial uses of atomic energy.
4. Research and development responsibilities of an affirmative character intended to put the Authority in the forefront of atomic knowledge and thus to enable it to comprehend, and therefore to detect, misuse of atomic energy. To be effective, the Authority must itself be the world's leader in the field of atomic knowledge and development and thus supplement its legal authority with the great power inherent in possession of leadership in knowledge.

If that is not the Lilienthal report line for line and word for word, then I cannot read the English language.

Mr. TAFT. However, Mr. President, as I pointed out, those words are in a speech, they cover about 14 lines in a speech of 8 or 10 pages, and they say, after we get through with them, "I offer this as a basis for beginning the discussion."

I have heard—I do not guarantee the accuracy of it—that Mr. Baruch said, when he was appointed, that there was a report, and that he was supposed to be bound by it. He did not know, apparently, that he would have to resign at the time, after he had just accepted. He said, "I offer this as a basis for discussion, but"—

Then he goes on for 6 pages of "buts."

I think it is fair to say that the conclusion, to anyone who reads it, is that he did not like it very much.

Mr. President, when we come to the final findings of the committee, which he supported and which he put through, it appears that nearly every feature of the Lilienthal report has disappeared, it is not there. Let Senators read it themselves. I have here the report by the President to the Congress, and on page 190 those matters are covered. Let Senators read it, and then read the Lilienthal report, and see if they think the two have a close connection.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator has been very kind in permitting interruptions, and I shall not interrupt him again.

There is one paragraph, however, already read from the letter of transmittal sent by the committee, which included General Groves, among others. I wish to read one paragraph from the introduction of the group consisting of Mr. Lilienthal and others who drafted this report, which was later acted on by the Secretary's committee. That group consisted of Mr. Chester I. Barnard, Mr. J. R. Oppenheimer, Mr. Charles A. Thomas, Mr. Harry A. Wynne, and Mr. David E. Lilienthal as Chairman. This is what they had to say about their own report:

We have tried to develop a report that will be useful, not as a final plan, but as a place to begin, a foundation on which to build. Many questions that at later stages should and must be asked we have not touched upon at all. We recognize that securing the agreement of other nations to such a plan will raise questions the precise contours of which can hardly be drawn in advance of international meetings and negotiation. We have not, of course, undertaken to discuss, much less to try to settle, problems of this character. The newly created Atomic Energy Commission of the United Nations, when its deliberations begin, will deal with many of these in joint discussion. Indeed, this process of joint international discussion is itself an integral part of any program for safeguards and security.

I merely wish to point out that the Lilienthal-Acheson group themselves recognized that this was merely a foundation on which to build in a vast new subject, and was not in any sense meant to be the final word.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the fact must be apparent to anyone who will read the report that they thought it was the final solution, and that Mr. Lilienthal wrote the report and offered the solution. It is a solution which looks perfectly ridiculous today, and yet it is still said it should entitle him to the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not wish to occupy the floor longer in this matter.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator spent much time yesterday and today denouncing the Lilienthal-Acheson report. In fact, his whole discussion has been upon that question, and I have learned some things about the report I did not know before.

The Senator says the report is naive, is simple, and indicates we are giving everything away to Russia under this plan. Can the Senator tell me, if that be true, why Russia does not accept this plan in a hurry?

Mr. TAFT. I think it is because Mr. Baruch came in with a veto power, and they thought the left-wingers in the United States, like Mr. Lilienthal and others, were going to get this thing through without the veto power. They did get Mr. Baruch out of the picture. In that much they were successful. I think Russia's refusal of the Lilienthal report is because they think they can get rid of the veto power. The Senator wants to know why they did not take it. I think it was because they thought they could get the Lilienthal report in its original form, the way Henry Wallace wants it, the way all the left-wingers in the United States want it.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator is reaching a conclusion based upon his own information. Assuming the Senator may be right with respect to the veto power, my conclusion is—yet I confess it may not be worth as much as the opinion of the Senator from Ohio——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator has equal capacity, equal right, equal mental ability. Certainly I have every respect for his opinion. I think that he is a profound student of international affairs in general.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. That is a gracious tribute by my colleague and rather difficult to live up to, but the point I make, even though it be repetitious, is this—the Senator has taken a lot of time announcing what he calls an ordinary, naive, simple report. I do not undertake to say that Russia failed to agree to the plan or not because of the veto power insisted upon by Mr. Baruch. I have my opinion, the same as the Senator from Ohio. As a result of the attitude of the Russian leaders, following them step by step, until at this very hour, I have no hesitancy in saying Russia would never have approved the plan that had been submitted by the Lilienthal-Acheson report. I regret to say this, but current events cause me to reach that conclusion. I still hope for the sake of the world that Russia will change her views upon this important world problem.

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

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

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, from some of the questions which have been asked, there seems to be doubt as to whether or not knowledge of the atomic bomb, the secret of its creation, could be divulged. I think that can be set at rest by Mr. Lilienthal's report. I read a short paragraph from page 54, in which Mr. Lilienthal himself acknowledges that adherence to the plan outlined in the report will divulge information to the world generally upon the creation of the bomb, and I read as follows:

We wish to emphasize that the initial disclosures will place in the hands of a nation (should it be acting in bad faith) information which could lead to an acceleration of an atomic armament program. We do not regard this circumstance as in any way peculiar to the plan recommended in this report. It is inherent in the concept of international control. The adoption of any workable scheme of international control may shorten the time during which the United States has a position as favorable as it is today. We cannot be sure of this, but we must be prepared for it.

I take that language to mean, Mr. President, that in making this report, Mr. Lilienthal says in it that he recognizes that if the plan be followed, the knowledge of the atomic bomb will be revealed to other countries.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to say that I think the only explanation for this report is a submission on the part of its authors to the theory which spread so rapidly through the United States. I cannot help thinking that it had some foreign support or initiative, but it reached many Americans well beyond the influence of Communist propaganda—the theory that there is no defense against the atomic bomb, there is no way to prevent other people from getting it, therefore we might as well give it away at once. The conclusion was so desirable to the Communist group that I cannot help thinking that to some extent the arguments for it were at least propagandized by them.

We had this tremendous propaganda last year against any military touch apparently of the whole subject of the atomic bomb, and we have it again today. We have the same propaganda today for the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal, on the theory apparently that in some way,

if we go ahead with this policy, there will be a wider distribution of the atomic bomb throughout the world.

Mr. President, all I say is this: We in this body have the responsibility practically of appointing the Atomic Energy Commission. We ought not to confirm anybody we would not be willing to appoint.

There are plenty of people in the United States, in the first place, who are believers in the system of free enterprise, who are believers in the American division of constitutional powers between the legislative and the executive; there are plenty of people in the United States who believe that our form of government can handle the atomic energy question as well as any other question that may confront us.

In the second place, there are plenty of people today who are realists about Russia, who realize that Russia has a form of government which is a threat to the welfare of the world and of the United States, who are not going to be soft toward Russia, and who are primarily concerned with seeing to it that we have absolute and complete protection against any threat from any foreign nation.

Finally, Mr. President, there are plenty of people in the United States who are open, frank, and truthful. I think we can choose one of those people rather than Mr. David Lilienthal.

USE OF THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have a very unpleasant task to perform, in that I must severely criticize one of my colleagues. I know of no other way. I have spoken to my colleague about the matter, but there has been too much of it going on at this session of the Senate and in past sessions.

I hold in my hand a so-called news letter. The title is "Space and Time," a news letter of advertising, published by M. Munro, 46 Clinton Place, Mount Vernon, N. Y., telephone Mount Vernon 73696. The particular letter I have in my hand, at the end of the letter, says:

Subscription rates $15 for 52 issues; $2 for 6 issues; 35 cents a copy.

This is a news letter. Those who publish it do so for profit. One of the able Senators purchased, or rather had delivered to him—I do not know whether he paid for them or whether they were given to him, but in any event he secured a number of copies; I do not know how many.

The publisher informed our committee that he wired for 200. How many of them he mailed out I do not know, but I hold in my hand one copy which was returned to me from the Miles City Star Printing Co., from Miles City, Mont. It says:

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: Since this so-called news letter openly criticizes you and makes light of your efforts, as well as those of Senator WHERRY, perhaps you would be interested in inquiring how it came to be mailed out postage-free under Senator MURRAY's frank. Your attention is particularly called to the last page of the letter, on which subscription rates to the letter are quoted.

Is this Government business to which Senator MURRAY has lent his personal frank?

That is signed W. F. Flinn.

Now I shall read some of the paragraphs, perhaps all of them, from this letter. It is No. 515. The date is March 17, 1947. The heading is "Republicans and republicrats of newsprint." Then it goes on to say:

HOMER the CAPEHART performs. Up until the reversal of last November, Montana's Democrat and liberal JAMES E. MURRAY—

And I presume when he says "liberal" he means liberal with the taxpayers' money, mailing out letters that are not permitted, illegally, under the franking privilege—

was the Senate man on newsprint, as chairman of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business. This year it devolved upon Indiana's Republican and foolish HOMER E. CAPEHART, acting as chairman of the Subcommittee on Newsprint and Paper Shortage, which is a newly created section of the Small Business Committee, now headed by KENNETH S. WHERRY, Republican, of Nebraska. MURRAY wanted a return to Government allocation, during the shortage, as the only means of getting over the hump. CAPEHART and WHERRY hoped for a scheme of voluntary rationing by which broad-minded publishers would find ways of making a return to official allocation unnecessary.

To that end they issued a call to the great publishers of America. Last week found these personages in Washington—meeting, of course, in executive session, for such is the concept of freedom of the press held by the owners thereof. It came to nothing. And, in fact, the cause of a return to Government allocation was materially advanced. The event turned out to be a much-needed educational exercise for Senators CAPEHART and WHERRY. They have emerged sadder, quieter, and (possibly) wiser men. Other Senators present included EDWARD MARTIN, Republican, of Pennsylvania; ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana; SPESSARD HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida; and WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD, Democrat, of North Carolina.

I might say at this point that we did call a meeting of our committee at which the publishers, the jobbers, and the managers of the newspapers of the United States were invited to appear, and some 100 of them did come before our committee. They came in a spirit of cooperation and they came frankly. They came after I had called a meeting of the committee, at which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was present, and the Senator voted for the holding of the meeting which was described in the paragraph I have just read.

Just what happened to HOMER, S. and T.'s correspondents have not revealed. But HOMER got himself into a comparable difficulty only the other day. He appeared in support of the Bulwinkle bill, which would exempt railroads from the Sherman Act—

I have not appeared before any committee in respect to the Bulwinkle bill—

and suffered a turn of the tables when it was revealed that as a shipper, in tougher times than these, manufacturer CAPEHART had complained to the Department of Justice about railroad rate-fixing in violation of the law.

That is simply an unadulterated lie. I never had thought of complaining, much less actually complaining about such a thing.

For KENNETH WHERRY the education process was more direct. He is an honest, if stumbling and myopic man.

Myopic, I understand, means nearsighted.

When the executive session was drawing to its dismal close, this Nebraska master of bombast pounded the table in the following fashion: "As you gentlemen all know, I did my part to eliminate controls, both of OPA and the CPA, but we'll have to return to those controls if you gentlemen cannot find some way of guaranteeing newsprint to the little papers." Spectators would have rubbed their eyes—if there had been any alert enough to sit up and rub their eyes over anything—over the spectacle of KENNETH WHERRY almost emerging as a responsible Government official.

Wendell Berge killed Cock Robin. The "free enterprising" Senators have little use generally for that guardian of free enterprise, the Antitrust Division, but WHERRY, CAPEHART, et al., had even less use for the Division after Wendell Berge, its head, contributed his wisdom to the executive session last week. In general, the idea proposed was that each big publisher contribute a stated percent of his paper as a "pool." This would be administered by regional councils of publishers who would allocate paper to distress cases as they saw fit. Naturally the publishers turned to Berge, who had been invited in, for his opinion on such a pooling arrangement. And Berge laid the scheme low. "I would be less than frank," he stated, "if I did not tell you what I think with respect to this suggestion. To begin with, no matter how praiseworthy its purpose, it is beyond the power of any official of the Antitrust Division to confer immunity from Federal prosecution. It would also appear to be likely that publishers would leave themselves open to treble damage suits under the Sherman Act by paper users who felt they were discriminated against."

Now I must say in all fairness that I have read the transcript of the record, and Mr. Berge made no such statement.

As Berge talked, relief spread over the faces of big publishers. They didn't want to give up any newsprint. They were quite happy that the Capehart-Wherry plan looked so illegal that it appeared inadvisable even to attempt it.

There is no truth whatsoever in that statement.

Where does MURRAY come in? Senator JAMES E. MURRAY knows more about newsprint, of course, than all his Republican and "republicrat" colleagues put together.

I again want to say that likewise he knows more about mailing documents illegally under his own personal frank than any of the leading Republicans or "republicrats."

Last week end found him chuckling to himself. Though a member of the Capehart subcommittee, he had not attended the secret session. He was letting the boys hang themselves on any convenient protruding gibbet of fact. Meanwhile he is busy preparing a bill to put newsprint back under the Government allocation. It is a difficult bill to write because MURRAY would be the last to want to freeze out prospective new ventures as was done in wartime.

Even the Antitrust Division fits more definitely into the picture than was indicated by last week's hit-and-run hearing. It is

known that several of the more flagrant cases of squeeze are now being investigated by Justice operatives. The standard condition is that the big mills have been tied up in long-term contracts with the big publishers. By reason of poor judgment, folly, or coercion, these contracts were generally signed at very low rates—$60, $70, and $80. Today the great bulk of newsprint sells at these rates under these contracts. Examples: The Washington Star beat the parade and won a favorable contract with Finnish suppliers and now sells its excess to the Washington Shopping News on condition that the latter take no national advertising; the Los Angeles Daily News beat the competition to a $69 Norwegian contract and now resells its excess to its LA competition at fancy fees. Meanwhile, there is a free market for newsprint at from $200 to $300 a ton. It all provides an interesting condition in which the jurisdiction of Justice or the applicability of the Sherman Act is unproved.

Saving the Senators' face. Though the above was the actual outcome, it should also be noted here that the conferees put the exact opposite interpretation on it in an official statement issued Friday, March 14. It read as follows:

"This group of newspaper publishers unanimously decided that they will undertake, so far as they possibly can, to have the local publishers' associations, which includes the regional, State, and city associations, examine all cases of distress of newspapers of general circulation, which includes weeklies as well as dailies, under section 520 of the Postal Laws and Regulations and do all in their power to see that they are enabled to continue to publish. As to other publications which are classified under section 521 of the Postal Laws and Regulations they are appointing a committee to investigate the situation and that committee will report back to this Senate subcommittee in 10 days."

The letter continues:

The committee mentioned above follows—

The names of those present are listed.

The letter then proceeds to give the testimony of a Mr. Lopez. Then there is a page of other matter which is not pertinent to the newsprint business. I read the concluding paragraph of the letter:

RADIO COUNCIL A STILLBIRTH?

One morning last week the word "czar" was suddenly front-paged as the suggestion of the Broadcasters Advisory Council (see S & T, last week). Next day Standard Brands and others were reported pulling out. It appeared that the pitiless limelight of openly exercised authority was too much for the Madison Avenue boys, who were not only in love with their money but with the way they made it. They refused to be a party to setting up a "radio Will Hays," refused to see the handwriting on the wall, which the Daniels of responsible broadcasting have been vainly trying to interpret to them. Though the outlook looks dim for progressive radio, there is nothing to prevent the broadcasters—plus such forward-looking advertisers as General Foods, Lever, et al.—from going ahead with their plans, naming their "czar," paying him his fee, and letting him whip the hucksters into line. The logical czar—Morris Ernst.

M. MUNRO.

Subscription rates: $15 for 52 issues; $2 for 6; 35 cents a copy.

As I stated in the beginning, that letter was franked, sent out at the taxpayers' expense, by one of our colleagues in the United States Senate.

There is a shortage of newsprint. Everyone knows it. We have been trying to help solve the problem. We have been trying to do a sincere, conscientious job. In every step we have taken from the very beginning we find persons such as this, as well as members of the old staff of the Senate Small Business Committee, continually sniping at our heels, continually interfering with our work. Now we find that the document which I hold in my hand has been mailed out under frank by a member of the committee.

I spoke to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] about it. He told me that he knew nothing about it. His answer is that a member of his staff ordered a certain quantity of the document which I hold in my hand. A quantity came into his office and was mailed out.

I ask the question, How much more of this is going on? I have reason to believe that literally thousands if not millions of pieces of literature have been mailed out of Washington under the franks of Senators and Representatives, at the expense of the taxpayers. That, in my opinion, is illegal. I bring this matter to the attention of Senators in order to protect the integrity of the United States Senate, in order to protect the integrity of the franking privilege of United States Senators and Representatives.

To me this is an unpardonable sin. I dislike very much to refer to this, but I cannot permit it to go unchallenged, because if Members of the United States Senate permit the misuse of their franking privilege for this sort of thing, it will be misused in other instances. Why any Senator or any Senator's staff should mail out a private letter, one which is published for profit, one which at the end of it contains an invitation to send money for subscriptions, is beyond me. I think it is an unfortunate situation. I do not like it. In the first place, the body of this so-called letter is not according to the facts. It is untrue. It is propaganda.

I may say for the benefit of the Senate that we are going to subpena Mr. Munro. We are going to bring him before our committee and ask him to bring down his mailing list showing the persons to whom this letter was mailed. We are going to find out where he received his information, which is so utterly unreliable. I find from reading the letter that there are very few facts, if any, stated therein.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator know who this man Munro is, other than what the Senator has told us?

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand that he is a writer. As I have just stated, we are going to subpena him before our committee. We are going to place him under oath and get the truth out of him, because there is too much of this thing going on.

I also have before me an account of the meeting described in the letter. That account was published by one of our columnists. It certainly misses the facts, as we say in Indiana, by at least a mile.

There is too much of this sort of thing going on, both on the Democratic side and the Republican side. Too many letters having no basis of fact are being sent throughout the United States. One of the reasons I bring this subject to the attention of Senators is that I wish to know whether Members of the Senate and of the House have sufficient courage to put a stop to this sort of thing.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that this literature was never incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

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 junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with certain instructions, the nominations of David E. Lilienthal and others to be members of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the nomination of Carroll L. Wilson to be General Manager of the Commission.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, earlier in the afternoon during the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] mention was made of the fact that Mr. Lilienthal was a high-handed autocrat. Those probably were not the exact words used, but that was the implication. I mentioned a series of statements which had been obtained by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch from the seven governors in the region affected by TVA, dealing with their relations with the management, the directors, and the personnel of TVA, the benefits obtained from it, and so forth. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks this entire page from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

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

TENNESSEE VALLEY GOVERNORS REPORT ON TVA—RIGHTS AND INTERESTS OF THE STATES, THEY SAY, HAVE BEEN STRENGTHENED BY OPERATIONS OF THE AUTHORITY—EXECUTIVES INTERVIEWED BY THE POST-DISPATCH ACCLAIM WIDESPREAD BENEFITS OF PROJECT AND PRAISE THE COOPERATIVE SPIRIT OF ITS REPRESENTATIVES

The governors of the seven States which comprise the Tennessee River Valley, interviewed by the Post-Dispatch, are unanimous in acclaiming the benefits which the Tennessee Valley Authority has brought to their respective States. They deny the two charges most frequently made against TVA, the proposed Missouri Valley Authority and regional authorities in general—that such a Federal agency is a "super-State" which violates States' rights, and that it robs the States of tax revenues. They also testify unanimously to the cooperative spirit of the agency and its avoidance of high-handed methods and

agree that the rights and interests of the States, on the over-all balance, have been strengthened by TVA's operations.

The governors, interviewed at their State capitals by Harry Wilensky of the Post-Dispatch staff, were asked for frank statements of what is good and what is bad about TVA. Their statements follow:

BY PRENTICE COOPER, GOVERNOR OF TENNESSEE

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"The people of the United States are entitled to development of their country's natural resources. The only instrumentality capable of effectively developing a great river valley is the Federal Government.

"TVA benefits not just a region but the country as a whole. The agency is justified from the standpoint of national defense alone. Our country needs to develop great power resources in the interior, where installations are less vulnerable to attack than in coastal regions.

"TVA already has effected tremendous savings in flood control, and will provide extended protection after the war, when additional dams are constructed and reservoirs are operated for this purpose. National commerce has benefited from improvement of the inland waterways and cheap transportation rates.

"People throughout the Tennessee Valley are enjoying low electric rates which the private companies used to tell us were 'fantastic and impossible.' Our farms have been electrified, and rural life has been made more profitable and enjoyable. You will notice that, in speaking of TVA benefits, I have placed several things ahead of cheap power. Power development is only one of the phases of this regional plan.

"I have heard the argument that a regional authority centralizing control over a major drainage basin interferes with States' rights, and I consider it an example of cloudy thinking. It comes from failure to recognize what is a natural field for the Federal Government. From the beginning of this Nation, development of natural resources has been considered a Federal field.

"I believe in upholding States' rights. I have served as head of the Southern Governors' Conference, and I drafted the resolution, which was unanimously adopted last year at the national conference of governors in Columbus, Ohio, calling for strict guarding of States' rights against Federal encroachment. During my 6 years as governor of Tennessee, I certainly have had ample opportunity to study TVA, and I can say that the rights of this State and its citizens, far from having been restricted or violated by activities of this Federal agency, have been enlarged through enriched opportunities.

"To those who contend that TVA eliminates large areas from local taxation, let me say that these taxes have been more than replaced in Tennessee by TVA contributions, both in the form of direct compensatory payments to the State treasury and in indirect benefits.

"TVA has proved an uplifting, progressive, civilizing influence on our people, and whatever opposition once existed in Tennessee has completely disappeared. The agency represents one of the best investments ever made with taxpayers' money. It would be little short of a crime if the benefits of such unified regional planning were not extended to other regions with undeveloped resources. The Missouri River Valley is only one of the regions capable of such development. We would like to see our Cumberland River Valley similarly developed.

"PRENTICE COOPER.

"NASHVILLE, TENN."

BY J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON, GOVERNOR OF NORTH CAROLINA

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"I have found TVA to be most cooperative, and have only praise for the agency's operations in this State.

"In distributing fertilizers for soil improvement tests on more than 5,000 North Carolina farms, TVA has worked with State and county agencies. All the county farm agents with whom I have talked have commented on the fine service and the cooperative spirit of this Federal agency, which is free of arbitrary methods.

"Minerals research has been carried on in cooperation with State agencies, including work on kaolins, vermiculite, olivine, and mica. Experiments in the TVA ceramic laboratory at Norris Dam have increased use of North Carolina pottery clays. Whenever we have a problem pertaining to minerals, we find TVA invariably ready to lend a helping hand. The agency has agreed to staff and equip a laboratory for research on clays which we are erecting in Asheville.

"New and improved farm machinery is now in use in North Carolina. These improvements include a barn hay drier and a small trailer thresher developed by TVA; the trailer thresher is manufactured by a North Carolina firm.

"I am a strong believer in States' rights, but TVA has done nothing which to my mind embodies any threat to the rights of this State. In building Fontana Dam, for example, it was necessary for TVA to pond a highway. The agency agreed to build a satisfactory substitute road and also to extend a park area. There was nothing arbitrary about this, the whole thing being arranged through amicable negotiations.

"Swain County has been deprived of a large part of its taxable land values by ponding for Fontana Dam, it is true, but this loss has been largely offset by TVA payments in lieu of taxes. Certain TVA revenues are paid into the State treasury, and this money is distributed to the affected counties on the basis of a formula recognized as equitable and satisfactory.

"My only complaint about TVA is that power generated in North Carolina is used by factories located mainly in other States. I would like to see the Federal Government place more war industries in this State, but I cannot hold TVA responsible for the Government's policy in this regard.

"To sum up, North Carolina has found TVA to be thoroughly competent and cooperative, and public sentiment in the State is highly favorable.

"J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON.

"RALEIGH, N. C."

BY COLGATE W. DARDEN, JR., GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"Only a small part of Virginia is in the Tennessee River watershed, and TVA has no construction projects in this State. Our experience with TVA has been principally in soil conservation work. In this field the Federal agency has made a notable contribution, and farmers in southwest Virginia are enthusiastic about it.

"Virginia has many test-demonstration farms using TVA phosphate fertilizers. I am told that the State extension service, reporting results on 98 farms after 8 years, showed a 30 percent increase in farm income based on 1935 prices, 40 percent increases in crop yields and carrying capacity of pastures, a 25 percent increase in livestock, and a 20 percent increase in labor efficiency.

"TVA has provided millions of seedlings for planting on eroded acres, and has established selective cutting demonstrations on farm woodlots.

"TVA operations in Virginia have not resulted in any encroachment on State rights. Of course, impairment of State rights might develop in the long run, and is a possibility to be borne in mind. But to date there has been no such impairment.

"Virginia has enormous coal deposits at the expense of which hydroelectric power projects may be organized. I do not know whether such hydroelectric projects, financed with tax money, really provide cheaper electricity. It is a moot question, and TVA production of power was the subject of considerable controversy before the war thrust most other considerations into the background.

"COLGATE W. DARDEN, JR.

"RICHMOND, VA."

BY SIMEON S. WILLIS, GOVERNOR OF KENTUCKY

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"TVA's work in Kentucky centers around the gigantic Kentucky Dam, $110,000,000 structure controlling the Tennessee River near its mouth. The dam, designed to extend the navigation channel 184 miles upstream and to reduce flood crests on the lower Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, is nearing completion.

"The operational test for TVA in Kentucky is yet to come. My experience with the agency during 1 year in office has been confined largely to the building stage. I can say that during this period there have been no conflicts between the State and the Federal agency. As far as I know, there were no land controversies in preliminary work on the big dam.

"There is no reason why TVA should not be able to operate without encroaching on States' rights. The idea underlying the regional valley authority is sound, and it is perfectly reasonable for State and Federal Governments to work together to realize all the varied advantages accruing from unified control of an entire drainage basin.

"Of course, something has to be done to compensate local governmental units for loss of revenue in taxes on property taken over by TVA. The agency recognizes this, and has made substantial payments in lieu of taxes. I have only a preliminary report on these payments at present. The subject is under study, and is a matter for future development.

"Anything improving the home life and the income of farmers naturally is welcome. TVA has numerous test-demonstration farms in Kentucky, and has provided tons of phosphate and nitrate, with the result that there have been increases in net farm sales and livestock carried, and a reduction in labor required. To encourage sustained-yield forest practices, selective cutting demonstrations have been established on Kentucky farm woodlots. Municipal and cooperative systems supply TVA power to a number of Kentucky consumers.

"Development of Kentucky Lake, which will have a 2,000-mile shoreline, should provide a popular recreational area. TVA has transferred 9,000 acres of land to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for inclusion in the Kentucky Woodlands National Wildlife Refuge.

"SIMEON S. WILLIS.

"FRANKFORT, KY."

BY CHAUNCEY M. SPARKS, GOVERNOR OF ALABAMA

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"At the inception of TVA 11 years ago, I publicly stated that I considered this the greatest experiment in empire building this Nation ever had undertaken. I have had no reason to change that view.

"Under the leadership of David E. Lilienthal, TVA chairman, the agency has kept free of politics. Not only that, but TVA has

been careful to work with our State agencies and local communities. In its far-reaching soil improvement experiments, TVA has cooperated with the State extension service, and in developing industry it has worked with chambers of commerce and other local groups. There has been no question of a Federal agency coming in and riding roughshod over the State and local agencies.

"TVA's fine record has impressed business, agriculture, and labor alike. In recent years I have found no opposition to TVA. Conducted as it has been conducted, with vision and regard for local agencies, it has made a tremendous contribution to public welfare.

"Taxation is the major potential field of conflict between State and Federal rights. In this connection I should like to point out that the Federal agency makes an annual contribution to the State in lieu of taxes, appraising the value of lands taken over and making a contribution from its power earnings. Last year TVA contributed $447,869 to the State treasury in lieu of taxes. In addition, it makes a settlement with each city and county affected on an ad valorem tax basis.

"Taking into account what TVA has done in improving flood control, navigation, power distribution, agriculture, cattle raising, dairying, soil conservation, and home life in general, I can say that the State has gained immeasurably more through service to its citizens than it has lost in mere taxes on lands taken over by the agency.

"CHAUNCEY M. SPARKS.

"MONTGOMERY, ALA."

BY ELLIS ARNALL, GOVERNOR OF GEORGIA

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"The only complaint I have regarding TVA is that its influence has not permeated this State further. Activities of this agency have been of great benefit to the people of Georgia, and we would welcome extension of TVA operations from the northern to other sections of the State.

"There once was talk about the danger of such a Federal agency wrecking local government and upsetting the tax structure. Such fears have proved unfounded. There has been no encroachment on States' rights, and I believe the States actually have received more money under the TVA system of payments in lieu of taxes than they did before the Federal agency went into operation.

"If we are going to industrialize the South and the West, we must have wider distribution of electric power. I might add that privately owned utilities have benefited from the advent of TVA, having been stimulated to render more service, with the result that their profits increased.

"TVA has been particularly active in cooperating with Georgia institutions in programs for development of the State's resources. Extensive work has been done in developing a flax-growing and processing industry with the Georgia School of Technology. In cooperation with several State institutions, TVA was instrumental in setting up 30 community dehydrators in 1943 as a first step toward complete community food-processing plants.

"This has been done in addition to rural electrification, establishment of test-demonstration farms, erosion control, forest-fire control, and selective cutting demonstrations for better utilization of forest resources. The mountain lakes TVA has created in north Georgia have given marked impetus to our developing tourist industry.

"People in all walks of life—business, agriculture, and labor—have benefited from operations of this agency and are grateful for TVA.

"ELLIS ARNALL.

"ATLANTA, GA."

BY THOMAS L. BAILEY, GOVERNOR OF MISSISSIPPI

"To the EDITOR OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH:

"Mississippi was the first State in which TVA power was distributed, commencing with Tupelo early in 1934. I was a member of the State legislature when this development was proposed. I supported this, as well as subsequent TVA measures.

"We are largely an agricultural State, and any program—Federal or private—designed to bring electric power to rural sections is definitely a step forward in the development of the State. The life of our people has been greatly enriched by TVA and the Rural Electrification Administration, the development and extension of cheaper electricity having proved sound and wholesome from every point of view.

"Use of electrical appliances has lifted many of our burdens. In the northeastern part of the State we are milking cows, pumping water, cutting wood, refrigerating food, and giving decent light chiefly with TVA power. Better refrigeration means not only a saving of food but improved health, while the electric pump, tank, water system, and sewage-disposal facilities are likewise of incalculable value to public health. These vital things we owe largely to TVA and to the power companies operating in our State.

"I do not feel that the role played by this Federal agency in Mississippi has constituted any encroachment on our State rights. We have cooperated with TVA, and it has cooperated with us and our State agencies. The result has been satisfactory.

"Development of cheaper electricity in other sections of the country, either through Federal agencies or private companies, where feasible and practicable, is in the interest of the Nation's welfare. In addition, such development would help provide jobs for returning service men and women and war workers, at the same time encouraging resettlement on the farm by giving to farm life the many blessings which would result from the use of electric energy.

"THOMAS L. BAILEY.

"JACKSON, MISS."

DECATUR (ALA.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRAISES OPERATION OF TVA

DECATUR, ALA., December 30.—Deep-water navigation has reduced freight rates, commerce moves on the bosom of the river and industry hits top speed on the shores of the stream. Farm yields are increasing on smaller acreages since the river is controlled by a series of dams and millions of folks in the Tennessee Valley have all sorts of confidence in the days that will follow the war. They foresee continued industrial growth, full-scale development of water transportation, improved and continually diversifying farming methods.

This is the opinion of John A. Caddell, president of the Decatur Chamber of Commerce, who has watched the city of Decatur grow from 14,000 to 25,000 people since TVA started 11 years ago. Continuing, Caddell said:

"The Federal Government wisely decided to control the Tennessee River, now the only controlled river in the world. The several millions of people in the valley decided to make the most of new opportunity, are capitalizing upon low-cost transportation, low-cost power, and are practicing scientific farm development. The fundamentals were provided through TVA, the people are doing the work. TVA helps when called upon, does not direct, and when you call on TVA, you'll find the officials right here in the valley living with and working among our own people day by day."

TRANSFER OF REMOUNT SERVICE FROM WAR DEPARTMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to offer some bills and to make brief comments on them.

The first bill I wish to offer is a companion bill to the bill introduced by Mr. CASE on the House side, H. R. 2868. I am introducing it for the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] in behalf of himself, myself, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr YOUNG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

This bill seeks to save the Remount Service presently operated by the United States Army and which we are given to understand is about to be brought to an end by the Army, and it proposes to transfer the Remount Service from the Army to the Department of Agriculture under certain conditions in accordance with certain understandings as set forth in the bill.

Of course I think it is very important to the horse breeders of America that the Remount Service be saved. I think it is most regrettable that it is not to be continued, as I understand it is not, under the Army. It has served over the years to the great benefit of the horse-breeders of America. In fact, I know of no other one thing which has so greatly improved the blood line of American horses than has the Army Remount Service. It is true, as the Secretary of War tells me in a letter which I shall shortly introduce into the RECORD, that the Army intends to discontinue the Service because of the fact that Army operations have been practically entirely mechanized it is very difficult to justify further expenditures of military funds for remount purposes.

I do not entirely agree with the Secretary of War, because there has been set up under the Army over the years a system of records and personnel and knowledge of the remount problems which, in my judgment, will result in a more economical spending of the money which goes into the Remount Service if left with the Army than will be the case if this Service is transferred to any other department, even including the Department of Agriculture.

However, in our bill we have sought to assure the greatest of efficiency and economy in the administration of the Remount Service if and when it is transferred to the Department of Agriculture, by providing that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture shall, by agreement, enter into mutually satisfactory arrangements for the transfer of the Remount Service to the Department of Agriculture, including the records and even personnel. It should be provided that the Department of Agriculture shall be able to make use of the highly qualified personnel of the Army which really has grown up with the Remount Service and developed it to its present fine standing.

The need for the Remount Service has not come to an end simply because the

Army has mechanized itself. There is still a great need throughout our country for improving the blood lines of our horses for domestic use. Therefore, I think it a very important service that ought to continue to be rendered by the Federal Government.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point a letter which I have received from the Secretary of War which leaves no doub as to the apparent intention of the War Department to dispense at an early date with the Remount Service.

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

MARCH 25, 1947.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: I have your letter of March 19 on the horse-breeding program. I have also read the letter from your constituent and I am returning it to you.

The need for horses in Army operations has virtually disappeared, due to the airplane, tank, truck and other advances in mechanization. This being the case, the continued expenditure of War Department funds for maintenance of the horse-breeding program has become an expenditure that cannot be justified or defended. It has been plain enough that unless some other agency or branch of the Government was willing to assume this activity, by transfer of the program from the War Department, the War Department would be obliged to terminate it.

An effort was made last year to transfer the program, with the property, funds and personnel pertaining to it, to the Department of Agriculture, by agreement between the two Secretaries and by Executive order of the President under the First War Powers Act. As I understand it, the Attorney General has recently ruled that the suggested transfer cannot be made under the First War Powers Act. There remains the possibility of a transfer by Executive order of the President under the Reorganization Act, but I am informed that the Department of Agriculture has come to the conclusion that it does not believe it should take over the horse-breeding program as now conducted by the War Department.

The impression has been prevalent that this program does not cost the Government any money, the thought being that it is on a self-sustaining basis. This impression is entirely erroneous, the program requiring an expenditure of Government funds in the neighborhood of half a million dollars a year.

Under the conditions the War Department has directed that steps be taken to terminate the program. I see no other alternative.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say again, as I have said to the Secretary of War, that I think it is a mistake to transfer the Remount Service out of the War Department into the Department of Agriculture, or any other department, but if it is a choice between dispensing with the Remount Service entirely or transferring it to another department of the Government, then I think our bill is a most appropriate one. Under such circumstances it ought to be vested in the Department of Agriculture.

I sincerely hope that both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of War will proceed by mutual agreement, in acordance with such terms and conditions as are set forth in the bill, to work out a satisfactory arrangement, if this bill passes, as I hope it will, so we can save this very important service to the horse breeders and the farmers of this country.

I shall not burden the RECORD with the large amount of mail which I have received and which some of the other sponsors of this bill have received in support of the Service from the farmers and horse breeders of the country. I do want to say for the RECORD that Congress can be assured that the horse breeders of this country are vitally interested in seeing to it that the Remount Service is continued either under the War Department or under the Department of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have incorporated in this part of my remarks the bill to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1034) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. MCCARRAN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the interests of economy and efficiency, the records, property, real and personal, and civilian personnel of the Remount Service of the Quartermaster Corps, War Department, are hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture, effective July 1, 1947 Prior to that date, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture shall enter into a written agreement on the property and the personnel covered by this transfer.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to receive the property transferred by this act and is directed to administer it in such manner as he deems will best advance the livestock and agricultural interests of the United States, including improvement in the breeding of horses suited to the needs of the United States; and, in carrying out such program, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with public and private organizations and individuals under such rules and regulations as are deemed by him to be necessary. He is authorized to acquire breeding animals by donation, exchange, or purchase, and to dispose of surplus or over-age stock from time to time by public auction. Proceeds from such sale, or from a share in breeding fees collected by persons with whom breeding animals are placed, shall be covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War may detail to the Department of Agriculture, from time to time, such military personnel, including veterinarians in the Medical Corps, as he may determine with the Secretary of Agriculture to be desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act or to safeguard the interests of the United States. Retired personnel of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, employed by the Department of Agriculture, for the purposes of this act only, may be paid at a rate, which together with their retired pay, shall not exceed the pay and allowances received by such persons in the permanent grade last held by them prior to retirement.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture such funds as may be necessary to carry out this act. The authority of the War Department to conduct a remount breeding program as set forth in the act of March 7, 1928 (45 Stat. 245) and to accept donations of animals for breeding purposes, insofar as it relates to horses (44 Stat. 1095), is hereby abolished. Funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for necessary administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, and purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

ACQUISITION OF HOSPITAL AT CAMP WHITE, MEDFORD, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I introduce a bill which seeks to provide for the acquisition of the hospital at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., for use as a domiciliary facility of the Veterans' Administration.

I do not think that it is sound economy for us to proceed as we have already proceeded too far in dismantling some facilities in this country which have cost the taxpayers many millions of dollars and which are now being dismantled for salvage and junk purposes, when investigation will show that there is still a great need for those facilities. I predict, Mr. President, that after we finish dismantling many of them it will be only a matter of a short time before we shall be called upon to appropriate additional funds to build identical facilities, or at least facilities, to serve the same purposes that some of these facilities which are about to be dismantled could serve.

In Medford, Oreg., at Camp White, we have a very fine hospital plant, a plant which should be used, in the judgment of the two Senators from Oregon, for veterans' purposes. We fully realize that it is the program of the Veterans' Administration, as far as concerns hospitals that call for the immediate attention of patients by way of surgery, and service of a so-called clinical character, to seek to locate such hospitals near metropolitan areas easily accessible to the veterans. We have a rather large number of veterans who do not need that type of hospitalization. We know that there are several thousands of veterans who are suffering from various neurotic disorders, types of battle shock, and psychological upsets, who need to be placed in domiciliary facilities for some time, where there can be a maximum of freedom and yet treatment and supervision and care by the Veterans' Administration.

Rather than see the great hospital at Camp White dismantled and junked at financial returns which will not begin to equal the great cost that the taxpayers have put into the site, we are proposing that it be turned into that type of a domiciliary hospital or resident hospital which will take care of the veterans who need that sort of care during their rehabilitation period. We think the proposal is a very economical one and will save in the long run a great many thousands of the Federal taxpayers' dollars. Hence, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the body of the RECORD at this place in my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1035) to provide for the acquisition of the hospital at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., for use as a domiciliary facility

by the Veterans' Administration, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. CORDON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to acquire from the War Assets Administration the tract of land with improvements thereon formerly used for hospital purposes at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., and known as Camp White Hospital, and to operate and maintain thereon a facility for domiciliary care for veterans.

PROMOTION OF SCIENCE, ETC.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to Senate bill 526 to promote the progress of science, to advance the national worth, prosperity, and welfare, promote the national defense, and for other purpose.

The amendment which I am offering is the result of efforts of a considerable number of educators in my State and in other States who have asked me to introduce it. I have received a letter from the president of the University of Oregon, Dr. Newburn, pointing out to me the desirability of seeing to it that Senate bill 526, known as the science bill, is amended so as to assure to our land-grant colleges and to our colleges west of the Alleghenies at least a proportionate share and a fair share of the funds which are to be made available under S. 526 for scientific research purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the amendment in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, viz: On page 15, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

"(c) Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be appropriated among the States as follows: Two-fifths shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census; and the amounts so apportioned to each State shall be expended only for carrying on research activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities, including the land-grant colleges, within such State pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements. In making such contracts or other financial arrangements, the Foundation shall give each individual institution the widest latitude in its selection of individual research projects, but the Foundation shall not be required to expend funds in any institution unless such institution submits proposals for the expenditure of such funds which the Foundation finds to be consistent with such general program and standards as it may establish in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act. For purposes of this section the term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), an additional amount of not less then 25 percent shall be expended in the facilities of nonprofit organizations without regard to the above limitations relating to State quotas or the tax-supported character of the organization. In meeting the requirements of this subsection, the Foundation may take into account whatever funds may be expended by it for facilities to be operated by the land-grant, tax-supported, or other nonprofit organizations, even though the title or ownership rights of such facilities remain with the United States."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very desirous of seeing a science research bill pass the Eightieth Congress. But I think we should frankly face the fact that in many of our universities and colleges in the Midwest and the West, and particularly in our land-grant colleges, there are scientists who view with some concern the present language of Senate bill 526. If it is contemplated—as I understand the authors of the bill would say, if they were here to discuss the matter—that there is no intention in any way to discriminate against land-grant colleges or tax-supported institutions or other State-supported schools, then I see no objection to the language of my bill, because it will quiet a good many fears on the part of those educators and scientists who object to the bill in its present form. My amendment will make it much easier, in my judgment, to gain support for Senate bill 526. If, on the other hand, it is planned by this bill to permit of a discretion on the part of the Foundation to the end that it could deny a reasonable apportionment of these funds to land-grant colleges and State-supported and tax-supported institutions, then surely the language of my amendment is sorely needed. I hope the authors of Senate bill 526, after reading the bill and reading the remarks I am now making on it, will find a way to accept the amendment I am proposing without making it necessary to draw any issue over it.

But I am going to be rather insistent that the bill be amended in some such way as that proposed by some of the educators in my State, so as absolutely to remove any fear they may entertain as to the possibility of discrimination by the Foundation against these midwestern and western institutions. I say that also, Mr. President, as one who owes part of his education, at least, to one of the great eastern universities. I have a very high regard for the great scientific work that takes place on the Atlantic coast in the so-called great institutions on the Atlantic coast. Nevertheless, they have no monopoly on scientific research, and the Congress of the United States should pass no bill which permits the entertainment of any fear by educators in other parts of the country that its language is such as to make it possible in the administration of the bill to discriminate against institutions in other parts of the country. Hence I say I hope the authors of Senate bill 526 will see the fairness of the language of my bill and will accept it, without making necessary the raising of any further issue over it.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT LABOR SERVICES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon still has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, inasmuch as I have the floor, I now turn my attention to another matter. I turn my attention to the problem of appropriations for some very-much-needed labor services in the United States because I think it very important that we take note of that need now before there is used on me, at least, the argument that so frequently is used on me by some of my colleagues after I have raised what even they sometimes admit is a very good point, namely, to say to me, "But it is too late. It is all arranged now." Of course, it is very difficult for me always to be able to guess what the strategists will do, when I am not "in" on the time schedule or program upon which they have agreed. So I frequently find myself confronted with the argument that it is too late to do much about some matter because it has all been done or agreed upon before I raise my objection to it. Nevertheless, I wish to give my party a little advice in regard to some of our appropriation problems as they affect the labor services. I am not sure that my advice will be taken, but I am sure of one thing, namely, that a great many people in 1948 will agree that I am right about it. Hence, I should be very happy if my party and the Congress would at least give serious consideration to it before they wake up, too late, to discover that a great many voters in 1948 want the Republicans to do what I now suggest. I do not want my party to face voters in 1948 who will say, "It is too late for you now to get our votes, in view of the appropriation policies you followed in 1947." I think there are going to be a great many workers in the country who will say that, Mr. President, if we proceed with some of the appropriations policies that we are hearing about over on the House side. They will oppose us if we cut the heart right out of the National Labor Relations Board—a Board which already is months and months behind schedule with its cases because it does not have sufficient staff, on the basis of its present appropriations, to do the job which should be done. Of course, Mr. President, speed in the handling of labor cases is of vital importance to peaceful settlements.

Likewise, if we look at the proposed cuts in the budget of the Bureau of Labor Statistics—one of the most important informational services which could possibly be rendered by our Government in supplying both employers and labor the objective data they need for settling disputes and for reaching agreement as to the terms of contracts—we find that the House proposed to emasculate it. Both workers and employers have come to rely on that service. I am one who, although sometimes accused of being rather theoretical and not being a very practical politician, nevertheless thinks he is practical enough to recognize that if we make very many mistakes like those we are making in regard to labor-service appropriations, I will have a hard time in 1948 in trying to convince a labor audience why it should vote for the

Republican Party. I will do my best, Mr. President, as I said the other day, but I am pleading for something to work with; that is all. Just give me something to work with. That is all I am asking of my party. I am now making a plea that they give me something to work with in regard to adequate appropriations for the United States Employment Service, and in order to speak very accurately about it, I have reduced my observations to the following comments.

Mr. President, I propose to say what I have to say about the reckless cuts in the United States Employment Service budget now, while there is yet time for the Senate Appropriations Committee to repair the damage which has already been done to morale by the House action, and which threatens to damage the interest of not only the wage and salary earners in the country, but also consumers, manufacturers, businessmen, and financiers who for years have used the many services of that Department in their daily lives.

This is not true economy, of the sort the Republican Party is pledged to achieve. It is economy on a binge, false economy, dictated, not by prudent expenditure of taxpayers' money by a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy once more being proposed by Republican leadership.

As a Republican, I want no part of the responsibility for economy at any price such as is displayed in the 77 percent cut in the budget of the United States Employment Service. Let me make my position clear on this point. I assume that every penny requested for payment to the State Employment Services is needed and justified. I hope the Senate Appropriations Committee will approve that item. I cannot discover any possible justification for the slash of funds for the functions of the Federal Government in our Federal-State system of public employment offices from the requested total of $3,900,000 to 23 percent of that figure, $900,000.

It is rather interesting that the President, after the estimate has gone through the Bureau of the Budget, should ask for $3,900,000 and the House should cut it to $900,000; $3,900,000 asked, $900,000 given. It is a remarkable selection of figures. It looks as though it was decided by those having to do with it that if they just crossed out the "3" and would leave "900,000," and presto, change, $3,000,000 would be saved.

Mr. President, this is not fiscal therapy, this is not surgery; I think it is butchery of the welfare of the workers of this country. This is a wrong which is proposed be committed to the Wagner-Peyser Act, and I know of no such pledge on the part of the Republican Party at any time to emasculate that act. I know that continuance of a Federal-State employment service has been endorsed year after year by both the Democratic and Republican Parties.

By cutting out the functions of the Federal Government, the effect will be to appropriate Federal funds to a system of individual State services with a great deal of duplication of effort, and with a great deal of multiplying of expense.

This proposal is to strike out of the whole Federal-State cooperative system recognition of the hard and inescapable fact that we are one nation, and that our economy, as far as employment, at least, is concerned, is a one-country economy.

It is an attempt, in my judgment, to repeal or set aside the very character of the interstate nature of employment. It is one of the secrets of the success of our economy and of our form of government that our country and our employment is fluid, that it is mobile, that it moves in response to demand and opportunity from one end of a State to the other, and from one section of the country to another.

We certainly learned that during the war. Look at the way we moved thousands and thousands of workers from the east to the west coast, and from the middle to both the East and the West. It taught us clearly the lesson that ours is a one-nation economy, as far as employment is concerned.

As I pointed out last year in my speech on this subject, when we were fighting the battle of Federal versus State employment services, we should not overlook the need of cooperation between the Federal Government and the State governments in regard to employment problems. We should avoid the setting up of State barriers.

Mr. President, this proposal to cut this budget is a mistaken attempt again to turn back the clock, to break up our united economy into 48 separate economies, competing with each other for labor, seeking to hold labor within the State, to deny employees in one State access to jobs in other States, seeking even to make it possible to keep from them the information as to the availability of jobs in other States.

Furthermore, and more immediately, it would result in the setting up of 48 duplicating sets of special services such as are now provided on a single, Nationwide, standardized basis, but adaptable to the needs in each of the 48 States.

Mr. President, at this moment our economy and the world's recovery is suffering from vast shortages of vital goods such as steel, coal, automobiles, box cars, locomotives, linotype machines, and a host of other items essential in the whole complicated cycle of production, distribution, and consumption. The railroad industry, the automobile industry, and the housing industry at this moment are all competing for the short supply of steel. Looking ahead, it appears obvious that if we can surmount the critical months when inflation threatens to blight postwar prosperity, every responsible analyst foresees several years of production up to the limit of our capacity, material, plant, and manpower capacity. In fact, I think if we can get over the next 12 to 15 months we will enjoy, perhaps, the greatest era of prosperity we have ever had in this country, and I only hope and pray we will know how to handle it wisely.

In manpower it is essential that we have the maximum utilization, at fair wages and under decent conditions. The United States Employment Service is the only implement at hand for dealing with the manpower problem on a Nation-wide scale, for seeing to it that qualified workers are available at the right places, the right times, and in the numbers and skills needed.

Consider even our atomic energy program. I think it goes without saying that we are going to have great problems in connection with further development of that program. It is going to call for transferring from different sections of the country a good many thousand skilled workers as we go forward with the various developments in the program. We cannot do that on a State-wide basis unless there is friendly cooperation between the States and the National Government. We shall need an efficient and effective United States Employment Service, such as we provided for last year. Such a service is being ruined by the proposed cut in the appropriations for the USES at the present time.

I submit that it is the sheerest folly, at this critical moment, to consider the deliberate break-up of this efficient implement—that is, the United States Employment Service—it has served us well for 14 years. Instead of reducing the operating efficiency of our Federal-State Employment Service, it is my judgment that it should be improved and assisted by an appropriation even larger than has been proposed by the President.

I happen to know that the amount asked for by the Service was cut down by the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget went over it with a fine-tooth comb, and they finally agreed that the minimum amount that should be asked for was the $3,900,000, which the House now proposes to reduce to a mere $900,000.

If the Federal Government, in the judgment of the Congress, finds itself in such dire financial straits as to require a cut in the funds for the Federal arm of this cooperative service to only $900,000 we will be guilty of false economy. The United States Employment Service cannot operate efficiently on that amount. If that is all that is to be granted it would be wiser to let the States take over the entire burden of maintaining their own State employment services. If this appears to be too drastic a proposal, perhaps the States might be asked to share 50 percent of the $72,000,000 which we are granting to the States under last year's amendment to the Wagner-Peyser Act. This, incidentally, was the 50–50 matching fund proposed in the Wagner-Peyser Act from which we departed during the war.

Rather than subscribe to a meaningless continuation of an ineffective United States Employment Service operating at 23 percent of the amount proposed for next year's operations, I would prefer to see an outright and aboveboard repeal of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

We would then have a clear-cut opportunity to vote for or against a Federal-State cooperative system or a system of State services, some of them excellent, some of them existing in name only, and others operated in such a manner as to be shunned by self-respecting wage earners and employers.

My position regarding the Employment Service was put on the record last year

when legislation affecting that service was before this House. I then stated:

I do not think we can ever get away from the fact that, after all, the problem of employment and the problem of unemployment is not a Federal problem alone, nor a State problem alone, but a combined Federal-State problem.

I think this is one of the social and economic problems which should be handled by the State and Federal Governments working in cooperation.

I was deeply concerned by the fact that substantive legislation was not enacted in both Houses to assure maximum cooperation in the operation of the Federal-State system of public employment offices. Instead, you will recall that the Employment Service, after nearly 5 years of Federal operation, was returned to a Federal-State system through the medium of the Appropriation Act of 1947 without legislative provision to insure its successful operation, which the Senate considered necessary. In this connection I pointed out that: "The obligation still rests upon the Congress to continue the work cooperatively with State governments in seeing to it that there is worked out an adequate Federal-State cooperative employment service for all our citizens as one of the best guaranties and checks against the danger of depression with its accompanying mass unemployment."

I am deeply concerned with the continuing necessity of making adequate financial provisions to assure that the Federal Government makes its proper contribution to a strong Federal-State system of public employment offices. This system cannot be maintained unless adequate funds are appropriated for both the operation of local offices in the field and for the United States Employment Service. The USES is responsible by law for maintaining a coordinated Nation-wide system of public employment offices. It does so through the development and maintenance of minimum standards of efficiency, uniformity in administrative and statistical procedures, furnishing and publishing information as to opportunities for employment, and other information of value in the operation of the system; and maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several States. All of these requirements are specifically set forth in the basic legislation which governs the activities of the United States Employment Service. These activities must be carried on by the United States Employment Service in addition to carrying its responsibilities for budget administration and fiscal management, involving the allocation of funds to the several States in accordance with the requirements of efficient administration and assuring that the expenditures made by the States conform with the law.

The basic legislation establishing a Federal-State system of public employment offices requires the United States Employment Service "to maintain a veterans service to be devoted to securing employment for veterans." This responsibility was clarified and increased with the passage of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. It is specifically stated in that act, and I quote:

The Congress declares as its intent and purpose that there shall be an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans and that to this end policy shall be promulgated and administered so as to provide for them the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment.

The Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service is concerned with maximizing employment opportunities for veterans. Ninety-five percent of its staff is located in local communities to supplement and assist the local employment service offices in developing job opportunities for veterans. But the procedures, methods, and program materials used by this staff are prepared by the United States Employment Service. The Veterans' Employment Service can be fully effective only if the USES is equipped to render the technical assistance which VES requires.

A strong Federal-State system of employment offices cannot exist in this country without the kind of activities carried out by the United States Employment Service. These include:

First. Collecting, analyzing, and distributing on a national basis of labor market information reflecting employment trends, job opportunities, hiring specifications, and conditions of work. Such information is now being used by all employment offices to counsel workers on job opportunities nationally and to assist workers in getting jobs in other States than the State of residence. Employers, labor organizations, and community groups concerned with the location and staffing of plants and the stabilization of employment, now use such information constantly.

Second. The continued development for use by all local employment offices of the Manual of Employment Office Operations, which sets forth recognized and tested employment office practices and procedures and which has now been adopted without change by almost all local employment offices.

Third. Promoting Nation-wide programs, such as the job development program, with specific emphasis on obtaining employment opportunities for veterans; coordinating and improving employment counseling for veterans, handicapped workers, and new entrants into the labor market; and conducting such special programs as the National Hire the Physically Handicapped Week.

Fourth. Rendering technical services to local employment offices resulting from the conduct of occupational analyses and the preparation and maintenance of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles; analyzing physical requirements of jobs, and the aptitudes and physical capacities of workers. These materials are used by local offices (a) in matching men and jobs and (b) in the placement of disabled war veterans and handicapped workers.

Fifth. Maintaining a system to clear workers between the States, which is particularly important for professional and technical personnel whose employment opportunities exist in the national labor market. The interstate movement of workers is especially important both to the employers and to the job seekers in industries having peak seasonal demands and whose production is dependent upon migration in accordance with patterns that extend over several States.

Sixth. Maintaining working relationships with national organizations of employers, labor, and veterans which are concerned with employment problems and are organized on a Nation-wide basis.

The same reasons that I advanced last year, for developing such a cooperative Federal-State relationship as we now have, apply equally today, and certainly in my judgment at least are an adequate rebuttal to the proposal to cut $3,000,000 off of this Federal Employment Service.

I have enumerated only some of the activities through which the United States Employment Service assures a coordinated and strong Federal-State employment office system. These are the normal activities. There is one other, however, that in the face of existing circumstances needs to be mentioned. This agency is the only agency in this country that has the responsibility and facilities to mobilize our manpower resources on a Nation-wide basis. With billions now being appropriated for the military aspects of our national security program, it seems to me to be nothing short of folly to virtually wipe out the United States Employment Service to whom we must look for the organization of our labor resources in case of emergency.

I should like to call attention to a statement by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Washington Daily News on March 31, 1947, entitled "Hamstringing USES."

In fact, I think he presents the problem much better than I possibly could present it. Mr. President, this article states, and accurately, that if the House cuts of the Employment Service budget shall be concurred in by the Senate, the Wagner-Peyser Act will have been, in effect, nullified or repealed and a Federal-State employment service will have been destroyed. That, Mr. President, is a piece of legislative folly which I do not want charged to my party or to this Congress. I hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee which, on April 7, will begin hearings on this budget, will make whole again the organism that has been developed in the past 14 years and which is going to be vitally needed in the future, both in good times and bad.

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

HAMSTRINGING USES

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

In the numerous drastic economies which the House voted a few days ago in the Labor Department's appropriation for next year it carved the United States Employment Service down to such a skeleton that it will be incapable of maintaining a national employment system.

That was the purpose for which it was created, back in 1933, in the midst of depression. In the Wagner-Peyser Act, Congress recognized unemployment as a national problem by setting up USES to cooperate with State employment services in finding jobs.

In the years since, USES has justified itself for its services, in cooperation with the States, to industry, labor, and, more recently, to veterans. It functioned so effectively, built up standards and procedures for job placement so well, that when the war came it was assigned the task of channeling millions of workers into war industry—a big job which it did most capably. Because of the emergency, USES was given temporary control and direction of State employment systems. The system, in short, was federalized.

After the war Congress restored the Federal-State cooperative system, turning control of State employment services back to the States. USES, though, was to continue its functioning of coordinating and assisting the States as provided by law.

That is, until the House last week knocked its appropriation to $900,000, a 74-percent cut below President Truman's budget recommendation. That will require the agency to reduce its staff from 875 to 202 and to close all of its regional offices with the possible exception of one on the Pacific coast. About all it would be able to do would be to serve as a fiscal agent to review State budget requests for funds appropriated for maintenance of State systems and to audit accounts.

Protests are coming in from certain types of business that require seasonal labor, particularly canners—which indicates the need of a national clearing house for transient labor. But further than this, the USES also serves all sorts of business and industry of stable employment. The search for skilled help and the search of skilled help for jobs know no State lines.

During the war, USES compiled a job dictionary which listed some 30,000 job classifications and kept this constantly up to date, so that the call from one locality for certain types of skills could be met from another locality through the clearing house.

This sort of service would have to be stopped under the appropriations cut. Congress would be taking quite a responsibility in doing away with it, with at least the prospect of a recession being forecast by economists. This will be one concern that will face the Senate when it considers the Labor Department bill. States are unable individually to perform this clearing-house function adequately.

But that is only one function that would be affected. Another, is a job occupational analysis carried on in cooperation with industry that industry has found valuable. Still another is a job-placement program just started in connection with colleges and universities for GI students who will graduate as specialists of one sort or another. This is a service USES provides, among others, for the Veterans' Employment Service, the appropriation of which was itself cut 34 percent to $1,756,800, so that the staff of that service also will be reduced here to only a handful.

What is seen, if the House action is upheld by the Senate, is a slow deterioration of the national employment system. For the USES also helped, by its surveys and its surveillance, to keep up standards in States to protect labor. There is a tendency in States, under pressure of special interests, to whittle down standards.

Mr. President, I do not see how we can carry out our obligations under the full employment bill that we passed last year, and which now is really being carried out, as far as our policies are concerned, by our Joint Committee on Economic Report. I do not see how we could carry that out, without a cooperative arrangement between a Federal employment service and the employment services of the State. We certainly need to continue the budget that is being asked for by the Federal Employment Service if we are going to make a good-faith attempt at least to prepare this country and to keep this country ready at all times to meet any great unemployment problem that may confront us.

It is very interesting that those spots of unemployment are beginning to develop now, like economic smallpox, all over this Nation, Mr. President. In almost all sections of the country there can be found areas of unemployment infection already beginning to fester. Out in my section of the country, for example, at Portland, Ore., we are suffering from unemployment. My senior colleague and I are now trying desperately to get the War Assets Administration to develop some understanding about this problem. I hope it is not a hopeless task we have undertaken though I sometimes despair of it. We are going to keep trying, Mr. President, to develop some understanding of the relationship between disposing of great industrial surplus property plants and employment.

I digress to call attention for example to our Swan Island problem, in Portland. Swan Island is one of the great shipbuilding yards of the country—not only of the west coast, but of the country. What is to be done with it? Are we going to recognize, as the leaders of industry and of labor in Oregon are recognizing today, that it is a great employment potential, and that it ought to be turned over to such a subdivision of government as the port of Portland, which is trying to get possession of it for lease purposes, so that it can be used for industrial employment in that area so that hundreds of men can be put to work? Or are we going to junk it? Are we going to dismantle it? I am opposed to dismantling it, for two reasons, and I wish someway, somehow, I could get General Littlejohn to see the importance of these two reasons. He ought to be able to see one of them, on the basis of his background. I hope the President will persuade him as to the other, too, because I have written to the President suggesting at least that this is of such importance to the economy of the country that it deserves some Executive attention.

The first reason is that we ought to use it for industrial purposes in order to put to work skilled craftsmen, who are now in increasing numbers in the Portland area becoming unemployed.

Those facilities can be leased for employment purposes so that those men can be put to work. Of course, if we want to take the attitude that we must exact from a government subdivision, such as the port of Portland, a Shylock price for Swan Island so as to make it not feasible to interest lessors in operating the yard for employment purposes, then of course we defeat, it seems to me, what I have thought was one of the objectives that was to be applied by the Surplus Property Administration in disposing of industrial plants. I thought that it was understood that wherever possible we ought to dispose of them to agencies of government which in turn can make maximum use of such plants for employment purposes.

The second reason why I think that these great industrial plants should not be junked at this time and sold only for salvage value is because of national defense. I happen to be one in the Senate who believes that the Eightieth Congress had better go slow in any fiscal program that does not give us every possible assurance that we shall maintain ourselves at a very high level of defense security. I think that is going to be true for several years. I think that is going to be true, Mr. President, until all the members of the United Nations give clear evidence that they intend to habituate themselves in the ways of peace and in the ways of peaceful procedures for the settlement of international disputes. Hence, I think it would be a great mistake for the War Assets Administration to dispose of such industrial sites as Swan Island for salvage value. I do not care where they are located; if they are located in Baltimore, Md., or Norfolk, Va., or Houston, Tex., or any other place in the country—I say we ought to make very clear to the War Assets Administration that wherever possible those facilities should be disposed of in a manner that will make possible their use for employment purposes and thus keep them available as potential defense and national security plants.

Of course that is closely related to this problem of maintaining a United States Employment Service at an efficient and effective level, because I do not think we can fairly risk dispensing with the Service which is the only efficient Service equipped to handle our manpower problems in time of emergency.

It is being charged, Mr. President, that the reckless cuts in the appropriations which have been made by the House in this budget are part of an attempt to nullify and abolish all the labor and social legislation of the past 14 years. For myself, and I believe for many Members of the Congress—and I think I speak certainly for a great many citizens who voted the Republican ticket in the last election—this is not truly the position of the Republican Party. We have always been a party and we must not cease being a party which believes in and stands for sound progressive social legislation. We recognize, I think, as a party, and we should recognize as a party the importance of working out a friendly and cooperative program between the Federal Government and the States in the administering of sound, social, progressive legislation. I think one of our chief quarrels with the New Deal has not been so much to the objectives of certain social legislation of the New Deal, but disagreements over the administering of the legislation that seeks those objectives. The fight has been between an over-centralized Government and the operation of Government on a local level working in cooperation with a friendly Federal Government. That is why I am pleading here again, as I did on this issue last year, that we recognize that in the handling of the employment problems of the country we are not dealing with a problem that is either State or Federal. It is dual in nature. I think that not only sound Republican policy, but sound Government policy should dictate that we not only continue the type of administrative set-up that we adopted

last year in the Seventy-ninth Congress, but that we appropriate the necessary funds for its efficient management.

The Republican candidate in 1944 did not pledge himself to repeal or nullify by cutting off appropriations any of the legislation which was overdue in 1932 and was enacted in the years that followed. He pledged himself, and his party—and I am here today to fight for that pledge as I understand it—to keep that type of legislation, and to improve it, and make its administration more efficient in the interests of the wage earners, employers, consumers, and all the groups and segments of our population.

Knowing the junior Senator from California and his deep interest in the development of the Pacific coast as the new frontier of this great advancing Nation facing on the new markets of the Pacific Basin, I am confident that, as chairman of the Senate subcommittee handling the USES appropriation, he will look at these cuts with the eyes of youth and of the veterans of World War II, who went to victory on the seven seas and the world's battle fronts under the motto "We do the difficult immediately. The impossible takes a little longer." I am confident that the junior Senator from California will see to it that those of us who hold views contrary to those which have been expressed in the House by the cut on such appropriations as this one for the USES will obtain a full and fair hearing before his committee in support of such a position as I am taking here this afternoon.

We know that the size of the amount requested for the United States Employment Service of $3,900,000, which is equal to the money costs of the war for about 20 minutes, is not the real question at issue in the granting or slashing of this appropriation. Before the issue is settled I think the truth will out. Those who want this $3,900,000 cut to $900,000 do not want a dual Federal-State employment service. It seems to me they are determined to wipe out such effective service. It seems to me they are determined to break up the national economic unity into 48 different State economies warring with each other for short-range advantage in labor costs and in stagnant pools of surplus idle workers in isolated towns and villages being bought and sold like commodities on the labor markets.

I recognize that the same program for the break-up of our economic unity—for the Balkanization of the United States—is planned with respect to other appropriations, if I judge correctly what is coming out of the House appropriations. I propose to stand up and oppose that type of budgetary cut in the Senate of the United States.

I call upon every Member of this body who has faith in the future of a nation that is united economically and politically, to resist the first attack as represented in the proposal to cut the budget of the USES from $3,900,000 to far below that amount, below the operating level of the Federal service as far as its Washington office is concerned, down to a meaningless $900,000 appropriation.

Mr. President, that will only pay for the bookkeeping services in connection with transmittal of Federal funds for unreviewed, unstandardized, and irresponsible expenditure within each of the 48 States under the supervision and absolute control of 48 State employment services. In fact, Mr. President, it is my mature judgment that we cannot justify to the Federal taxpayers of this country appropriating a single dollar of their money if we do not appropriate more than $900,000 of their money for this service. As I say, it will pay only the bookkeeping charges, and we shall have no check at all upon the use that is made by the States of the money involved under the Wagner-Peyser Act.

As I stated last year, I think we have a duty, when we come to appropriate Federal tax dollars, of double-checking and seeing what use is made of those Federal tax dollars by the States for whose benefit they are appropriated.

The House has also cut the veterans' employment service budget by 34 percent. In passing, let me point out that the reduction of 34 percent in the Veterans' Employment Service will taste rather bitter on the tongues of several million veterans applying through public employment offices, who may not be able to find employment in their own towns or localities where they are now finishing their GI schooling. Do the roses which were strewn along the path of these returning veterans in a good many towns of this country fade quite so quickly in the minds of Members of Congress when it comes to appropriating money for employment services to our veterans? I point out that the veterans have the least job status, the least security of seniority and skill, and the greatest exposure to shakeouts and changes in private employment of all our workers, they may be inclined, if we do not watch out, to write down their regard by a similar or greater percentage at their first opportunity at the voting polls.

The Veterans' Employment Service should, of course, be maintained at the level requested in the original budget, and, in my opinion, should be increased even above the figure recommended by the President. Likewise, I think that at least the $3,900,000 recommended for the United States Employment Service should be maintained by the Senate, and we should insist upon its replacement in the budget when that item comes to the floor of the Senate.

I close with just another sentence or two. I think we are in the making of a political program for 1948. I think we must stand on the record that we make in the Eightieth Congress as to our appropriations for needed Federal services, the efficient functioning of which is absolutely necessary if we are to have a prosperous economy in this country. So, for the record, in order that no one can ever say that no warning flag was raised, I now state that, in my judgment, if the Republican Party continues to make the type of budget slashes that are being made on the House side in such needed services as the United States Employment Service we Republicans will be hard put in the 1948 campaign when it comes to justifying that type of Republican program.

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 (Mr. CAIN in the chair). 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 nominations of David E. Lilienthal and others to be members of the Atomic Energy Commission, together with the nomination of Carroll L. Wilson to be General Manager of the Commission.

Mr. TYDINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have no desire to yield for that purpose, unless the Senator has some other purpose in mind. If it will accommodate him, I will yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would not want the Senator to think that I would take advantage of him, but I do have another purpose in mind.

Mr. TYDINGS. With the understanding that I may have the floor after the quorum call, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assure the Senator that my purpose in suggesting the absence of a quorum is to discuss the question of a unanimous-consent agreement. I would not take advantage of the Senator for anything.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

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

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the debate on this question has proceeded at some length. It seems that Senators for and against the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit have had an opportunity to express themselves, and, under the suggestion which I should like to make, they will have further opportunity to express themselves.

I again say, Mr. President, that it is in my opinion of vital importance that the Senate reach the earliest possible determination of the question of confirmation of the nominations to the Atomic Energy Commission. The first question to be acted upon before confirmation can be acted upon is the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit with instructions. So far as I am personally concerned, I feel that that will have a substantial effect upon the attitude of the Members of the Senate insofar as final action is concerned. I do not under any circumstances want to appear as trying to curtail frank and open discussion of this subject so far as pertinent facts are concerned, but I am mindful that we shall have a night session tonight, and it has been announced that we shall have one tomorrow night if the matter is not concluded. I am also fully mindful of the fact that a strong effort will be made to bring the subject of the Greek and Turkish loans before the Senate for consideration, beginning on Monday, and that considerable debate will ensue on that question.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am wondering whether it will be possible to secure a unanimous-consent agreement along the following lines: To agree upon a time tomorrow when a vote shall be had upon the question of the motion to recommit, which has been submitted by the junior Senator from Ohio.

In order that we may discuss the matter at this time, so as to see whether there may be objection to such a request, I wish to read a proposal for a unanimous-consent agreement which I have taken up with the majority leader, the minority leader, and a number of other Senators on both sides of the aisle who are interested in this matter. The proposal is as follows:

I ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Thursday, April 3, 1947, at the hour of 5 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed without further debate to vote upon the pending motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit, with instructions, to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the nominations of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, including that of the General Manager; and in the event that the said motion is rejected, that the Senate immediately thereafter recess until Monday, April 7, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

I ask further unanimous consent that the time on tomorrow, which would be Thursday, the day above referred to, between the convening of the Senate and the hour of 5 o'clock be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the motion, to be controlled respectively the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. President, that is the unanimous-consent request which I propound for the consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request which has been stated by the Senator from Iowa?

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me inquire why the Senator inserts provision that as soon as the Senate votes tomorrow it shall stand in recess until Monday. What was the Senator's reason for including that provision?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as every Member of the Senate well knows, unanimous-consent agreements are seldom, if ever, spontaneously adopted on the spur of the moment. There has been much discussion on both sides of the aisle and among both those who are opponents and those who are proponents of this matter. I will say that the matter of adjournment until Monday was one of the controlling items that the proponents of the motion insisted be included in the unanimous-consent agreement. We felt that the interests of speed and accomplishment here would be best served by including provision for it. So far as I am concerned and, as I understand, so far as the majority leader and other Senators to whom I have talked are concerned, that is agreeable.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether he has any arrangement regarding the amount of time he will allow each Senator under the parceling-out arrangement which is included in the request.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will permit me to reply, let me say that no arrangement has been discussed in regard to the limitation of time or whether it will be a few minutes or many minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator suppose that the junior Senator from Oregon could have 20 minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think there is no question but that that could be arranged. I do not know what idea the Senator from Nebraska has about it, but I say it would be my idea that those who wish to speak against the motion to recommit should get in touch with me, and we shall put the time in a hat and try to allocate it equitably, in keeping with the approximate length of time which each Member wishes to have.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure the Senator from Iowa will be very reasonable; but I remember that not so long ago I found myself in a similar position in regard to another unanimous-consent request arrangement, and in that case I received only 5 minutes. I do not wish to be in that position tomorrow. I should prefer to have at least 20 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I hope the Senator from Oregon has sufficient confidence in me to realize that we must view the whole picture. I could not guarantee him twenty minutes, but I will stick my neck out far enough to say that perhaps I would give him 15 minutes, or perhaps 25 minutes. Of course, this evening we are having a session, and if the Senator from Oregon can get the floor, he can speak from now until we adjourn or take a recess. He will not be limited this evening, under this agreement.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not be ready until tomorrow afternoon; I am sorry. But I am sure we can work out a satisfactory arrangement.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely wish to add that if there is any question in the mind of any Senator that a little more time might be helpful, it would seem to me to be constructive to suggest that the hour of meeting tomorrow be 11 o'clock, instead of 12. I think that would be helpful.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will yield to me, let me say that before we discuss this matter further, I wish to suggest that we are having a night session tonight, and no limitation is proposed upon the length of time for discussion this evening. Any Senator who wishes to discuss this matter pro or con tonight will not be inhibited or interfered with in any way.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's understanding that if at 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon the Senate fails to adopt the motion proposed by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], then on next Monday the Senate will resume debate on these nominations?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is my hope—although I do not control the situation—that if the motion of the Senator from Ohio fails of adoption, then on Monday we shall resume consideration of the nominations. But there is no agreement as to that, at this moment, so far as I understand.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to say that in the event we take a recess, if the motion is rejected, we shall still be in executive session, when the session convenes on Monday.

Mr. ELLENDER. But I understand that the plan is to have a recess taken tomorrow at 5 o'clock or immediately after the vote is had at 5 o'clock.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is true. The Senator from Nebraska has correctly stated, as I understand, that, under the agreement, when the Senate takes a recess after the vote is taken at 5 o'clock, it will convene on Monday in executive session, and the nominations will be the order of business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request proposed by the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, paraphrasing the immortal language of Mark Antony at the bier of Julius Caesar, I do

not come either to bury or to praise Mr. Lilienthal. I do rise to discuss the Lilienthal report because after listening intently to the arguments on both sides of the aisle for the last several days I have reached the conclusion that the Lilienthal report is not quite so good as those who favor it would make it and not quite so bad as those who oppose it seem to think.

For a long while I was a member of the Atomic Energy Committee of the Senate, and it was during that first year, I think, that we met nearly every day, and had before us not only the men who had manufactured atomic energy, but the very top flight 10 or 12 or 15 scientists who had brought atomic energy into being, and we had the 3 leading scientists who had actually designed the bomb.

In order that Senators may appreciate the impulses which provoke me to speak at this time let me say that at one of those hearings there were two scientists who had participated in the manufacture of the bomb, and, as I recall, before we went into the hearing room FBI agents had pretty well searched the room, and there were FBI men at the door, so that the information we were to receive there in very earnest secrecy would not be imparted by any unusual apparatus or source to the outside world.

I became greatly impressed with this problem, and so when Mr. Lilienthal, before I left the Atomic Energy Committee of the Senate, appeared briefly a time or two in support of his plan, I took the liberty of opposing it, not feeling it was a sound solution to our own national defense or to the peace of the world. I told Mr. Lilienthal I did not think his plan was a sound one. So, with that brief word of preface, let us see what the Lilienthal plan really is, good and bad.

To start with, it is a mistake to call it the Lilienthal plan, because the plan was evolved by five men, of whom Mr. Lilienthal was only the chairman. The five so-called experts who were summoned consisted, in addition to Mr. Lilienthal, of Mr. Chester I. Barnard, president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co.; Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, of the California Institute of Technology, University of California, a name we all know in connection with the manufacture of the atomic bomb at Los Alamos, N. Mex.; Dr. Charles Allen Thomas, the vice president and technical director of the Monsanto Chemical Co.; and Mr. Harry A. Winne, the vice president in charge of the engineering policy of the General Electric Co. So, if the plan is a bad plan, these five men share its evils on their shoulders, and if it is a good plan, they share the credit with Mr. Lilienthal. This committee of experts acted under another committee, which was composed of Mr. Dean Acheson, as chairman; Vannevar Bush, James B. Conant, Leslie R. Groves, major general, United States Army, and John J. McCloy. I do not have to identify these gentlemen, because they are well known in the very large and important fields in which they daily perform their work. The Lilienthal plan, so-called, was in part prepared and created and sponsored by 10 men, and therefore it would be a mistake, in my judgment, in all fairness, as we sit here as a jury, to condemn this plan as the Lilienthal plan when it might as well be called the Conant plan, or the Oppenheimer plan, or a plan under any one of the other names that went into the creation of the plan.

My objection to the Lilienthal plan was, briefly, this: It proposed, through a series of steps, to come to the point in world affairs where all atomic energy, so-called, would be turned over to the United Nations. That is rather a generalization, but an accurate one. Coincident with that and inherent in it there was to be created an international inspection force to see that, once the plan agreed upon was put into operation and adopted, no nation would violate it. It was an honest, sincere attempt, with which I did not agree, to approach the problem of world security generally through the mechanics which I have outlined.

My reason for opposing it was, briefly, this—and I think it is the defect in the so-called Lilienthal plan which should have caused us to examine it more thoroughly than we did in our great haste to do something to avert the danger of the atomic bomb in this modern world. My objection to it was that I assumed, for the sake of argument, that the Lilienthal plan would be adopted by all the nations of the earth, and that an inspection force would be set up to see that, once it was agreed upon, no nation would violate the terms of the agreement. Then I said to myself, "Suppose they should refuse to go on with progressive disarmament from that point. What would happen?" The net result of what would happen, briefly, would be that in the process we would have imparted to the scientists of other countries the knowledge of how to make atomic energy, and when we impart that knowledge, we give away 80 percent of the knowledge of what is necessary to make an atomic bomb.

For the making of an atomic bomb briefly is divided into two general categories; category one being the manufacture of the energy, and category two taking the energy and knowing how to put it in the bomb, so that at a given point at a given time the bomb would explode. So, when we impart the knowledge, no matter how much inspection and agreement may go with the imparting of the knowledge to any other country, we have told the world 80 percent of what it needs to know to manufacture the atomic bomb. So as I visualize the evolution of the Lilienthal plan, if the world then refused to prohibit the use in warfare of disease germs, or flying missiles, or flying bombs, or artillery, or poison gases, or all the other things that have been used in modern warfare, we would have accomplished nothing. We would have left the world an armed camp. We would have left the United Nations impotent. And then if a war broke out in the future, atomic bombs would be sure to be used; for the minute that hostilities started, every nation that knew how to make the bomb—and we would have told them how to make 80 percent of it through the Lilienthal plan—would immediately as a matter of necessity proceed to manufacture atomic bombs, for fear its enemies were going to do it, and that the first nation that had them and used them would probably win the day. So all that would have been done in the process of adopting the Lilienthal plan, if evolution toward disarmament stopped there, would be to outlaw the atomic bomb between wars. It is not going to be used between wars, anyway, and if in any event it is going to be used if war comes, the plan seemed to me to represent a lot of lost motion, with elements of great danger, even if it were successfully carried through to its logical conclusion.

I thought the approach should be as follows: There should be a special disarmament conference called, devoted to one purpose only, namely, disarming the world and putting a police force at the disposal of the United Nations. The atomic bomb and atomic energy should be a part of that picture. If a schedule like that could be set up and carried out by an inspection force, with a police force at the disposal of the United Nations stronger than that of any country, then there would be some hope that the United Nations could inflict its will to keep the peace as against any aggressor who might rise up, but to proceed in a piecemeal fashion and in time of peace give away the secret to a future potential enemy, who would use it anyway, was not good sound common sense. I think I am reasonably safe in saying that when I presented rather briefly, as I am presenting it today—and I do not want to detain the Senate very long—the elements of my objection, to Mr. Baruch and others who assembled there, I think Mr. Baruch was impressed with it. But the committee decided to go ahead, on the theory that we had to make a start, and if we could make a start on atomic energy, then flying missile and disease germs and all the other things which nations have in their hip pockets, "just in case," could in turn be considered, and we would progress down the road of peace to that happy day when all weapons except small arms would be done away with, and the United Nations would have the only strong and mighty force in the world.

I did not share that point of view, but I say that those who did share it thought that they could use the plan as a beginning and then progress on from there. I think in the light of subsequent events the objections which I humbly made to this very distinguished group of scientists, Mr. Baruch and others who had been assembled, have been abundantly demonstrated to be pretty sound, although, as I recall, I was the lone dissenting voice in the original tackling of this problem.

Mr. President, I do not think Mr. Lilienthal, notwithstanding great names were associated with him in the scientific and educational and manufacturing fields, was very sound. I say that of him with no harsh or prejudicial intent. I do not think he was sound in the political and human fields, about which sometimes those of us who go out among the great masses of the people of the country, and who deal with political things, might quite often be a little better informed.

I do not think he was sound, for the reasons I have stated, and because he assumed events would shape up, which in the light of subsequent happenings have gone completely down the other road.

If the atomic bomb and atomic energy in truth are to serve mankind rather than to destroy it, every minute, every second the world postpones an approach to world disarmament under proper safeguards with proper inspection to make sure that every nation carries out over a period of time on a schedule its progression toward world disarmament—every minute and second that we lose is perhaps to doom this civilization to dust.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me proceed for a moment, and I shall yield to the Senator.

I am in total seriousness about this, and, as I have said before on the floor of the Senate, the views I am expressing in the major part are shared by some of the highest ranking Army and Navy officers.

I never thought when I came to the Senate that I would ever stand here and be an exponent of world disarmament. I thought it was impractical. I have been a strong Army and strong Navy man ever since I came here in 1922. I cannot recall that I have ever opposed, at least in its essence, any proposal to strengthen the defenses of the country.

But, Senators, sooner or later—I cannot guess any better than others can, whether it be 2 years, or 4 years, or 6 years, or 8 years, or 10 years—the day will come when we will know that country X or country Y has mastered atomic energy and the atomic bomb. And if we know that that nation has the planes with which to transport it, the peace and the safety which we share at this moment in this Chamber we shall never embrace again. We cannot visualize how we shall feel when that knowledge comes to us, and if, when we are gone, some 50 or 100 years from now, the great United States of America is still here with its great people; if its capital is still here, if its great cities like New York and Columbus and Toledo and Chicago and Baltimore and Pittsburgh are still here, they will be here only if we have been able to evolve and devise a system which will control war. There is no other way, because without such control, without the prevention of war, which it is most difficult to bring about, I admit, we face a period of complete global devastation for most of the human race.

Does anyone think the atomic bomb of 5 years from now will be the atomic bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima or on Nagasaki, or at Bikini? Not at all. I am not a scientist, and I am not giving away any secret information, but it is my considered opinion, based upon the evolution of other things that have happened in my own lifetime, that the atomic bomb of the not far-distant future will be 100 and possibly 500 times more powerful than the bombs which were dropped on those 2 cities in the Far East.

Last summer I flew over Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Like many of my colleagues—and I see the Senator from Colorado present—we saw hundreds of moving pictures of what occurred at Nagasaki and Hiroshima before we undertook the trip. Together with the Army observers, I saw the bomb come down on the fleet at Bikini, and, Senators, it was an ominous thing, but it was a crude engine of destruction compared with the bomb of the future.

Nothing would make me feel more secure, nothing would do so much to fill my soul with hope than if the President of this, the greatest nation on earth, the most powerful nation on earth, the only nation with the bomb and with the secret of atomic energy at this moment, were to call the representatives of the leading four or five nations into a single meeting which would be devoted exclusively to an effort to assure the maintenance of law and order in this world, to bring about the disarmament of all nations, and to place an adequate police force at the disposal of the United Nations. There are many things involved in such a proceeding that I do not like; but what is the alternative? The alternative is, with our life insurance policies in force, to sit in our homes or on our farms or in our places of business, while our children grow to manhood and womanhood as we plan for their future education, and to realize that in 10 or 15 or 20 years other nations will have this secret, and all the time fear will grow as inventions for the transmission of news and propaganda multiply, until, when it is all too late, we discover that we have lost everything without even making a fair trial of the other alternative.

Let us suppose the President were to call such a conference. Let us suppose any nation should fail to attend. That is what I want to know—the name of that nation. Suppose they all come, but that nation X refuses international inspection and disarmament on a proportionate scale throughout the world. That is what I want to know—the name of that nation, for the name of that nation is the name of the greatest enemy of mankind in all the days from the beginning of Christendom down to this hour.

Mr. President, I made a talk something like this a year ago in this body. As I look back over that valuable year of time which has gone I see little or nothing that has been accomplished in this world to save the children and the grandchildren of the parents of today from the holocaust which, in all possibility, is just over the horizon.

Yes, when the war was freshly over all the Allies were drinking toasts to each other and falling into each other's arms, and there developed a false sense of security. Our airplanes were scrapped willy-nilly, our plants were dismantled. I doubt whether we can put two squadrons of fighter planes in the air over Germany today.

I know America. America loves peace. It hates war. It hates the waste resulting from war both in humanity and in property. I know that having that feeling, as each year passes we will drop lower and lower and lower down in the scale of our national defense and preparedness. I came out of one world war to serve in the Congress, and I have seen that happen over and over again. But other nations are not democracies; they are not responsive to the same longings that are expressed by the American people, through their representatives in this body. They are controlled by men who declare what is best for the people and who can impose a program of military preparedness and might do so without one voice of criticism being raised. Five or 10 years from now, when we are a little further away from this war and its irritations, when perhaps the peace treaty with Japan is written and signed, when the treaty with Germany is written and signed, when our boys have all come home, we will go to our tasks, the farmer to the plow, the clerk to the counting house, the blacksmith to his forge, and we will think about Amos and Andy on the radio on Tuesday night, and the best movie in town, and how to buy a home in the suburbs, and how to win a case in the county seat that is coming up next November, and all the other things of normal life.

Now is the time for America to act. The mystery to me is why our friends, the Russians, did not accept the Lilienthal report. If they had we would in time have told them how to produce atomic energy. Of course there would have been an inspection force, I will admit, and certain safeguards thrown around it. But if we had told them that, they would not have to spend a great deal of money and time to learn the secret. They would today know 85 percent about the manufacture of atomic bombs, and the production of atomic energy.

Who were the men who proposed this plan? Some of the greatest educators in our country and some of the greatest scientists in our country.

I want to tell the Senate something about the scientists who worked on the atomic bomb. They are fine men, they are patriotic men, but they are human, just like you and just like me. The discovery of the atomic bomb is worrying them. They have created this Frankenstein. They want something done about it. In their great desire to eliminate the evils which have sprung from the production and the discovery of atomic energy they are not quite so careful as you or I who do not have on our conscience to such an extent as they have the problem of undoing the Frankensteinian aspect of this epoch-making discovery. They are not always the best ones to advise us internationally in regard to atomic energy because understandably and humanly they want to accentuate the good side, to make this discovery worth while. They are not always the best advisers in the world, because, being human and being good, they want to counter the potential good in this great discovery against the impossible evil.

No; the Lilienthal report, in my judgment, is not quite so bad as those who oppose Mr. Lilienthal say it is, because it was an attempt—a bad one, I think—but an attempt to meet this problem. It was supported by nine other eminent, honest, patriotic and successful Americans. It was not quite so good either, as its advocates on this side of the aisle would

seem to make it out to be, for the very obvious reason that if it had succeeded, and we had been able to go no further, all we would have done would have been to outlaw the atomic bomb between wars when it was not going to be used anyway, and in the process to have told our potential enemies how they might make the atomic bomb if war again did come. So I felt, without wishing to take sides in this debate, that I should make this brief explanation neither for nor against Mr. Lilienthal per se, but to bring this note of realism, and I hope fact and truth, into this discussion.

I should like again to ask my colleagues many of whom have been good enough to say, some in public, many in private, that they favor the resolution which is now pending in the Foreign Relations Committee, which asks the President to call a conference on world disarmament and world inspection, under proper safeguards, as Senators will find if they read the resolution, if they will not request the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, in particular its chairman, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], to report that resolution to the Senate and give our President support in calling such a conference. If it fails we shall have lost nothing. But it it succeeds we shall have won centuries, perhaps, for the human race. If it ultimately fails after trial, I have the firm conviction that millions of people now living on this earth are doomed to death in a quick and horrible war, more cruel in all its aspects than all the other brutalities of the human race put together. In the next war the greatest man in America in any big city will be a doctor. When the first bomb drops on New York, the Army will not take over. It will be the medical men who will lay down the law.

Mr. President, atomic bombs could even be smuggled into the Capitol in Washington in times of peace. We have seen quick attacks made in Europe. When everyone was saying, "Will there be war, or will there not," the next thing anyone knew the Germans were in Warsaw in 20 days. Then the "phoney" war came along. The French and German soldiers were facing each other, exchanging tobacco, and the French were playing mandolins and drinking champagne. In the Siegfried line the Germans were telling the French how fond they were of them. It was called a "phoney" war. The armies were not expected to fight. The French had the Maginot line. Gamelin was the greatest military man in the world. The armies sat there all winter, and we heard stories of the soldiers visiting back and forth, exchanging the best stories. All of a sudden the rush came, and France was conquered in a few months.

We were sitting quietly in our homes one Sunday when bombs were dropped on the fleet at Pearl Harbor. Fifty years from now or 20 years from now bombs may be dropped on the Capital of the United States. It is as easy as that. The President, the Vice President, and Members of the Cabinet may be killed, together with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Members of Congress. It could happen.

We are not playing with gunpowder, bows and arrows, or the cross-bow. We are not playing cat and mouse, as Drake played with the Spaniards. We are not playing with poison gas and mustard gas, which were used in World War I, or with the machine gun which then came into use on a large scale, or the French 75. We are not even playing with the fast airplanes which carried demolition bombs over Berlin, Frankfort, and Essen. We are not even playing with the flying bomb with which Hitler, 150 miles away, showered London. We are playing with something a thousand million times greater than all those things put together; and the time when we can play with it safely is becoming shorter. It may be next year that the world will learn that countries X and Y have mastered the secret of atomic energy It is always more difficult to deal with another person if one is settling a lawsuit, buying a piece of property, or running for political office, if his case is just about as strong as ours.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator in his statement point up the absolute and imperative necessity of Truman, Attlee, and King getting this program under way, as they did in November 1945?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think there is a great deal to commend the point of view that the leaders of the three nations which had most to do with the production of atomic energy and the atomic bomb were anxious to project a thought in the world which would eliminate some of the conditions which I have been describing. Whether it worked or not is not the question for the moment. The point I am making is that there was an effort, and that here there is no effort. We have virtually quit work on atomic energy, atomic-energy control, and world disarmament. The Senator knows, and I know, that the United Nations is simply a farce and a sham in a world where every nation is armed to the teeth.

We make speeches about the hope of humanity, and we extol the United Nations, as though it could keep law and order in the world, as though it could keep down a war if any nation really wanted to go to war. It has no equipment to do so. I say this not in derision. I say it in sadness. The people of this country have been lulled into a false sense of security, a feeling that there will never be another war if only the debating society continues in session in New York.

The League of Nations, whether we went into it or stayed out of it, never would have been successful in a world armed to the teeth, because it is clearly evident that nations which pledged their faith and trust in the League of Nations and then maintained large armies on the side did not really depend on the League of Nations at all. It is the same way with the United Nations. Why are we keeping an Army and Navy and an Air Force, and discussing a unification program in the Armed Services Committee of the Senate? What have we been discussing on the floor of the Senate for 3 days? We have not called it by its right name. We have not been discussing Lilienthal. We have been discussing World War III.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Why do we not return the problem of atomic energy to the military, as Bernard Baruch stated on page 103 of his report should be done?

Mr. TYDINGS. I voted to turn it over to civilians, and I think our committee was unanimous at that time, provided there were certain military safeguards.

Mr. WHERRY. Times have changed, have they not?

Mr. TYDINGS. With the stalemate which exists in world progress toward peace and order, and with the lack of an attempt to obtain real disarmament and to establish the United Nations so that it will be worth something, and so that it will mean what it says, I am thinking seriously of having to reverse my position in the light of future events. I do not want to do it.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. I want to keep on trying, because the possibilities are so horrible if we fail.

Against whom are we maintaining an Army? It is not against Nicaragua, Honduras, Panama, or Jamaica. It must be against Russia, England, France, or China, or all of them. Why are the Russians maintaining an army? Does any one suppose that they are maintaining it because they are worried about Afghanistan or Azerbaijan, or Korea? Not at all. They are maintaining it against France, Britain, America, or China. It is the same way with the British.

The five great allies have all subscribed to the United Nations Charter, which bristles with the ten commandments of love, sweetness, and light. "We will never wage war again as a matter of national policy. We will settle all disputes by peaceful means. War is an abominable thing. We pledge our faith and trust to the principles enumerated above." The Charter is signed by the United States, Russia, France, England, China, and other nations. Then back home they go to get large appropriations for intelligence services and larger air forces. They must have the secret of the atomic energy and the atomic bomb; they must have conscription in peacetime; they must have navies. What becomes of that little piece of paper floating on the wings of time? It is merely a pious and passing hope of mankind.

The purpose of these remarks—and I have spoken longer than I intended—is to say that Mr. Lilienthal is one of many eminent men who thought this procedure was the proper one at the time the plan was presented, and I am sure he acted in the best of faith and with hope for the welfare of the country. I was one man who did not agree with it, and I

do not agree with it now, but I do not think we should condemn Mr. Lilienthal on that account. If it had worked, maybe we would have gone on through the successive steps I have mentioned. The important point is that it did not work; and I am not sure that it was not a good thing for us that it did not work if it was not going any further than it has. I know that was not Mr. Lilienthal's intention.

I should like to have the men who have children, and those who speak for the women and the children of the country, ask the Committee on Foreign Relations of this body to report the resolution to which I have referred. Let us request the President to call such a conference and find out what nations are unwilling, in spite of their pledged word, to live under the terms of the United Nations, and we shall know where we stand. If they all agree to live up to it and carry out its high principles and then pursue actions which make that course possible of realization, we shall have accomplished a great deal. If they fail and we learn why, and who caused the failure, we shall have learned a great deal.

I do not like the strategy of nations having one foot in the United Nations and one foot in the barrack room and one hand on the gun just in case. What shall we do about it in this the sovereign representative Chamber of this Republic? Are we willing to see time pass on until next year, if we are all alive? If I am back here I shall be making the same speech again next year.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to state a thought of mine and also to repeat that which I have stated on many occasions.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should welcome it.

Mr. THYE. Atomic energy will be known to the other nations of the world just as soon as we perfect it here. It is only a matter of time. I made the statement a year and a half ago as Governor of the State of Minnesota that it is only a matter of time before mankind will know the secrets of atomic energy, and then it becomes only a question of who strikes first as to who shall control the affairs of the world. Insofar as atomic energy is concerned, I fully concur that mankind will commit murder in order to obtain the secrets of atomic energy if they are at war, and they will be paid handsomely to do exactly that. It may be our secret today and some other nation's secret tomorrow. We had better prepare ourselves and know that we are going to control it by international police power in order that mankind shall not be struck in the manner in which the Senator has so ably described.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator for his invaluable support. But for fear I may be misunderstood, let me say I do not believe in disarmament by example. We had a taste of that in 1922, when we had a naval disarmament conference. I am not arguing for that kind of disarmament at all. It is not worthy of the name. I want an arrangement which will run the whole gamut and will be carried out by successive steps under the eyes of competent inspectors, over a period of time, until the day arrives when every nation is playing the game from the point of disarmament, and until simultaneously there is raised and placed at the disposal of the United Nations, a force sheriff suitably and well equipped to keep the peace.

But, Mr. President, we cannot argue this matter 5 years from now, perhaps, or 8 or 10 years from now. Our opportunity then will be gone. I am not a pacifist who believes that we can do away with national defense and keep out of war. I am willing in a fair game to put my cards on the table, so to speak, if we can get others to put their cards on the table, and constitute a world of law and order and establish a civilized community in which people can turn a great amount of money and great effort to hospitals, schools, roads, and all the other things which contribute so much to the progress, civilization, and welfare of mankind.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows of one single instance in history in which a nation, having developed a new instrument of warfare, has been able to keep the secret of that instrument to itself for as long a period as 5 years, once it has been employed in warfare?

Mr. TYDINGS. It never has been so in the whole history of the world. The history of weapons, from the spear on down, demonstrates that once a nation has used a particular maneuver or weapon or means of warfare, it has been employed in the next war by other nations. For example, the crossbows of the Englishman, as we know, withstood the mailed might of France in one of the great battles of history. Does the Senator believe that after that exhibition of the value of the crossbow, immediately upon the decision rendered on that battlefield, the defeated nation did not take up the crossbow to eliminate mailed might? Of course it did.

So we could go on through time. The Senator is right. It is only a question of how long, and I would rather, while we have all this might, not be the bully; I would rather try to use it so that my good intentions could not be questioned if I were moving with caution and courage and fairness toward an objective that would be good for all mankind.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, England forced the invention of the crossbow by cutting down all of the yew trees of sufficient length to make long bows.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. But, to get back to the point which I wished to make earlier, it would be only the blindest folly on the part of the United States to assume that other great nations of the world will not be able to make atomic bombs within 2 or 3 or 5 years' time.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. When I talk with friends in the Senate, Democrats or Republicans, or when I talk with friends outside the Chamber, and the subject of the atomic bomb comes up, the question always is, "How long do you think it will be before country X or country Y or country Z will know how to make the atomic bomb?" One says he thinks it will be so long, and another says it will be somewhat longer, or that Mr. So-and-So or General So-and-So, they heard, said it would be so long. But let me remind the Senate that it is going to be 1 year less from now on than it was a year ago, and it is going to be 2 years less a year from now than it was 2 years ago—less and less and less.

There may be men who honestly disagree with my proposal. It did not spring like Minerva full-blown from the brain of Jove. I have thought a great deal about it. I know that when I served on the Atomic Energy Committee of this body, together with my good friend and able representative of the State of Iowa, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], both of us serving together, many nights when we went home after hearing much of this secret testimony we thought, "What in the world can we do about this devilish thing which has such potential possibilities for good and such indescribable possibilities for evil?" As a result of all that thinking, I have formulated this plan. I assure the Senate it was hard thinking, and I knew I would be somewhat laughed at as a visionary to propose such a plan, but I did it only because I could think of nothing better. God knows, Mr. President, if there is in this Republic any man who has a better plan than this, he has my wholehearted support. But I say we are either going down that road and have national and international survival or we are going to face circumstances that are indescribable.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question in the nature of an observation?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Has the Senator considered—I am sure he has—that it took a totalitarian economic organization to produce the atomic bomb? We did not produce it within the functions of what we call a free-enterprise society.

Mr. TYDINGS. A civil economy, so to speak.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It took the pressure of war, under the compulsions of war and under the power of a totalitarian organization which is essential in modern warfare, to produce the atomic bomb and to command the services and materials and fidelity by way of security and otherwise that had to inhere in connection with the bomb that blew up in the desert.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If we now delay or fail to do the very thing which, in general, the Senator has been talking about—in short, to find a solution for the control of this great force internationally, so as to keep it from being used for destruction—then we may face the very real possibility that if, as, and when another nation discovers how to make this very bomb, we may be forced against our will into a totalitarian state of war production in order to protect our

own borders or even to have any semblance of protection against possible invasion. In other words, if we have to go into an atomic-production race, at this moment I see no possibility of carrying it on other than in a type of totalitarian economy with the same measure of compulsion which had to be brought to bear during the last war in order to produce the atomic bomb in the first instance.

Mr. TYDINGS. I endorse what the Senator has said, because I would say we are now in an atomic-bomb race. Every nation which can do so is experimenting with atomic energy. Every one of them that can afford to do it is doing it. There may be members of the Senate who agree with me. I want to do something about it. I am impatient by nature, particularly when I face a problem. Probably that is a weakness, but I am certainly impatient about this matter.

In my opinion we are marking time, while time is drifting on and on and on. Perhaps if this Chamber survives, 20 or 25 years from now someone will dig up this speech and will say—and please pardon the immodesty, which I do not intend by this remark, "Maybe if the Senate had acted then this great catastrophe which has come might have been averted."

If Senators agree with me I ask them to act. Or if they have a better plan, I ask them to tell me what it is and I will agree with them. But in heaven's name let us not sit here twiddling our thumbs. We represent the sovereign people of this Republic. They look to us for leadership and they look to us to promulgate policies. We do not have to wait on anyone in the Republic to set in motion what we think is going to be for the good of the people of the Nation. If Senators agree with me, I ask them to write a letter to the Foreign Relations Committee of this body and request action on the resolution pending there. Let us debate it on this floor. If we devote to that matter half the time we have given to the appointments now before us we shall have made a greater contribution to civilization than we are going to make by considering the appointments themselves.

I want action. I am not content to sit here and see this prairie fire come closer and closer, and admit that the Congress of the United States is impotent. After all, God Almighty gave us brains and arms and feet and hearts, and I hope he gave us courage. Let us face the situation forthrightly. Let us have in this world a showdown as to whether we are to live by the tooth and the claw, or whether mankind in the various nations is to have a chance to live under a government of law and order, maintained by a sheriff competent to keep law and order in the world.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to say to the Senator from Maryland that I have approved his resolution; I did so when I first heard of it. But, like many other persons, I, too, talk about the weather and do not do anything about it. Many of us do that. But as a direct result of what the Senator has said, most certainly I shall write to the Foreign Relations Committee and urge that action be taken on the Senator's resolution.

Let me ask the Senator a question. In order properly to police the world and be able to have an authority that can arrest anyone, anywhere in the world, does not the Senator feel that it is also necessary to call a convention to consider ways and means of turning the United Nations organization, which the Senator has called a debating society——

Mr. TYDINGS. I say that, not in derision, but in sadness——

Mr. TAYLOR. I say that myself. I say I am all for the United Nations. I voted for it—but simply as something better than nothing; that was my attitude toward it.

But does not the Senator feel that we should call an international conference, having in mind the objective of turning the United Nations into a general world government with elected representatives, and thus ending the impotence of the United Nations?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator at this point. I understand the purport of his inquiry, and it is a proper one, and I shall answer him.

First of all, I thank him for his support, and I am glad to have it. I shall appreciate any support he can give, because I am interested in what we are trying to accomplish.

I do not think it would be wise to try to eat the whole cake in one bite. One of the reasons why we often fail as human beings is that we set out to conquer Rome in 1 day, and that is a rather large undertaking. There is no reason in the world why we cannot have a disarmament conference, and it might be a stepping stone toward what the Senator from Idaho has in mind.

Mr. TAYLOR. It would be.

Mr. TYDINGS. But people who would be for one thing would not necessarily be for something else. The reason the United Nations is in the shape it is in today is that it has 85 or 90 different problems before it, but it is not working on a single one of them.

That is why I want a separate conference which can work on this one problem. I shall have to answer the Senator that, for the time being, at least, I would not favor incorporating so broad a horizon into this work, which already is so difficult that the addition of any other controversial matter would, in my judgment, kill it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator does not think it would be wise, then, to call a separate constitutional convention to consider the ways and means of turning the United Nations into a genuine representative world government?

Mr. TYDINGS. If we had world disarmament and put a police force at the disposal of the UN, I visualize 99 percent of the things we should then do would follow as a matter of logic. But if we attempt to do those first, we will not accomplish the major objective, without which the UN will never be any good, namely, to make it superior in its ability and authority to keep the peace in the world.

Mr. TAYLOR. I agree with the Senator in that wholeheartedly. As the Senator said, Rome was not built in a day.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not taking issue with the Senator. I merely think it is not opportune at this time to enter into that particular field.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have often thought what kind of a body the United States Senate would be if we were appointed by the Governors of the various States to come here, and we could not sit down and talk with each other man to man, and thrash matters out. When a question was put before us, there would be no need of debating it, we would just go to the cloakroom and put in a call for the governor and say, "How do I vote, Governor?" He would not be here to look out over the Nation, he would be back in the State—my Governor, in Idaho—and he would instruct me from the point of view of Idaho how to vote.

I believe the United Nations is in exactly that predicament, so that when the matter of Greek and Turkish assistance came up, I do not believe Mr. Austin was free to act on his own initiative. He had to come and see the President, who appointed him, and get his views in the matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have said about all I care to say on this subject, and will hasten to my conclusion. Since the birth of Christ 1,947 years have rolled by. Progress was very slow for the first 1,900 years, more or less, and terrifically fast for the last 47. Transportation and communication are almost instantaneous. I understand the Army feels it will soon have a plane that will travel a thousand miles an hour. The atomic bomb is no longer a theory; it is a hard, cold fact. The one atomic bomb I saw drop at Bikini was a relatively crude affair, but I visualize a hundred of them, in my imagination, of the improved and modern type.

I tried to visualize what damage they could do to New York, Chicago, Moscow, Paris, or London. I have tried to visualize the time when atomic bombs would be a part of the equipment of the armies of the great nations of the world. Perhaps I was overimaginative, perhaps I am a descendant of Jules Verne, but it seemed to me that man had lost his ability to challenge, that he had lost belief in himself, that he said, "This is tremendous," and ran to the cyclone cellar and hid, instead of standing up to the new force, devising a means to utilize it for the benefit of civilization, and to protect humanity from the dire consequences of its abuse.

I hope that these brief remarks may challenge the reflection of those who have been good enough to sit here and listen, and I hope that out of these reflections may come support for the proposal that is pending in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I am hopeful that in this session we can show enough leadership, and so keep abreast of the times in which we are living, that the Senate may request the President of the United States to call a world conference to achieve world disarmament, under proper safeguards, not

disarmament by example, but world disarmament, with a world inspection force, and with the United Nations equipped to keep the peace thereafter.

If the conference should fail, if the goal is not attainable, I want to know it, because my course will be to do everything I can in such a world, where peace is not attainable, to protect the institutions and the people of the United States of America from what I believe might be an instantaneous conflagration coming without notice, as Pearl Harbor came to us, and Hitler's invasion came to Poland and to France—to protect them as best I can in the time available, with the implements and the means that are still at hand, rather than to sit here uttering pious words and empty proverbs, and putting my trust in an institution that is no stronger than the shell of a newly laid egg.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments made in the Senate in the last few days with respect to whether or not the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal should be confirmed by this body.

Soon after the President appointed Mr. Lilienthal and Mr. Sumner Pike—and I mention Mr. Sumner Pike because he is embraced in the motion now pending to send all the appointments back to the committee—as members of the Atomic Energy Commission, which may prove to be the most important administrative body ever created by the Congress, I announced that I could not agree with the President as to the fitness and qualifications of these two gentlemen. My objection to the appointment of Mr. Lilienthal and Mr. Pike was based on the well-known philosophy of government held by these gentlemen, which had been so vividly demonstrated by their previous activities as government administrators. The committee hearings and the discussion of those hearings on the floor of the Senate confirmed and emphasized the fact that these men are not imbued with those principles of constitutional government so necessary to safeguard the welfare of the United States in administering the congressional policy concerning atomic energy.

Mr. Lilienthal has had a long career as an administrator of one of our experiments in the field of Government ownership. He is an outstanding exponent of Government control of natural resources, including electric power, and the Government ownership of the business of the distribution and sale of such power.

Mr. Sumner Pike had a long and well-known career as an administrator in OPA. He believes in the theory of a governmentally controlled economy. Upon leaving the OPA, Mr. Pike made a public statement, in which he said that Federal price control on petroleum and petroleum products would have been removed by the OPA long since if it had not been for the fear of the Federal administrators that State authorities would so restrict production of petroleum as to cause an increase in prices. This statement reflects the essence of his thinking on the subject of a centrally controlled economy.

Atomic energy is both a military weapon and a potential source of great industrial, commercial, and social advancement. If we conclude that its military value is paramount in these times of world uncertainty, then, for the present, the secret of harnessing this great power should be left in the hands of the military. It seems to me there can be no argument on this score. If atomic energy is to be looked upon at the present as a military weapon, then the Congress has no more business taking the control of this weapon away from the military than we would in taking the control from the military of dozens of other highly important, secret weapons. In my own view, we would be extremely wise in treating atomic energy as a military weapon for the present, and so long as we are confronted with the international adjustments that are constantly arising as an aftermath of the war. The economic and social stamina of every nation that has survived the recent war has been seriously impaired. New international policies have come into being on every hand. No man can say what destiny the future holds for the world.

It has wisely been suggested that for the present, at least, the control of atomic energy should be recommitted to the military. Certainly, we can make no mistake in this decision.

If, however, we are to adopt the policy, now or in the future, of undertaking a civilian administration of atomic energy, then it is all important that the members of any such commission shall enjoy the faith and confidence of the public. They must be men whose ideals are grounded in the theory and practical operation of our constitutional form of government. They must believe wholeheartedly in the constitutional protection of the private enterprise and effort of the individual. They must understand that government ownership and a governmentally controlled economy are the antithesis of our form of government.

I have heard it argued that it should be the policy of the Senate to go as far as possible in the acceptance and confirmation of personal appointees of the President. I think it should be recognized that in this case, as pointed out by the junior Senator from Ohio on last Friday, Mr. Lilienthal and the other members of this Commission are not appointed by the President as members of his official family. Mr. Lilienthal and the other members of the Commission are appointed to fill positions created by the Congress itself, and to carry out a specifically defined policy of the Congress.

This Commission, in effect, is a mere agency of the Congress to carry out the congressional intent and policy that have been established. In this case, and in all such cases, the legislative branch assumes a responsibility equal to that of the President with respect to the appointive power. To accept such Presidential appointees without question would be shirking a self-imposed responsibility of the legislative branch to the detriment of the public interest and contrary to what the public expects of the Congress.

Mr. President, the basic determining factor of Mr. Lilienthal's qualifications to serve as chairman of this important Atomic Energy Commission has resolved itself into one of public confidence. It certainly cannot be said that a substantial majority of the people accept Mr. Lilienthal's philosophy of the superiority of public ownership versus private enterprise, or Mr. Pike's theory of a controlled economy as against our traditional competitive system. It certainly cannot be said by anyone that doubts and fears have not been raised as to Mr. Lilienthal's sympathy, and even his active support of people generally classed as fellow travelers and tools of the Communist Party. Let us not forget that the Communist Party believes in the declared principle of the destruction of our capitalistic system and an overthrow of our form of government. It has been pointed out here on the floor of the Senate that since the Atomic Energy Commission was appointed by the President, testimony was heard by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as to the kind of men that had already been employed by the Commission. From the testimony it appears that one of these employees, Mr. John L. Burling, has been charged with giving to an unauthorized individual information from Government files concerning an enemy alien, while he was a member of the Office of Alien Enemy Control under the Department of Justice.

Mr. Herbert S. Marks, general counsel of the Commission, previously employed in a legal capacity at TVA and other Government agencies, is reported to be "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 is believed by some to be "completely a self-server." He has spoken in defense of "left-wing individuals and groups." He was refused a commission in the United States Navy because he did not possess "the requisite qualifications for appointment." Every opportunity appears to have been given to show whether this had reference to physical qualifications, but no such showing was made to the committee. Other testimony, however, shows that Mr. Marks apparently served in the Army under the direct command of Col. Walker L. Cisler, overseas, as a part of the Public Utilities Staff of the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Forces. This would not indicate that he was denied a commission in the Navy because of "physical disabilities."

It has been pointed out that this Commission, although not yet confirmed by the Senate, has proceeded to employ and set up a personnel without regard to the civil-service laws or the salary schedules of other departments of Government. It has been pointed out that the chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, during the committee hearings on these appointees, requested of the President that he direct any investigating agencies of

the executive or administrative branches of government to put into the hands of the committee all information possessed by any such agency or branch bearing upon each of the appointees and the general manager of the Commission, and explained to the President that the members of the Senate section of the committee believed that "justifiable criticism can be directed if we do not exhaust all reasonable avenues for the securing of information upon which to base our final recommendation." This request was refused by the President on the ground that it has been the established policy that all investigative reports are confidential documents of the executive department of the Government and that congressional or public access to them would not be in the public interest. The President further stated by his letter of March 1 to the chairman of the Senate section of the joint committee that the records of the investigating agencies of the executive branch of the government were checked at the time the appointees in question were named to the Commission and that no derogatory information was contained in any report; that before answering the chairman's letter a current check had been made of the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army and Navy Intelligence Departments, and the Intelligence Section of the Manhattan district, and that no derogatory information with reference to any of the appointees or with reference to the general manager of the Commission was contained in the files of these agencies.

It is difficult to understand the President's statement in this connection in view of the fact that the Navy files disclosed that Mr. Marks, general counsel of the Commission, was refused a commission in the Navy because he did not possess the requisite qualifications for appointment.

It is also difficult to understand the President's statement in this connection in view of the report made to the committee concerning Mr. John L. Burling, who has been employed as an attorney on the legal staff of the Atomic Commission.

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

Mr. MOORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator know that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has never been requested by the Attorney General or the President of the United States to investigate Mr. Lilienthal or any of his associates on the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. MOORE. We have no evidence to that effect.

Mr. MALONE. I was informed today of that fact by the Attorney General himself, that no request had ever been made by the Attorney General or the President of the United States or their representatives for the FBI to make such an investigation of either Mr. Lilienthal or any other member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. MOORE. I do not think the President's letter indicates whether or not there was an investigation by the FBI of these appointed Commissioners. It says that he has been told by the FBI and other agencies that there is nothing derogatory.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. I can state with certainty that the Attorney General, Mr. Tom Clark, informed me today that no such investigation had ever been requested or had ever been made, to his knowledge, by the FBI, and that so far as the FBI is concerned, there would simply be, in the case of Mr. Lilienthal and his associates on the Commission, a name file; a "name file" meaning merely a file with no investigative information whatever.

It is further my information that the FBI is not entitled to initiate and can not initiate such an investigation, on its own volition.

Mr. MOORE. I think that is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Furthermore, since the Attorney General and the President of the United States are the only authorities entitled to request such an investigation, and since that has never been done, then there is no file on Mr. Lilienthal, and the President of the United States is therefore technically correct no doubt when he says that there is nothing in the file derogatory to Mr. Lilienthal, since there has been no opportunity to investigate him.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. President, the charges and countercharges that have been made with respect to Mr. Lilienthal and his associates are such as to shake the public confidence in these men, and for that reason, if no other, it would be a serious mistake for the Senate to confirm them for the tremendously important positions to which they have been appointed. Men of wide experience and who enjoy public respect and confidence are available. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] yesterday suggested several names of individuals to whom the President could have no objection, and who, I am sure, would be accepted by the public with a feeling of confidence in their Americanism.

I suggest to the Senate now that if these present appointees are confirmed, it will result in raising fear and suspicion in the public mind, and will result in continued attacks upon the Commission that will impair its effective operation. This situation will be particularly aggravated by the approval of Mr. Lilienthal, but I include the entire membership of the Commission, because their activities on the Commission have already been such that they cannot escape the censure of which I speak.

The division of the Members of the Senate is such as to remove this matter from a political or partisan consideration.

I urge upon every Member of the Senate to approach this question with the future welfare of the Nation as a paramount consideration.

I say to the Senate now that it is not good business to employ men for these important key positions in Government on which there is such a wide public division of feeling.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, 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:

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

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

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I am very much pleased that today we have had a most illuminating and thorough-going debate on the paramount problem of our time. I indeed regret that this debate did not occur a year ago. I had the distinct honor and privilege of being asked to address the joint Army-Navy War College last September. The invitation came at a very inconvenient time for me, but I thought that my duty required that I respond to it. For 4 hours I was before an audience of approximately 400 Army and Navy officers, from lieutenants to generals and full admirals. I talked for about an hour and a half; I answered questions for at least 2½ hours. I was indeed pleased to see that that body of men on whom our future security, from the standpoint of military leadership, depends, seemed to understand that which happened on the desert of New Mexico in July 1945. I must say, in all frankness and regretfully, that I am sure they understood the implications, military and political, much better than does our American citizenry as a whole, and perhaps better than does the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, when the bomb dropped on Hiroshima from an airplane manned by 11 men, and the plane sped away, it left behind it a scene of indescribable ruin, death, decay, and confusion, and there were certain things and certain concepts of a military nature that absolutely and positively disappeared in the same fashion and form as the Roman phalanx has disappeared from the military operations of our time. When that happened, Mr. President, the conceptions of generalship, the conceptions of strategy, military frontiers, strategic railways, armies—yes, and navies as we have

known them—became distinctly obsolescent if not obsolete.

I do not intend to belabor the description of what this force is—we all know about it—except to ask Senators what they think would have happened when we massed our troops for invasion on the southeast coast of England if Hitler had possessed even three atomic bombs, two atomic bombs, or even one atomic bomb of the kind that we dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and they had been dropped on that concentration of troops. It would probably have resulted in not one man reaching the coast of Normandy. If while Hitler was on his death bed in 1945, or as late as March, he had possessed some atomic bombs, even though the death rattle was in his throat, it is my firm conviction—not only mine, but that of many eminent military men with whom I have discussed this subject—that he would have risen and stricken the armies of the Allies and dispersed and defeated them.

The Bikini tests have been referred to. Only two have been held. The first one seemed to disappoint some who anticipated that the world itself would end. The effects were horrible enough. I remember commenting on it to one of my friends when he said that there were some battleships left afloat. I agreed that that was true, but I said that 140,000,000 people could not live on battleships.

When the second test was held, the water-level test, a scene of indescribable destruction and confusion was created on the naval armada; and, Mr. President, if the third or deep-water test had been held not a single ship would have survived in that lagoon, because according to scientific testimony the force of the explosion beneath the water would have opened the seams of every ship and plummeted it to the bottom.

We are dealing with the force which is contained in the sun. We have opened the heart of nature. I sometimes regret that we have done so, because I am obsessed with the fear that we shall not match our physical accomplishment with our actions in the field of ethics and morality, law, and order. Mankind has finally reached an achievement by which he may destroy himself. The other night I was looking in the Book of Revelations. I saw the prediction that man would destroy himself by fire. I could not but wonder whether we had achieved the first step in that horrible prediction.

Mr. President, as the Members of the Senate know, I early became acquainted with the implications of that which we have done. Yesterday I referred to the fact that on September 6, 1945, the first day the Congress reconvened after the end of the Japanese War, I made a speech which did not take me more than 10 minutes to deliver; and in it I said there were two obvious things which we had to do. The first was to put this discovery domestically under national control, so that fissionable material would be used in the public good, so that we might try to harness it for the benefit of mankind. I pointed out that it was unthinkable that we should permit this force to be handed out to any private citizen or private corporation. I believe in free enterprise. The free enterprise system has been rather good to me. But it seemed only obvious that we could not permit the existence of private armies or private navies in the hands of any individual or any corporation.

The second principle which I enunciated in my speech on that day was that what we had done some other nation would do in a given length of time; and that when we ceased to have a monopoly on the making of atomic bombs, America would be in mortal danger. I said we were in the position of a man who had money in the bank and who knew that inflation was inevitably coming and that when it came his money would amount to nothing more than pieces of paper; and that, being in such a position, we were in effect, closing our eyes to what was coming, and were watching what we had and letting it become worthless, instead of using it to buy something, while it still had buying power. So on that day I said it was absolutely and imperatively necessary to get this force under control. I advocated that it be done through an international inspection system.

As a result of that speech and of a bill which was introduced by me on that day, with the very great aid and assistance of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who now is the distinguished President pro tempore of this body, we succeeded in forming a special committee to consider both the domestic and the international control problems which arose out of what we had done. All Senators know, I am sure, that we were most devoted to our duty. We spent weeks and weeks and weeks, hour after hour, listening to the testimony. We even went so far—for the first time in congressional history—as to go to school. That was the first time in the history of Congress that a senatorial committee ever went to school. We went to the Bureau of Standards, and there we tried to learn at least the basic essentials of what we were attempting to deal with. We faced the blackboard. Some of the most distinguished scientists of this land tried to implant in our minds some knowledge of nuclear physics which would enable us to appreciate the nature of that which had been accomplished.

Mr. President, I shall not at this moment dwell on the domestic legislation, except to say that I do not suppose any piece of legislation in the history of Congress has been more thoroughly tested and argued over and interpreted than the legislation which was finally agreed upon unanimously by the committee of which I had the honor to be chairman—the Committee on Atomic Energy which was considering the problem to which I now refer.

I see before me now the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. Let me pay tribute to him, fine lawyer that he is, for his suggestions and arguments and the consideration which he gave, hour after hour, in our room on the first floor of the Senate Office Building, in hammering out our differences—and they were many and serious—in connection with the formulation of this act. When the bill finally emerged from the committee, it contained things which the Senator from Colorado did not like. Yet the Senator from Colorado was the strongest advocate of the provisions contained in that bill, which for the first time enunciates principles which never before have been adopted in our American system of government. The Senator from Colorado knows that I did not particularly enjoy having them incorporated in the measure, either. But we were faced with the compulsion of certain facts which absolutely demanded that we do that which was done.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to confirm, so far as my own personal philosophy is concerned, what the Senator has said about the revolutionary character of the bill. I would not possibly tolerate the application of that bill in any other governmental direction that I can think of, and it was made very clear, during all the debate and all the proceedings, that we were tailoring a bill to fit this new and unprecedented energy, and that it was not to be considered a precedent in other directions.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, if Senators will examine the record of the debate on that bill—and I shall never forget it—they will find that I stood next to the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from Colorado stood in front of me, and he made exactly that observation, and I agreed with him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, for the first time we have said that a man in the United States cannot take out a patent on a patentable idea; we have barred him from taking out a patent on a new weapon utilizing atomic energy, and we have barred the granting of any patent on the production of fissionable material. For the first time we have compelled the compulsory licensing of a patent granted by the Patent Office of the United States. In this bill for the first time we have said to a governmental commission, "You must not issue a license until you make a complete study of what the articles or products manufactured under the patent would mean when that new invention is introduced into American economy; and you cannot issue a license until you report on that matter to the Congress of the United States." The Congress is given 90 days in which to make up its mind regarding whether any further legislation is necessary in view of the development, let us say, of an atomic-energy locomotive.

Mr. President, we also considered the international question. The other evening I was interested in rereading the hearings before our special committee.

I came across a passage which I put into the RECORD a few days ago from the hearing held on December 3. We were discussing international control, and I wish to read to the Senate what I said, because the Acheson-Lilienthal report, which I shall defend, had its genesis right there on page 173 of the hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Atomic Energy. This was the genesis of it. Dr. Bush was on the stand, and I said:

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 the 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 and 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 omitted to state that on November 15 the now famous three-power declaration was signed by Mr. Truman, Mr. Attlee and Mr. King, and in that declaration they acknowledged certain fundamental facts which have been the guide of what I thought until today was the thinking of our Government on this question. Of course, underlying all efforts to get international control are the following salient facts:

(a) This is the all-controlling weapon. Joe Stalin does not think so; at least, that is what he said. Last September he said, "Well, I think people are exaggerating their estimate of what it is." I suggested in a newspaper interview that it might be well if Mr. Stalin were to consult the relatives of the dead at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, that I hardly thought he would find them in agreement. I further said that perhaps his lowly estimate of the capacities of the bomb were somewhat influenced by the fact that he did not have it yet.

It is the all-controlling weapon, and any military man who is worth his salt will say so. Despite the assertions of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] this afternoon, Mr. President, there is no defense against it, and unfortunately and unhappily our scientists and military men do not foresee the possibilities of a defense.

Mr. President, now comes the second and probably the most fundamental and salient fact of all, that is, regardless of what the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] believes—and I must say to him I wish I could believe with him—it is impossible for any nation to maintain for a long period of time a monopoly on this death-dealing device. That Russia will in time secure the bomb is as inevitable as that we are sitting in this Chamber this evening.

Mr. President, what I and others, shall I say, who have studied the problem think and know is that before any other nation, especially Russia, gets the bomb it is absolutely essential that we get this force under effective control. Mind you, I said "effective control."

I have heard Senators declare on this floor that we should outlaw the bomb. That is exactly the position Joe Stalin takes. I refuse to take that chance with America. For my part, I am not going to vote for any outlawing of the bomb, and trust to the chance of any other nation using it against us.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator made reference a few moments ago to the position Stalin takes with reference to the importance of the bomb and atomic energy. The Senator said Stalin did not believe it was the supreme weapon. Does he believe Stalin is sincere in that statement?

Mr. McMAHON. Of course not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator think any American who knows anything about the effect of the bomb would be deceived by such a statement?

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator that Stalin does not deceive me, and at the time the statement was made I was chairman of the joint committee, and I thought it was incumbent upon me to tell him that at least we were not "falling" for the statement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. I believe the statement is a sample of the tactics being employed, and I think the only solution of the great problem which now confronts us is to determine with respect to whether we can have disarmament with world inspection, with police power with authority to make a world inspection, to know that all nations stay disarmed, atomically and otherwise. If we do not achieve that, and achieve it soon, the United Nations and everything else will fall by the wayside.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. Let me interject at this point something which has been brought to my mind by what the Senator has just said. I want the Senate to note the qualification I put in the statement, because it is all-important.

I say that if Gromyko uttered the last word, 4 weeks ago tomorrow, on the international control of atomic energy, if the door has been finally closed, on that day the United Nations died.

Why do I say that? I say that if an association of nations which has gathered for the primary purpose of organizing law and order and peace, cannot solve the basic and first problem that hangs like a dark cloud over the minds of men—then its raison d'etre has disappeared.

We are talking these days about the fact that we may get into an atomic armaments race. The Senator from Delaware was absolutely accurate when he said that we are in an atomic armaments race now. It is no secret to our own people that all the governments of the world are seeking to produce an atomic bomb. They are seeking desperately to produce it because they realize that the possession of the bomb gives to the United States the controlling weapon of war.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. In all the conversations and debates it seems to be generally understood and taken for granted that, of the entire 51 nations in the United Nations organization, if any one of them, other than the United States, should discover the atomic-bomb secret, they will use it upon us. Why is that assumption made?

Mr. McMAHON. As I understand the Senator's question, it carries an implication that he feels it does not make any difference whether other nations have atomic bombs or not.

Mr. MALONE. No; the Senator misunderstood me. Why does the Senator from Connecticut, and why do other Senators—I have listened very carefully all day—assume that as soon as another nation, that is also a member of the United Nations, discovers the secret of the atomic bomb, it will immediately attack us?

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator that I am aware, just as he is, of the exacerbation of feelings and sentiments, and the tension that is mounting daily between this country and Russia.

Mr. MALONE. Why?

Mr. McMAHON. The fault, certainly in the atomic-energy field, in my opinion is Russia's. I shall develop why I feel that way. There are other reasons which time does not permit me to discuss with the Senator now.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Why is feeling in Russia rising against us?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator, I suppose, due to the fact that the Russian people are living behind a high wall which keeps out the true knowledge of the intentions of the American people and what they desire to do, they have been able to convince a good many of their own people that we are bent upon destroying the Russian Nation.

Mr. MALONE. By "they," to whom does the Senator refer?

Mr. McMAHON. I am talking about the political end. I am talking about the people who control and rule Russia. That is quite obvious, is it not, to the Senator?

Mr. MALONE. No; it is not obvious to me. Russia is a member of the United Nations, the same as we are. Why do they not take the same attitude?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator, I refuse to stand responsible for the foreign policy of Russia. That is all I can say.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. If it be true that they have an attitude such as the Senator describes, and if it be true that this feeling is mounting, then is it the opinion of the Senator that it would be better, and it would stop this mounting feeling, if we should give them the atomic-bomb secret?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator assumes something that is simply not true. I shall talk about that, if the Senator please, in a few moments.

Mr. MALONE. I beg the Senator's pardon, but I am not assuming anything; I am asking the Senator from Connecticut for information.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will permit me, that is a question which I want to discuss when I come to describe what we have really proposed in the United Nations.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. I share with the Senator, and I have so stated on this floor, his deep regret that the Russian delegate has not seen fit, under instructions of his government, to embrace the proposal which we have made. I say that because

if the problem regarding atomic energy can be settled, and if the problem of controlling atomic energy can be solved in a way that will assure effective control, it is my opinion and belief that the other questions, such as reparations, boundaries, ethnic questions, and all the other questions that disturb the peace, are infinitesimal in comparison with this prime question.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. If it be a fact that Russia, being the only other great power besides the United States, takes the attitude that the Senator apparently assumes it to take, is it not an impossibility to secure such an agreement until Russia entirely changes its attitude?

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator has answered his own question. If the Senator had listened to what I said a little earlier he would have heard me point out that if Gromyko has said the last word in New York, then the United Nations has died.

Mr. MALONE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Then, if this is the only real weapon of national security in the world, and we are the only ones that have it, temporarily, would it not be a great mistake if we were to part with the secret of the atomic bomb until such an agreement has been made?

Mr. McMAHON. Who in the world proposes to part with any atomic bomb secret until an effective agreement has been made?

Mr. MALONE. I beg the Senator's pardon, if I misunderstood him earlier in the evening to say he believed that the proposal made in the report by Mr. Lilienthal should be accepted.

Mr. McMAHON. Absolutely; and if the Senator has read the Acheson-Lilienthal report he would know that it does not propose giving the bomb to Russia at this time. Will the Senator permit me to explain?

Mr. MALONE. Yes. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me point out to the Senator that that board which was appointed and which has been truly described as being composed of great Americans, finally produced, in the month of April 1946, as I recall, the Acheson-Lilienthal plan or report. I should like to point out to the Senator something that I do not believe has been discussed. That is, that the Secretary of State, in publishing the report, wrote a foreword from which I should like to quote:

> The committee also states that it regards the consultants' work as "the most constructive analysis of the question of international control we have seen and a definitely hopeful approach to a solution of the entire problem.
>
> The document is being made public not as a statement of policy but solely as the basis for discussion.

That is one statement contained in the Acheson-Lilienthal report which, I think, has generally escaped the attention of Senators. Incidentally, let me say to the Senator, regardless of the statement of the senior Senator from Ohio as to the abandonment of the Acheson-Lilienthal proposals by Mr. Baruch, a study of both proposals will show that they are identical, with the exception of the addition of the veto feature.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I presume the fact I am about to suggest has been developed before; but all through the debates there is reference to the Lilienthal report or the Lilienthal-Acheson report, and those opposing the confirmation of Mr. Lilienthal would have the Senate and the country believe that it is the creation of Lilienthal and of nobody else. I think it is time, if it has not already been said, to state just who was on the committee, and the type and kind and character of men who signed the report, who considered it carefully and conscientiously for weeks and months before signing it.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator. It is in the RECORD, I suppose, three or four times. Mr. John J. McCloy, former Assistant Secretary of War; Dean Acheson, at present Acting Secretary of State; Gen. Leslie R. Groves, who seems to have won the acclaim of a good many Senators who are opposed to Mr. Lilienthal; also joined in signing that report, as did also Dr. Conant, of Harvard; Dr. Vannevar Bush, who was probably more responsible for the organization of the scientists in their work on the bomb than any other man; and Harry A. Winne of the General Electric Co.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there any evidence in the hearings that any of the individuals whom the Senator has mentioned, who are great Americans, had any communistic leanings or were charged with belonging to any subversive organizations?

Mr. McMAHON. I do not know. They have not been nominated and so become subject to confirmation. I cannot tell what would happen if they were. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that after hearing what went on in the hearings I would hate to predict what might happen in such event. I listened in the hearing to an old man who was brought up from Tennessee, who was described as a peace officer. He was a funny old fellow about 65 years old. His name was Remine. He said he had been put to the job of hunting Communists, and he said he was assiduous in his work. Where do Senators suppose that work took him? It took him to a nudist colony, and he got up close to it. He said his purpose was to hear what they were plotting and conspiring to do. Of course I suppose there was no other attraction. He hid behind the trees. He said, "Yes, they were Communists all right." But lo, and behold, it turned out that they did not work for the TVA. They were among the 55 Communists in the State of Tennessee. But that old gentleman was subpenaed at public expense and brought here to testify. The Senators who sat on the committee, with a total of 105 years of service in the Senate, had to give of their time to listen to him.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. When I look back over the record of leadership of the last 30 years, not only of our own country but of the entire world, and when I look back at two world wars and all the suffering that has taken place in the world, I am not so certain but that it may be well to listen to an old man like the old gentleman from Tennessee. He at least could not have done any worse than was done by those who have had charge of affairs in the world and in the United States, and who have had responsibility for what has taken place during the last 30 years under their leadership. I do not know how anyone could have gotten our world into a worse mess than it is now in.

Mr. McMAHON. I was disappointed that the Senator was not present to hear Mr. Remine's testimony. If he had, I am sure he would share my own estimate of the worth of the testimony.

Mr. CAPEHART. I also am sorry I was not present to hear his testimony, but I do not particularly appreciate the taking advantage of an old gentleman who possibly was 70 or 75 years old, and perhaps was unable to do any better than he did when he appeared before the committee, so far as detailed conversations were concerned.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator that I did not subpena Mr. Remine, nor was I responsible for him appearing before the committee. The testimony I have described appears in the record. I wish those who represent the point of view the Senator from Indiana represents were as tender of the susceptibilities of one of the demonstrated great public servants of this country.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I likewise wish that those who advocate that we go into Turkey and Greece to fight a certain ideology of government which we are asked to go there to fight would likewise look a little bit toward the interests of America, and look around a little bit over America to see what is going on here. I wish they would be as much opposed to those who may have that ideology in America as they are opposed to those who are six or seven thousand miles away.

Mr. McMAHON. I suppose the Senator is announcing his steadfast opposition to Communist ideology anywhere in the world. Is that the intention?

Mr. CAPEHART. I certainly am, and I expect to vote for the proposal made by the President of the United States. But I likewise shall oppose communism in America. I see no sense in going seven or eight thousand miles to fight communism and then wink at communism in America. I am not saying that Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist. I do not think he is. But, in my opinion, it is one of the most unfortunate things that ever happened to our country that we should now be asked to confirm a man about whom there is a single bit of suspicion. I pray to God that someone may be appointed to head the Atomic Energy Com-

mission, important as it is, important as the Senator thinks it is, and as I think it is, in whom America can have the utmost confidence. I know of nothing more important than the matter under consideration.

I am not responsible for the situation as it exists. This is the first time I have made a statement in respect to Mr. Lilienthal on the floor of the Senate. We are asked to appoint a man upon whom the United States is divided. Sincere Senators are divided upon that question on the floor of the Senate; sincere Americans are divided on it. We were not divided with respect to Mr. Marshall when he was nominated to be Secretary of State. We were not divided over many other nominations submitted to us. We are divided on this particular nomination. I admit that I do not know whether the Senator is right or whether those who are opposed to Lilienthal are right. But in the name of heaven, on a matter so important as this is, why is it not possible to have someone nominated, even though he may not be as well qualified as is Mr. Lilienthal, even though he may not be indispensable—why is it not possible to have submitted the name of a man in whom we can have the utmost confidence regardless of who he is or whence he comes.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I think that Mr. Lilienthal meets the qualifications that have been laid down by the Senator from Indiana. I further know that Mr. Lilienthal's appointment was acclaimed in every leading newspaper of the country, and by dozens and dozens of our outstanding public men immediately after his appointment on October 21. There was no indication whatever of the storm that was to overtake us when we opened the hearings and when we had a parade of witnesses from Tennessee, discharged employees, people who had a grudge, people with no standing of any consequence in their community—people who were brought here to testify, mind you, not against Lilienthal per se. I may be wrong, and if so I should like to be corrected, but I do not recollect that any single witness subpenaed here for 1 minute claimed that this man was as he was described by the senior Senator from Tennessee, "The chief Communist of my State."

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the able Senator from Connecticut tell us how long Mr. Lilienthal has been in public life?

Mr. McMAHON. As I recall, he entered public life in the Wisconsin Public Utility Commission, or Railroad Commission, I believe it was called, in 1931.

Mr. PEPPER. Was he confirmed by the State senate of Wisconsin for that position? I ask for information.

Mr. McMAHON. I believe he was.

Mr. PEPPER. And thereafter did he come into the Federal public service?

Mr. McMAHON. As the Senator knows, he did. He was appointed to the Tennessee Valley Authority, confirmed and reconfirmed, I believe, twice.

Mr. PEPPER. And his conduct was subject to public scrutiny all the time by Members of Congress and by the American public; and were any of these charges ever made against him, and was he ever impeached as to his patriotism or his integrity until after his appointment to this position was announced to the country and to the Congress?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that so far as I am aware the answer is "No."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Connecticut sat on that committee a good deal of the time. He was away much of the time, but he was certainly present when the Senator's own witness, Mr. Lilienthal's own witness, his former secretary and stenographer, came before the committee and testified that Mr. Lilienthal, all the time he was with the Railroad Commission or the Public Utilities Commission of Wisconsin, was performing business for the very railroads and public utilities that he had been chosen to regulate, and that during 18 months and 15 days he had drawn from the utilities more than $7,000, in violation of the laws of Wisconsin, and had drawn from the utilities which employed him more than $17,000 at the same time. He was a lawyer. He was not doing legal work. It was research work. He seems to have been a book man, and he was doing research in books, magazines, and newspapers for the public utilities of Wisconsin, contrary to the terms of the Wisconsin law, just as a lawyer who takes fees on both sides of a case, except that in this case it was in direct violation of the statutory law. The Senator, after hearing that evidence before the committee, says that this man is without blemish and without fault. How can the Senator say that?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator made his speech yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. I told the Senate——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. That is a habit of the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. It is the same treatment which I received yesterday. The Senator made those charges yesterday about his Wisconsin experience. I endeavored to read into the RECORD at that time a telegram from the then Governor of Wisconsin on this subject. The Senator from Tennessee refused to yield to permit me to do so at that time. I now read that telegram into the RECORD, dealing with this transaction. Mr. President, his record is as clean as a whistle. What does Governor La Follette say?

> I note the imputation that David Lilienthal was underhandedly serving private interests while on Wisconsin Public Service Commission. When offered the appointment he was active in his profession and naturally had to wind up his affairs. He fully and completely disclosed his affairs and subsequently filed in the Governor's office a copy of the contract which his affairs were wound up in. His record as commissioner was outstanding, devoted to public service, and wholly honorable.
>
> PHILIP F. LA FOLLETTE.

What are the facts in regard to this Wisconsin matter? I did not intend to go into it at this time, because I am anxious to discuss with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] the question which he has asked me as to what we have proposed in this report.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator intend at a later time to recur to a discussion of the Wisconsin incident? I urge the Senator to do so, because I believe that a great many Members of the Senate are uninformed, or have been misinterpreting the so-called Wisconsin incident. I think the RECORD should be perfectly clear on that point, because if the Senator will place the facts in the RECORD, I am satisfied that no Senator can justify voting against Mr. Lilienthal on the ground of the Wisconsin incident.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator that I intend to discuss it to the best of my ability.

On February 19, Mrs. Meads Duncan Leitzell, a Chicago housewife and secretary to Lilienthal when he maintained a law office in Chicago in 1931, testified that Mr. Lilienthal continued to receive compensation from the Commerce Clearing House, a legal reporting service which abstracts decisions of courts and commissions pertaining to various fields of law, after he became a member of the Wisconsin Railway Commission. Although Mrs. Leitzell apparently is not a lawyer, she testified that she believed the receipt of this compensation to be in violation of the Wisconsin law. That is the charge which has been made by the senior Senator from Tennessee at great length on the floor of the Senate.

I have read the telegram which has been received from Governor La Follette. Mr. Lilienthal testified about this incident. I should like to read into the RECORD a short synthesis of what he said.

On February 20, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] inserted in the record of these hearings the provisions of the Wisconsin Statute, 1945, No. 195.01, as follows:

> No commissioner shall be pecuniarily interested in any railroad, public utility, or motor carrier, and if any such commissioner shall voluntarily become interested his office ipso facto shall become vacant.

Section 4 is as follows:

> Full time office: No commissioner shall hold any other office or position of profit or pursue any other business or vocation or serve on or under any committee of any political party but shall devote his entire time to the duties of his office.

This is what Mr. Lilienthal said about it:

> The record of my activities as a member of the Wisconsin Commission is a public record. The soundness of the work I did as commissioner is, of course, a matter of opinion, but that I put every ounce of energy and every moment of my time into that work is well known to scores of people, to members of the then Wisconsin Commission staff, to utility executives and experts with whom I had official relations, to public officials in the State government and throughout the

State. I was fully and entirely engaged upon the commission's work. For example, at the outset of my service I drafted a complete revision of the utility regulatory laws of the State for consideration by the legislature, a draft which was agreed to in advance of its introduction by most public and private interests and enacted virtually as drafted.

Early in 1931, 16 years ago, the newly elected Governor of Wisconsin, Governor La Follette, called me to Madison from Chicago, where I was engaged in the practice of law. I had never met Mr. La Follette before, and he knew me only by reputation. He said that due to a death there was a vacancy on the railroad commission and that he had called me to Madison to discuss with me my appointment to serve the remaining 2 years of that unexpired term. He said that during his administration he hoped to bring about the improvement and strengthening of the utility regulations, and believed that I would contribute to that objective. At that time I was 31 years of age. I was interested and honored by this offer, but I explained to Governor La Follette that there were a number of important business affairs that would have to be worked out before I could accept such an appointment.

I told him that I had only recently signed a new lease for a term of years on space in the new 1 North LaSalle Street building where I had established my law practice. I also explained I had for some years had an arrangement with the firm of Commerce Clearing House to supervise the editing of a loose-leaf legal reporting service abstracting the decisions of courts and commissions on the regulation of public utilities and carriers, that this publication had involved the Commerce Clearing House in a substantial investment of money, that the publication, which now ran into some 20 volumes and was still not complete, had been sold by Commerce Clearing House on a continuing basis to a number of subscribers. I told the Governor that it had been generally contemplated at the time the service was started that as the service got a market I could expect substantial returns in the future in compensation for the low level of current payments I had agreed to accept during the building up period of writing the service and getting it started.

I explained that we were about at a stage, I thought, in the development of the service where it seemed reasonable to expect that I should begin to get paid for this past effort expended during the development stages. I told the Governor that in view of this situation and the new lease I had just entered into it seemed very doubtful indeed that I could accept even for a short period of time. La Follette said that he realized that anyone in active practice would have problems to work out, but strongly urged me to return to Chicago and try to work this out with Commerce Clearing House and report back to him. He said that even a year's leave of absence from my work would give me a chance to help reorganize the Commission's work and aid in drafting new legislation.

I returned to Chicago and took up the matter at length with Mr. Kixmiller, president of the Commerce Clearing House. After considerable discussion Commerce Clearing House agreed to the arrangement embodied in the following letter contract under the heading of Commerce Clearing House, dated February 5, 1931—

This is signed by Mr. Kixmiller—

DEAR MR. LILIENTHAL: Following your report to me yesterday that you would like to accept the position of member of the Wisconsin Railroad Commission provided your appointment is confirmed, I am glad to inform you that we should be willing to give you a leave of absence for a year, with an option to renew the absence the second year.

It is understood that you will render no personal services for us during this period and will receive no compensation from us. The editorial work heretofore performed by you, and carried on in your office by assistants under your direction is to be continued by them during your absence, pursuant to this arrangement.

Your present weekly check from us of $385 will be reduced initially to $240 per week. This check will be drawn directly to you to avoid unnecessary bookkeeping, and is to reimburse you for liabilities (such as rent, salaries, and so forth) heretofore assumed by you primarily to carry on our work. In addition to such reimbursement these weekly checks drawn to you during your absence will include a margin above reimbursement as part payment for your past services, particularly in the training of assistants to carry on this editorial work. We estimate this sum to be $2,000 per year, though it may be less. Your right to the reimbursement of payments above provided for is not and will not be in any way affected by the extent to which we market the service.

COMMERCE CLEARING HOUSE, INC.,
WM. KIXMILLER, *President*.

It was accepted by David E. Lilienthal. Then he says:

I returned to Madison and conferred with the governor. I showed the governor this letter contract.

He is a despicable, conspiratorial fellow, is he not?

I explained that the arrangement would involve me in no obligation to render any service to Commerce Clearing House and that I would not be compensated for anything except heretofore uncompensated past services. The contract would take care of my obligation to Commerce Clearing House respecting the publication in which they had invested rather heavily, and would take care of my office lease situation during my absence.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is quite important at this point to clear up an erroneous impression given by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. On the floor today the impression was certainly given to the Senate that at the same time Mr. Lilienthal was serving as a member of the Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, later called the utilities commission, he was also serving public utilities which he was regulating. I think it should be brought out at this time that Commerce Clearing House is a publishing house which issues material used by those who practice before commissions; used by regulatory commissions themselves, and State and municipal bodies in the regulation of public utilities, as well as by public utilities themselves. So in no sense was he working for the people whom he was regulating.

Mr. McMAHON. That is an absolute fact.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is not that, in substance, a sort of legal service? These articles are sent to lawyers and others who buy them and use them. They do not operate any utilities that are being regulated by the commission.

Mr. McMAHON. Let us hear what the Governor did when Mr. Lilienthal arrived. I read further:

The Governor studied the contract, and as I recall he had it examined by his legal adviser. He thereupon advised me that he regarded this arrangement a proper and legal one. Shortly thereafter, he announced my appointment and late in March 1931 I took office. A copy of this contract with Mr. Kixmiller was made a part of the official executive files. The arrangement was also reviewed with the Honorable Theodore Kronsage, chairman of the railroad commission, a distinguished member of the Wisconsin bar, who also gave it his approval. The editorial work on this publication was carried on in my former office in Chicago, supervised by Commerce Clearing House directly. It was an open arrangement, well known to many people, both in Madison and Chicago, and at no time a secret, nor done clandestinely as falsely imputed here.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the view of the Senator from Connecticut that the arrangement which Mr. Lilienthal made with Commerce Clearing House was somewhat similar to the arrangement which an author has with a publishing house for royalties on a book previously written by the author?

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct. That is a very good analogy.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not somewhat similar to rights which an inventor retains in a patent on which he receives royalties after the patent has been turned over to a production agency?

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in understanding that there is nothing in this record that shows that after Mr. Lilienthal went to work with the Wisconsin commission he did any work for Commerce Clearing House during that period of time?

Mr. McMAHON. Not a thing.

Mr. MORSE. As I understand, whatever work was done for the Commerce Clearing House by any individuals who previously had been assistants or members of the so-called editorial board working under the direction of Mr. Lilienthal was thereafter done under the supervision of officials of the Commerce Clearing House and not under the supervision of Mr. Lilienthal?

Mr. McMAHON. That is the record.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to read from the record for a moment to show how utterly mistaken the Senator is in his facts. I shall read from the bottom of page 589. There were only three people in Lilienthal's office. If I may be permitted to say so, this witness was not my witness. I never heard of the lady before, never saw her before, never dreamed that there was such a human being on earth until she appeared as a witness and was placed on the stand by the chairman of the committee, I supposed as a witness for Mr. Lilienthal. I

assumed that she was a character witness. This is what she had to say:

I handled such correspondence as was necessary. Mr. Lilienthal often wrote his notes and material in shorthand. I could read and transcribe his shorthand notes.

I handled his check book, preparing checks for payment of myself, Booth, and Swidler, and for office expenses, such as telephone bills and rent.

I checked his monthly bank statements against the stubs in his check book, which was kept in the office.

This was before he was ever appointed.

Early in 1931, Mr. Lilienthal was appointed to the Wisconsin commission and went to Madison.

He continued to maintain his office at 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago. He continued to pay the office rent. He continued to pay me. He continued to pay Mr. Booth and Mr. Swidler.

He handled these checks in one of two ways: Either he would come into the office and sign the checks, or I would mail them to him in Madison for signature.

After his appointment to the Wisconsin commission, Mr. Lilienthal told me to tell anybody who asked for him that the office was no longer his. I followed his instructions.

I am reading now from the testimony of Mr. Lilienthal's witness, who was brought there to my utter astonishment. I never dreamed of it before.

I read further:

If I couldn't cope with any situation that came up, I turned it over to Mr. Booth or Mr. Swidler.

I continued to work for Mr. Lilienthal under these conditions through and beyond the summer of 1932. I remember the date, because in the summer of 1932 my husband went on a camping trip and I returned to work for Mr. Lilienthal after coming back from that trip.

That lady was utterly unknown to those who oppose Mr. Lilienthal. She was put on the witness stand by the distinguished chairman of the committee. She was told by Mr. Lilienthal not to tell anyone that the office was his, but to state that the office was not his—why? Because he was drawing two salaries from antagonistic sources. Those are the facts. It is precisely the same as having a lawyer draw fees from both sides of a case. I challenge any Senator to read the entire statement of that lady; for if her entire statement is read, the truth is apparent.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, Mr. President, the unfortunate thing about the testimony the Senator from Tennessee has read is that it is entirely and utterly consistent with the arrangement which was entered into openly and publicly and was filed in the office of the Governor of Wisconsin.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield. I should like to get away from this point, because I think we are spending too much time on it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish the Senator would take my judgment on that matter. I do not think we can spend too much time on this particular point, because I think it has been greatly misunderstood by some of my most cherished senatorial friends on this side of the aisle. I think the Wisconsin incident will stand any analysis which anyone wishes to give it, if they will really go into the facts, including the testimony which the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee has just read.

Does the Senator from Connecticut agree with me that that testimony shows very clearly that Mr. Lilienthal gave to his secretary instructions that he was no longer doing work in that office?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; if I may answer the question, let me say that he told his secretary to tell anyone who asked for him that he was no longer connected with it. He just wanted to pull the wool over their eyes, so to speak. He wanted to keep everyone in the dark, and to continue to keep his business and salary, while holding the Wisconsin office.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I say, with all respect, that I think the interpretation made of that language by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is most interesting, but I do not think there is a word of the statement of that witness that will support his interpretation. I think the interpretation the Senator has just stated is what he would like to read into the testimony, but I find in the testimony, which he himself has read from the record, nothing which would support his conclusion.

What she said was that after his appointment to the Wisconsin commission, Mr. Lilienthal told her to tell anyone who asked for him that the office was no longer his. She said, "I followed his instructions."

I understood the Senator from Connecticut to say that Mr. Lilienthal pointed out to the then Governor of the State of Wisconsin the problem that he had in regard to his previous connections with the Commerce Clearing House, and that it was suggested to him that he take a leave of absence for a year or, if necessary, 2 years, in order to do that work with the Wisconsin commission; and that Mr. Lilienthal had told the Governor that he had already taken a lease on the office in Chicago, for a term of years; and the Governor suggested to him that they work out an arrangement whereby he could help for at least a year or possibly longer, and then go back to the Chicago practice; and that all Mr. Lilienthal did, in regard to the testimony which has been read, was to work out such an arrangement with the Commerce Clearing House, whereby the office would be available to him when he went back to Chicago, after leaving the Wisconsin commission, but that during the period of time when he was on the Wisconsin commission he would devote his full time to the work of the commission.

The people who had previously been associated with him on the Clearing House reports, continued to do the work on the reports, under the supervision and direction, not of Mr. Lilienthal, but of officials of the Commerce Clearing House.

Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is absolutely correct, and I thank him.

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

Mr. McMAHON. In a moment, Mr. President. First I wish to say that there is an old saying of law, falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus. The charge which has been made here cannot and will not stand up. It is typical of the other charges which have been put together on the floor of the Senate in order to accomplish the end which some seek to achieve. I say to the Senator that instead of the interpretation which has been put on this matter by the Senator from Tennessee, I leave it to my brother Senators that if a statement of those facts does not demonstrate that Mr. Lilienthal was entirely honorable, entirely ethical, and entirely decent and aboveboard in that transaction, then I do not know the meaning of the code of ethics.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I promised first to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few minutes ago my friend the Senator from Oregon said that in talking to some of his colleagues he found they expressed concern about that arrangement. I confess that I am one of those. Without going into a discussion of my own views, I can say that at the beginning of these hearings no question had arisen in my mind as to the qualifications of this nominee. But beginning with this arrangement in Wisconsin and from the testimony of Mr. Morgan, certainly questions have been raised about him which, although they may not seem fundamental to some persons, nevertheless seem to me to touch on the very fundamental intellectual honesty of this nominee.

The letter which touches on the contract—I read from page 806 the provision of the Wisconsin statute:

(4) Full time office: No commissioner shall hold any other office or position of profit, or pursue any other business or vocation, or serve on or under any committee of any political party, but shall devote his entire time to the duties of his office.

I think all of us agree that if he continued in any other business or vocation, he would be in violation of that law.

I find the following in the letter or agreement:

It is understood that you will render no personal services for us during this period and will receive no compensation from us. The editorial work heretofore performed by you, and carried on in your office by assistants under your direction is to be continued by them during your absence, pursuant to this arrangement.

Your present weekly check from us of $385 will be reduced initially to $240 per week. This check will be drawn directly to you to avoid unnecessary bookkeeping, and is to reimburse you for liabilities (such as rent, salaries, etc.)

Certainly from that letter, we see that before this contract had been entered into, he had the office, he paid the rent, and he paid the salaries of his assistants; and it is stated in that letter that his work had been performed by his assistants prior to this arrangement.

After that letter was written, he still maintained the office, he still paid the rent, and he still paid for those assistants. They did the same work that they had done before; they continued the work. They published the same publications that had been published before by the Commerce Clearing House. He still received the compensation.

I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut in what respect does the business which he had pursued prior to this arrangement differ from the business he pursued subsequent to the arrangement?

Mr. McMAHON. I shall be happy to answer the Senator. Before this contract he stayed there and supervised the work. After he entered into the arrangement he devoted no time to the duties required by the Commerce Clearing House, with one exception, as I see it, that he checked on employees who were working under the supervision and control of the Commerce Clearing House.

I suppose the Senator is aware of the fact that his name was taken off the flyleaf of the publication. I suppose the Senator is aware that the work that was done was done under the direction and control of the officers of the Commerce Clearing House.

Mr. COOPER. I should say, in response, that I have read the hearings, and I find no statement in them as to that, except his statement that he recalled that his name had been taken off the letterhead, and I still say that from my reading of this letter, and my understanding from reading his own testimony as to the type of business that had been carried on before, there was absolutely no cessation in the work, no difference, after he had taken this office.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator recognize the right of this man to receive compensation for the work which had been done in the past?

Mr. COOPER. I will ask the Senator this question——

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to get an answer to my question.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; I do.

Mr. McMAHON. That is what was provided for, was it not?

Mr. COOPER. I wish to say that the telegram received from the clearing house, given on page 812, states:

> Assuming your telegram of even date, our records show payments to David E. Lilienthal for production of manuscripts in the amount of $17,574 between February 12, 1931, and August 27, 1932.

Are we to believe that sum was in compensation, in payment, for prior services, when upon page 809 Mr. Lilienthal himself said:

> The Commerce Clearing House gave recognition and acknowledgment to my past contribution to the development of the service by agreeing to compensate me from current earnings of the service.

In answer to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who gave an analogy from a case to some past work, that paragraph and sentence stated that his payment was coming from the current earnings of the service.

I should like to ask the Senator whether in his investigation he made any effort to determine what the salaries of these assistants who worked with him came to, so that the Senator could determine whether he was receiving a substantial portion of this weekly sum.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Tennessee put those figures in the RECORD yesterday. The sum total of them I do not remember. Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee can tell.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to give them. When he was getting $390 a week—it was above $300, either $380 or $390 a week—he was giving Mrs. Leitzel, who came here, as I always supposed, as his witness, $24 a week, he was giving Mr. Booth, his other clerk, $28 a week, and he was giving Mr. Joseph C. Swidler, now the general counsel drawing twelve or fifteen thousand dollars a year, I believe, in the TVA, the enormous salary of $17.50 a week. Monthly it amounted to about $125 to Booth, or a little less, about $100 to his stenographer, Mrs. Leitzel, and about $71.75 to Mr. Swidler.

After he left, he paid those three clerks just exactly the same that he paid them before. He was getting at the rate of $20,020 a year from this concern, which furnished the utilities and the railroads all this information. They got up his pay by subscription, and one of the reasons that was given, as some letter in the record said—they advertised the fact that he was then a commissioner of utilities in Wisconsin, and that the railroads and other utilities should contribute. Mind you, these clerks did not get a large salary when he got another position in Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER. I do not care to take the time of the Senator from Connecticut, but I should like to ask one further question. The office with which Lilienthal was connected continued to publish or to give to the Commerce Clearing House a publication which was of great interest to utilities. Did the committee make any effort to determine whether that service was sold in the State of Wisconsin after Mr. Lilienthal became a member of the railroad commission in Wisconsin?

Mr. McMAHON. It is my recollection that some telegrams were dispatched—by whom I forget—asking whether or not any force had been used by Mr. Lilienthal, or any inducement or any influence exerted by Lilienthal, in the selling of this service, and the answer categorically was "No."

Mr. WHERRY. O, Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. McMAHON. I am sorry, but it is now getting late, and I have much more ground to cover.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator——

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield at this time. The facts have been thoroughly outlined. The Senator can draw any conclusion he desires to draw. I have drawn my own. I stand on it as an ethical transaction. The Governor of Wisconsin stood on it as an ethical transaction. The other members of the railroad commission stood on it as an ethical transaction. The Governor's council stood on it as an ethical transaction. I say to the Senator that to try to impute some evil motive, some improper action, into something that was done openly, open to all the world, seems to me to be straining at a gnat.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may yield to the Senator from Kentucky. I do not care to interrupt.

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I had no intention of implying in any way that the Senator from Connecticut could not reach his own conclusion and form his own judgment. I have no fault at all to find with that. I can only say that for myself, reading that testimony on the question of whether or not the business done had been discontinued, frankly, I could not see that any business had been discontinued.

Mr. McMAHON. Let us see what Lilienthal said he did.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he goes into that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield at this time. This is what he said he did—I call this to the attention of the Senator from Kentucky, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

> I moved my family to Wisconsin—

After his appointment—

> made Madison my residence, and devoted myself exclusively to the work of the commission.
>
> Except for signing salary and monthly rental checks—

"Rental checks"—

> (until August 1932 when the contract was terminated) and during the earlier months of the new arrangement an occasional conversation with the management of Commerce Clearing House or the two lawyers who were carrying on the service in my absence, I had nothing to do with the editing or the marketing of the Public Utilities and Carriers Service, and rendered no service to the Commerce Clearing House in respect to the editing of this Service or otherwise.
>
> During the entire period I held no other position than that of commissioner, pursued no other business, and devoted my entire time to the duties of my office.

Does that satisfy the Senator?

Mr. COOPER. I received the Senator's answer. I am not satisfied.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

Mr. McMAHON. I think I shall yield to the Senator from Nebraska first.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McMAHON. I wanted to surprise the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator did, and I thank him very much indeed. I appreciate it.

Mr. LUCAS. A pleasant surprise.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator with reference to the statement he made in answer to a question by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky about the messages which were sent to the public utilities of Wisconsin. I understood the Sena-

tor to say that the answer, categorically, was no. Are those messages and answers in the record?

Mr. McMAHON. I cannot answer the Senator on that point. I frankly do not know, but that is my recollection. My recollection may be faulty, but that is as I remember it.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that. I know the Senator wants to be honest, but we want to make the record clear.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator does not mind the interruption, there are 900 pages of the record, and I believe there were something like 23 hearings. Despite the suggestion by the Senator from Tennessee that I was absent a good deal of the time I think I missed but three of the hearings, and therefore I feel that I have a good deal of the record in my mind. I do not pretend to have it word for word.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not in any way indicating that the distinguished Senator is evading an answer. As the distinguished Senator has said many times, we want to keep the record straight. I should like to have the Senator point out to me where the answers may be found which the Senator has said he knows categorically were in the testimony. I refer to the messages that were sent to the public utilities of Wisconsin. I have been unable to find them in the record, and I am interested in that, because I was one who advised the committee of that situation and asked that it be investigated. Furthermore, I understood the Senator to say that the name was not on the letterhead. Does the Senator wish to leave the impression with the Senate that it was not on the letterhead, that there was no attempt on the part of this new association formed by Mr. Lilienthal to force that service upon these public utilities and railroads?

Mr. McMAHON. That is exactly what I want to tell the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator say that there is no letterhead indicating that, and that the Senator could not find it?

Mr. McMAHON. I quote:

> Following my appointment to the Wisconsin Commission, Commerce Clearing House sent out a new title page to the volumes of the service, from which title page my name had been removed as editor.

I may say to the Senator that I know there is not a scintilla of evidence in the record to show that any pressure was exerted on any public utility. The Senator apparently adopts the attitude that it was up to Lilienthal, when he was before the committee, to show that he had not exerted any pressure. That is exactly the standpoint from which this case has been tried, from the start. The attitude of those who have opposed Lilienthal has been, "You are guilty, now show that you are innocent."

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

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

Mr. WHERRY. I want to suggest to the distinguished Senator that all I asked him was about these messages and about the letterhead. I am satisfied that the messages went out, and I was interested to know what the answers were. They might have gone to but a few; I do not know, but I think it is highly important. I know the integrity of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I know that he does not want to leave the inference that the messages that went out, all were answered with a categorical no. I am sure he does not. I am sure the Senator wants the record to show the facts.

Mr. McMAHON. I notice that the chairman of the committee is sitting here. Perhaps his recollection of the answers received to those telegrams is better than mine. I ask the Senator from Iowa, if he recollects, to tell us what the facts are.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have the facts on that particular situation, and I shall try to give them to the Senate as clearly as I can. I believe the Senator from Nebraska or some other Senator, near the close of the hearing before the Senate special committee, came to me, or sent to me, as chairman of the committee, a suggestion that certain utility companies in Wisconsin had been high-pressured into subscribing for the Public Utilities and Carriers Service, which was the service published by Mr. Lilienthal before he became commissioner, on the strength of Mr. Lilienthal's name on the Wisconsin Power Commission, in other words, that salesmen had gone around, and the insinuation that had come I believe to the Senator from Nebraska was that there was some collaboration or some pressure by Mr. Lilienthal, as a member of the commission, to drum up this business for this carrier company.

I obtained a list of agents of power companies in Wisconsin. I will give the list for the RECORD: Wisconsin Electric Power Co., of Milwaukee; Wisconsin Gas & Electric Co., of Racine; Wisconsin-Michigan Power Co., of Appleton; Wisconsin Public Service Co., of Milwaukee; Northern States Power Co., of Eau Claire; Lake Superior District Power Co. of Ashland; Madison Gas & Electric Co., of Madison; and Wisconsin Power & Light Co., of Madison.

These are not all the power companies, but as I understand, these are the larger power companies which would be apt to be subscribers for a special reporting service, which is at best, as any of the lawyers know, an expensive service.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator, it costs about $200 a year, does it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It costs a little more than that, I think, depending upon the size of the company and the extent of the service. On March 1, 1947, which was either the day that I obtained this suggestion from the Senator from Nebraska, or the day after, I cannot recall now, but it was immediately thereafter, I sent the following telegram to each of the power companies referred to or mentioned by me, a month ago. The telegrams were identical, so I will merely read the body of one, and it applies to all of the companies. The telegram is as follows:

> Will you please wire me, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., as soon as possible, specific answers to the following questions:
>
> 1. Was your company solicited by Commerce Clearing House of Chicago, or anyone else, to purchase a service thought to be entitled "Public Utilities and Carrier Service," during February 1931 or thereafter, through June 1933?

Those happen to be the dates, I believe, of the service of Mr. Lilienthal on the Wisconsin Commission.

> 2. If the answer is yes, what was the name of the person soliciting you?
>
> 3. If you were solicited, did solicitor refer to David Lilienthal in connection with his solicitation, or indicate that David Lilienthal had any connection with Commerce Clearing House or with the service being sold?
>
> 4. Did you purchase the service? How much did you pay for it, and for how long a period?
>
> 5. Had you been a subscriber to or a purchaser of the service prior to February 1931?

I am continuing the telegram:

> It may be difficult for you to recall all details because of expiration of time, but I would appreciate your answers as fully as it is possible for you to make them at this time.

I signed that as chairman of the Senate Committee on Atomic Energy. I received telegrams from each of the companies. From the Wisconsin-Michigan Power Co., on March 3, of Appleton, Wis., I received the following telegram:

> Question 1. No record or memory of solicitation or purchase.
>
> Question 5. No.
>
> W. E. SCHUBERT,
> *Wisconsin Power Co.*

Senators will recall that question 1 was, had they been solicited by anyone. The answer was "No."

Question 5 was "had you been a subscriber to or a purchaser of that service prior to February 1931." The answer was "No."

On March 3 I received a telegram from the Northern States Power Co. of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, Wis., as follows:

> Re tel March first, relative public utilities and carrier service Commerce Clearing House. Be advised, number one answer: This company was not a subscriber to the services mentioned during period February 1931 or thereafter through June 1933. Number two answer: Do not recall being solicited. Number three answer: see above. Number four answer: See above. Number five answer: Records do not indicate that this company was a subscriber or purchaser prior to February 1931.
>
> J. V. ROBK,
> *President, Northern States Power Co.*

On March 3 I received a reply from the Wisconsin Gas & Electric Co., of Racine, Wis. The message is as follows:

> Find no record of purchasing or being solicited to purchase Commerce Clearing House's utility and carrier service.
>
> WISCONSIN GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

Mr. McMAHON. Does that conclude the reading of the telegrams?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. I have eight of them. I can place them in the RECORD, but I thought the Senator would like to know the answers in each case.

Mr. McMAHON. There was no answer in any case that there was a solicitation of them, was there?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Read one of them.

Mr. WHERRY. Read all four of them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not want to burden the Senate, but I thought that since this matter was of interest I should place the telegrams in the RECORD.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. McMAHON. I assume the Senator will. Go ahead and read the telegrams.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to read them and place them in the RECORD, and then give a short explanation of the exact method in which this information was handled before the committee.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator will not have any interruption from me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. On March 3 I received the following telegram signed by Aberg, Bell, Blake & Conrad. I assume that to be a law firm representing the utility company. The telegram is as follows:

Mr. Walter Hodgkins, president of Lake Superior District Power Co.—

That would be of Madison, Wis.—

has requested us to reply to your telegram of March 1. To the best of his recollection the company was not solicited for CCH public utilities or carriers service during 1931-33, and did not purchase service then or earlier.

ABERG, BELL, BLAKE & CONRAD.

On March 3 I received the following telegram from Grover C. Neff, president of the Wisconsin Power & Light Co., as follows:

March 1. Answer question 1. Yes.

Question 1, Senators will recall was:

Was your company solicited by Commerce Clearing House, of Chicago, or anyone else to purchase a service thought to be entitled "Public Utilities Carrier Service" during February 1931 or thereafter through June 1933?

The answer to that question in this telegram was:

Yes, on April 2, 1931, April 1, 1932, and April 3, 1933. Question 2—

Which was the question as to the name of the solicitor—

Question 2 (answer). H. M. Wisland, thirty-one.

I assume that refers to 1931.

Do not know the name in thirty-two, and T. H. Credon in thirty-three. Question 3, Yes.

Question 3 is as follows:

If you were solicited, did the solicitor refer to David Lilienthal in connection with his solicitation or indicate that David Lilienthal had any connection with Commerce Clearing House or with the service being sold?

The answer to that was "Yes."

Question 4, Yes.

That question was:

Did you purchase the service, how much did you pay for it, and for how long a period?

The answer to question 4:

Yes; $800 in April thirty-one; $200 in April thirty-two; $200 in April thirty-three.

Question 5—

Which was—

Had you been a subscriber prior to 1931?

The answer to question 5 was "No."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the record in any other place showed the cost of this service per annum. The telegram would indicate $800 in one place and $200 in another.

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

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assume the Senator has purchased many lawbooks and law services, and there is usually a very substantial charge for the accumulated services up to date, and then a yearly charge for the supplements or the continuation of the service. I assume that that was exactly what this was.

Mr. McMAHON. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator proceed to a conclusion?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to place the telegrams in the RECORD and get through with that end of it.

March 3 I received a telegram from the Wisconsin Public Corporation of Milwaukee as follows:

Retel. March 1. Following is our reply numbered in accordance with your questions:

1. Yes.

That is on the question of solicitation.

2—

Which is the name of the person who solicted them—

H. M. Wisland in 1930, 1931, and 1932. T. H. Credon in 1933 and 1934. T. L. Armstrong in 1935.

3—

Which is the question as to whether or not the solicitor referred to David Lilienthal in connection with these solicitations or indicated that Lilienthal had any connection with the Commerce Clearing House or the railroads.

The answer to that is "Yes" in this telegram.

4. We purchased the service paying $270 in April 1930, $70 in April 1931, $70 in April 1932, $50 in April 1933, $50 in April 1934, $60 in April 1935, and $60 in April 1936.

5—

Which question is—

Had you been a subscriber prior to February 31?

The answer to that is:

See answer to No. 4—

Which I have just read as to the year's subscription.

On March 3 I received the following telegram from the Wisconsin Electric Power Co. of Milwaukee:

Referring to your telegram, March 1, asking for specific answers to five questions, such answers are as follows: Question 1. Yes.

"Were you solicited," I will interpolate.

First solicitation, March 1931.

Question 2—

Which is the name of the solicitor.

H. M. Wisland in 1931. Invoice of 1932 lacks name of representative, but for 1933 name of T. H. Credon appears as representative. Question 3—

Which is the question as to whether or not Lilienthal was referred to in connection with the solicitation.

Question 3. Yes. Question 4—

Which was "Did they purchase?"

The answer is "Yes."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, question 3 is the one concerning solicitation, in which Lilienthal's name was mentioned.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. Question 3 is the question with respect to whether Lilienthal was mentioned in connection with the solicitation.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Question 4 is:

Did you purchase the service, and how much did you pay for it and for how long a period?

Question 4. Yes, 1931, $660; 1932, $200; 1933, $150; with installment of $50 carried over to the following year. Question 5—

Which was the question as to whether they had been a subscriber before 1931 or not.

The answer to question 5 was "No."

For some reason I received two telegrams on the same day from the Wisconsin Electric Power Co., but they are duplicates.

On March 3, 1947, I received the following telegram from John St. John, president of the Madison Gas & Electric Co., Madison, Wis.:

Reply to your day letter of March 1, question 1, answer, yes.

That is the question with reference to solicitation.

Question 2—

That is the question as to the name of the solicitor—

Don't remember name.

The answer to question 3, which is the question with reference to whether or not Lilienthal's name was mentioned in connection with the solicitation, is "Don't remember."

Question 4 is:

Did you purchase the service? How much did you pay for it, and for how long a period?

The answer to question 4 is "Yes." The amount paid for the year 1931 was $190; for 1932, $50; for 1933, $50.

Question 5 is:

Had you been a subscriber before 1931?

The telegram merely says "Question 5" and then ends. I think probably there is a strip missing.

Those are the eight telegrams which I received, and I shall be glad to place them in the RECORD verbatim.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Will not the Senator yield——

Mr. McMAHON. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I decline to yield. I have the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. I have tried to be very generous in yielding. I intend to yield to the Senator from Nebraska in just a moment, but I decline to yield at this particular time. The Senator from Iowa has indicated that he has something to add after reading the telegrams.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator from Iowa still wish to say something?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would appreciate it if the Senator would yield to me for just a moment more, so that I can tell the Senate exactly what happened with respect to these telegrams, what the committee thought about them, and what we did.

Mr. McMAHON. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I expect to place the telegrams in the RECORD, although in the original program we did not think they were of sufficient significance to place them in the record of the hearings. I say that very frankly. This information came to us about the 1st of March. I immediately telegraphed, as did the committee, in response to many rumors which came to the committee. We received these telegrams. My telegrams to those companies and the telegrams from the companies in reply were taken before the committee. A full report was made to the committee. I cannot recall whether the entire membership of the committee was present, but I think it was a full-committee meeting. There might have been an absentee. However, the committee discussed them, and every member of the committee took the same attitude. Every member of the committee has been either a business or professional man. Four of the eight companies had never been solicited and had never purchased the service. They had never heard of the gist of the questions in the telegram.

Representatives of three of the companies stated that they had been solicited by the same sales force, Mr. Creden, Mr. Wisland, and someone else. Those names appear. They said that Lilienthal's name had been mentioned in connection with the solicitation.

Any Member of the Senate who has ever been the victim of a law-book salesman or of a professional service of any kind knows that those people are artists, and that they will use any name, any reference, any connotation, any suggestion, to get the poor professional man's name on the dotted line on a contract to purchase their service or books. I have been through the mill many times. When I was a young lawyer, salesmen would come to me and use the names of prominent lawyers in my town, to whom the particular service was absolutely indispensable. Many times I was gullible enough to sign a contract, which I had a great deal of trouble fulfilling when the bills came later.

Representatives of only three of the companies stated that this method had been used in the solicitation. One of them stated that he could not remember the name of the salesman, and that the writer had no recollection that any references had been given.

I do not know of a single member of the committee who raised his voice in objection to the action taken by the committee, or who pointed his finger at this thing and said, "It smells." I think the committee approached the question from the standpoint of practical professional businessmen of experience, conscious that any salesman who travels the road selling books would use exactly the same methods. We asked ourselves, "Are we witch hunting? Are we seeing ghosts? Are we jumping from this conclusion to that conclusion on the basis of a foundation of cards, and thereby concluding that because some salesman took advantage of the fact that Lilienthal had been connected with the operation of this business in the past, we should condemn Lilienthal as a scoundrel, a crook, and a cheat in high public office because someone said he tried to profit from the transaction?" As I recall, not one member of the committee pointed a finger of accusation at him. The members of the committee are practical men with a great deal of experience with sales methods. They said "Phooey. There is nothing to it. It falls flat, and we cannot sustain any charge against Lilienthal on that basis."

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know whether or not to thank the Senator from Connecticut, because I did not care to make a speech tonight on this subject. However, if there are any questions left unanswered, I will say that I expect to place these telegrams in the RECORD in full. I have done my best to give a factual recital of what happened, and under what circumstances, and how the committee looked at the question.

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

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator yield for a question of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. McMAHON. I decline to yield at this moment. I do not wish to seem captious, but I have at least half a dozen other very important questions to cover in my remarks tonight. I think the Senator from Iowa has completely answered the question as to the attitude of the committee. Furthermore, my statement stands, that there is not a scintilla of evidence in the record, nor do I believe that any could be produced, that David E. Lilienthal improperly, in any manner, shape, or form, tried to influence any prospective purchasers of this service.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I could continue to yield and debate this subject until 12 o'clock tonight. If Senators have comments to make on this transaction they will have to make them in their own time tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator promised to yield to me when the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] had concluded.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that if he thinks I made a promise to yield to him, I will yield for a question at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa a question.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], for whom I have the highest regard, stated categorically that in the record the answers to the messages were "No."

Mr. McMAHON. It is my recollection—the RECORD will show—that I stated that there was not a single scintilla of evidence that any effort was made by David E. Lilienthal to procure subscriptions to this service. I stand on that statement.

Mr. WHERRY. The messages are not in the RECORD. I ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa if they are in the RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They are now. I put them in.

Mr. WHERRY. They were put in the RECORD tonight. Eight messages only were sent out. Not one of the eight public utilities had taken the service prior to Mr. Lilienthal's entrance into Wisconsin.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think that is not quite correct. I think one of them had subscribed before.

Mr. WHERRY. Which one? Will the Senator give me the name?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I decline to yield further. The RECORD will show the Senator from Nebraska the facts he is asking for at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. They are not in the RECORD.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from Nebraska in order that he might ask a question of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. LUCAS. I demand the regular order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator want to take me off my feet?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not taking any Senator off his feet. I demand the regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from Nebraska to ask a question of the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from Iowa was answering the question when the interruption came.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the case of the Wisconsin Public Service Corporation of Milwaukee their telegram showed that they subscribed, beginning in April, 1930. I can read the telegram to the Senator if he wishes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, aside from one company, does the Senator from Iowa know that any of them kept the service after Lilienthal left Wisconsin?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. One company made its last payment in April, 1936.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Iowa for finally giving the Senate this information. It may be said that it is immaterial, but the Senate is trying to arrive at a conclusion as to the honesty of Mr. Lilienthal in the conduct of operations in Wisconsin, and this question was raised, so we have here tonight the testimony which has just been adduced. I did not read all the messages. I asked the distinguished Senator from Iowa why he had not placed them in the RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, let us keep the RECORD straight. The Senator from Nebraska read the messages not a half hour ago when I showed them to him.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked the Senator why he had not introduced them into the RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In my opinion and in the unanimous opinion of the committee they are not material.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment for one observation, Mr. President——

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

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

Mr. McMAHON. I feel that I cannot yield further at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make one observation? I have been on my feet for the past 30 minutes trying to get the able Senator to yield for one brief observation, and I have not been able to get in a query.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to my good friend the Senator from Illinois that I do not see how I can yield to him, having refused to yield to other Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator permits further colloquy to be carried on as it was conducted on the Republican side of the aisle a few moments ago, I shall make a point of order to take him from the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, five employees of this Commission were challenged by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before proceeding to another point in the argument?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether there is any other evidence or testimony taken before the committee which is not incorporated in this record.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator that the committee held two executive meetings in which some highly confidential matters relating to security, proposed methods of operation of the commission, and employment fields and policies were discussed. I am merely trying to recall whether there were any other matters of evidence taken.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I complete my answer to the Senator's question? The Senator has referred to the telegrams as evidence. They were not necessarily evidence. They were not accepted by the committee, after canvassing the whole situation, as necessary or material parts of the evidence. They came in on the basis of a rumor. No witness testified to them. There was no firm allegation of any irregularities. They merely came by way of a rumor from, I believe, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and they were investigated. I have a file full of "wild goose chases" which were followed up by some members of the committee, based upon fleeting and nebulous rumors. Most of them ended in thin air. All of them were reported to the committee, but nothing resulted therefrom. If the Senator from Connecticut or the Senator from Ohio or any other Senator who was on the committee can recall anything of that nature I should be glad to have him state it at this time; but so far as I can recall there was no evidence before the committee that does not appear in the hearings, with the exception of the executive session.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I must proceed; there is much yet to be covered. Apparently I was mistaken in joining in the unanimous-consent agreement, inasmuch as it certainly does not appear now as if I shall be able to cover the subject. I certainly cannot cover it if I yield to every Senator who has a question. In view of the fact that we have entered into an agreement to vote at 5 o'clock tomorrow, I think it is fair that Senators use their own time tomorrow.

I now pass to the charges which have been made against employees of the Commission. I refer to the case of James T. Ramey, who is a young lawyer. His appointment was protested on two grounds. The first ground was that he had signed a qualified oath on his passport. The Senate will recollect that the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] pointed out that as a college student Ramey went to Europe and wrote on his passport that he would defend the United States insofar as his conscience would permit. Since that time I believe this young man has taken four or five oaths. In the last one he made and in all of the ones subsequent to the first one that is criticized, he added no qualification whatsoever.

I think it would be interesting to the Senate to listen to a very short letter which Representative CHURCH, of Illinois, who represents the district in which this young man and his family have their residence, has sent to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] regarding Ramey. We all know Representative CHURCH; he is a Republican Representative from a district in and near Chicago. He said the following in his letter to the Senator from Tennessee:

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: It seems that the public press in the Chicago area about January 23 included the name of James T. Ramey, connected with the TVA, as among those named by you as being affiliated with Communist activities.

Being acquainted personally with the boy's father, James F. Ramey, and the family, who are residents of my congressional district, and knowing of their excellent reputation in our community, I feel certain James T. Ramey is in no way connected with any communistic movement. I know of no family in my district of higher standing, or more loyal and patriotic than the James F. Ramey family.

I am advised that the name of James T. Ramey was not included with the names you furnished to the committee to be included in the hearings, although I understand his name was included with some notes furnished you by someone at Knoxville. I want to express my thanks to you for not including the name of this boy in any published hearings.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. CHURCH.

The Senator from Tennessee graciously replied to that letter. I read the reply which he sent to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who also wrote him to the same effect:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
February 13, 1947.

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Answering your letter of the thirtieth. It has been delayed because of my active work on the two committees considering the nominations of Lilienthal and Clapp.

I am delighted to hear the young Mr. Ramey is all right. Of course, I take his father's word for it. I am happy to have this information.

Thanking you and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely your friend,

KENNETH MCKELLAR.

Another charge made against Ramey was to the effect that he was guilty of unethical conduct in seeking, while he was an attorney for the TVA, to get into the RECORD some testimony, which under the rules of evidence, should not be admissible. Mr. President, when I investigated that allegation I found, I may say to the Senator from Ohio, that directly the contrary is true. An investigation of the memorandum discloses that this young man pointed out to his superiors in the TVA that although it might be possible under the law to exclude certain evidence in a condemnation hearing, he was of the opinion that it would be better that the evidence be admitted.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The record that is now made, and that I read to the Senate last Friday, was a report made to the committee of which the distinguished Senator is a member. It was made to that committee by an employee of the committee. I read his exact words, so far as the security files of the commission itself are concerned.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that it was only last Friday that investigators for the FBI actually read the memorandum that is referred to. What the Senator has referred to—and that is all he could refer to—was the statement of a man by the name of Bolt, who was a discharged employee, as to what Ramey had actually done.

Mr. BRICKER. The record I read to the Senate, if the distinguished Senator will yield, was made by an employee of our own committee, from the security records of the Atomic Energy Committee, filed with them by the proper department of the Federal Government.

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator in further explanation that the record which was synthesized, and which he read, was the FBI record on this case. Unfortunately, the FBI did not get the final facts of the case until last Friday. When they did get them, they were exactly contrary to what was alleged against him.

I pass now to John L. Burling, whose appointment and employment were criticized. Mr. Burling is a son of a mem-

ber or partner of the firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, an old and dignified law firm in the city of Washington. It was charged that Mr. Burling had made available to an unauthorized person a file of the Department of Justice.

I was very much interested in that accusation, and I pursued my own investigation of it. I found, as I stated yesterday, that a professor of military government went to the Department of Justice, and saw Mr. Burling, who had been his student. He knew him, and said to him, "Do you know anything about an alien by the name of X?" Burling said, "I do not, but I shall find out something about him. Why do you want to know?"

The professor said, "Because I am thinking of employing this German for the purpose of having him teach some of our students some of the things they ought to know before they go to Germany."

So Burling consulted his superiors, he got all the information he could, and he gave it to this professor at Harvard, with their full authority.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield.

Mr. KEM. I ask the Senator to yield for an inquiry.

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield.

As I have said, Mr. Burling did that with their full authority. He gave that information to this professor, and advised him that, in his opinion, it would be improper or would be an unsafe thing to employ this alien. As a result, the professor went home and apparently told that or gave that information to another alien, who, in turn, told it to the applicant. It was then discovered that this had been done. As I understand, the alien got word to the Department of Justice that Burling had issued unauthorized information. As a result of that complaint, Burling was called up, and the Department placed charges against him. But when the facts were known, of course, Burling was entirely exculpated, and he went back to work, and worked there until he was hired by the Atomic Energy Commission.

I next referred to Joe Volpe. If Senators will recollect, a statement was issued by a Member of the Senate to the effect that Volpe, who was hired by the Commission, unfortunately had a brother who was a Communist. I may say that Joe Volpe was a trusted personal assistant of Gen. Leslie B. Groves. There were no doors closed to him; there were no files secreted from him; there was no information in connection with the Manhattan district that was closed to Joe Volpe. Let me say that that confidence in him was not misplaced. I have had considerable contact with Volpe. Let me pay tribute to him now as a very real, live, competent young American.

Yes; Volpe's brother was a Communist—not a very active Communist; he signed an application, and went to one meeting, and said he had no use for it, did not understand it, and left the organization, and went home. So Joe Volpe is used as a basis by those who do not wish to confirm Mr. Lilienthal.

I refer now to Herbert Marks, the general counsel. The charge against Marks is that he was denied a Navy commission. I believe the file says that he was a member of the United Government Employees and Lawyers Guild until 1940. Those of us who are lawyers will remember that it was during that year that those who did not believe that the Lawyers' Guild was holding up the ideals and purposes for which it had been formed, resigned from the Lawyers' Guild and left it. Marks resigned during that year. Yes; Marks was a member of the union, and so was every other employee of TVA. He was denied a commission, and I think there are those of us in the Senate who know many a young man who was denied a commission in the Army or the Navy, who did not automatically thereby become suspect as to his loyalty or his patriotism to the United States.

On the other hand, what do we find, when we look at the record, about Marks' associations, and what do we find from the people who knew him best? I read into the RECORD the other day a telegram that was sent by the brother of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], in which he said, as I recollect, that he was proud to have Marks as his friend, that he vouched for him as a man of patriotism and integrity, and that the Government of the United States was fortunate to receive his services.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

Mr. McMAHON. Marks was a man of combat. A man by the name of Cisler, of the Detroit Edison Co., testified about how they went to Europe to see what they could do about reviving the power systems that were destroyed during the war, and Cisler paid a tribute to Marks for his conduct under fire, and to his patriotism, that was most impressive to the members of the committee.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I am sorry; I cannot yield to the Senator at this time.

Mr. Cisler said:

> And I could give you instances of where these men, Mr. Marks among them, were right up where the firing was going on. And I recall particularly that in the Netherlands we were trying to get power back so that coal mining could be resumed because we realized the importance of getting that coal mining going.

Then we have a remarkable list of Americans testifying to the patriotism and to the integrity of Mr. Marks. I should like to read into the RECORD just a few of them.

Mr. Acheson, whose confidential assistant he has been for some time past, said:

> I am as certain as I am of anything in this world that he has no shadow of a leaning of any sort toward either communism or fellow-travelerism or any such doctrine or idea. * * *
>
> I should stake my life and my reputation on the fact that all of those allegations are untrue.

I have referred to the Taft telegram. I refer, among others, to the statement by Mr. Reed, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co; Col. Walker L. Cisler, chief engineer, power plants, Detroit-Edison Co.; William L. Batt, former Vice Chairman, War Production Board; Donald Nelson, former Chairman of WPA.

John S. Dickey, president of Dartmouth College, testified and he also vigorously endorsed Marks. Dickey stated that he had known Marks for 17 or 18 years, and I now quote him:

> My opinion is that I know no man who is more loyal to this country than Herb Marks. I am perfectly certain that I know no one, likewise, whose devotion to the public good is greater.
>
> And I know of no one who combines those things with extraordinary capacity to serve the public good, as does Marks.

I could go on and read another list that takes up three or four pages. But suppose I pass to John Lord O'Brian, lately the Republican candidate for Senator from the State of New York, and one who worked most closely with Marks. O'Brian said:

> Then this goes on to say that he irritated so many people that they were compelled to move him, and from the War Production Board he went to the State Department.
>
> That is absurd. Marks' assignments were never changed during the period that he was there, except in connection with these several reorganizations of the war production effort.
>
> Certain functions would be redistributed, and he might have supervision of something besides power. But he remained with power from the beginning to the end.

Mr. President, I have talked about Volpe, I have talked about Ramey, I have talked about Marks, I have talked about Burling, and there is only Niehoff left. All I can say about Niehoff, that I recollect as being in the record, is to the effect that Niehoff went to a labor meeting at which there were some Communists. There is not a Member of this body who has not been in a meeting where there were some Communists. We did not know them, we could not identify them, but nevertheless we may be sure that in our extensive campaigning we have been in their presence and in their company.

Mr. President, there has been much reference to the fact that Lilienthal wants more and more power, that he is a power-hungry individual. There is cited as authority for that statement mainly the testimony of Dr. Arthur E. Morgan.

Let me say—and it cannot be too much emphasized by those who want to be fair—that every single charge that has been brought by Dr. Morgan was brought in 1938 before a joint congressional committee. Every single one of those charges was heard and tried and found wanting.

It is significant that the majority report was signed by a Senator on the other side of the aisle, Senator Frazier, of North Dakota, I believe. It is significant that not a member of the minority, except Representative JENKINS of Ohio, insinuated or implied in any way that any whitewash had occurred.

Mr. President, I do not have the time to read in detail from Democracy on the March, but I have read much from that book, and everything I have read indicates to me that this man is a democrat, a democrat with a small "d", and I should like to say to the Senate that those of us who were privileged to be

present when he was asked by the Senator from Tennessee what his definition of "democracy" was, will always cherish that moment as one of the privileges that comes to a Senator of the United States, to be present to hear a great American define, in the most superb, the most eloquent, and the most persuasive terms, his concept of democracy, which swept this country, and which roused the enthusiasm of the people of the United States as it has not been aroused in many and many a day.

Ah, Mr. President, it was a simple thing. There are those, I suppose, who will say that he put it on, but one could not sit there and watch that man think it out, and spell it out laboriously and slowly, without knowing that that was the faith that was in him. Senators need have no fear of his patriotism and integrity.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I cannot yield at this time. I regret it.

Dr. Morgan was Chairman of the TVA. Many of the things that are complained about in its administration took place under his chairmanship. When it suits the purposes of those on the attack, they conveniently forget that Dr. Morgan was Chairman of the TVA at that time. Then when it suits their purpose, they drag him out and quote him as one whose testimony is to be believed against this proposed commissioner.

I should like to point out that Mr. John Lord O'Brian, who certainly had as many dealings with Dr. Morgan as anyone else in this connection—that is, in connection with TVA operations—said:

> I would simply like to add this, that in all my contacts with Dr. Morgan that I have referred to I was impressed in every instance with this feeling of his of distrustfulness toward everybody, and the fact that he was under apparently great strain and very greatly overwrought, and these wrongs had grown in his mind to such an extent that I felt his judgment was affected by it. That is the criticism I have to make.

A few days ago I quoted the characterization of Dr. Morgan by the senior Senator from Tennessee, in which he referred to him as an engineer little known, who, he believed, had built old levees in Arkansas.

President Roosevelt had dragged him out of security for some reason, he knew not what, and I think a search of the records will disclose that the senior Senator from Tennessee, who now calls Dr. Morgan to the witness stand, in 1936 denounced him as one who would associate with the private power companies so that the objectives of TVA would be defeated.

Mr. President, the hour is getting late, but I feel that I must cover one or two other matters rather briefly. Something has been said today, in fact it has been said more frequently during this debate during the past week than I anticipated, and yet I am not totally surprised; it has been said that the thing to do with atomic energy is to turn it back to the military for its control. I have tried to explain carefully to those who held that viewpoint that the safety of America, if we do not achieve effective international control, can only rest in the manufacture of more and bigger and better bombs as speedily as possible. I have pointed out that that cannot be done under military supervision. I have pointed out that that must be done with the cooperation of the nuclear scientists and the physicists and the engineers of this Nation.

I have pointed out, Mr. President, that we are a civilian government, that we are a government that does not believe in the supremacy of the military. I will point out to the Senate that when this question was fought out last year, the people of this country rose in their might and made it evident to the Senate and to the Congress and to the country that they believed that this greatest of all God-given forces should be put where our traditions and our history and our beliefs demanded that it should be put, and that is in the civilian government.

I should now like to direct my attention to the question asked me by the Senator from Nevada earlier this evening. I will say to the Senator that Mr. Baruch, as I have pointed out, adopted in toto and completely the Lilienthal-Acheson plan, so called.

In this plan it is proposed to do several things. The first thing is to erect an international authority, to erect it by contract or treaty, if you please; that after this authority is contracted for, after the contract is executed, then the first stage in the proceedings is for us and for all of the countries in the world to divulge the source materials out of which atomic energy is made. It is proposed that during this first stage the inspectors of all countries have free access to all other countries for the purpose of locating that source material. That is stage No. 1. I might say to the Senator that no timetable has at any point been suggested, nor have we gotten that far in our negotiations. At any rate, that is the first stage.

When that has proceeded to a certain point, a point at which we are satisfied that our security is still maintained and that there have been no violations of the agreement, the second point is the production of fissionable materials by the authority. After fissionable materials are produced for a certain length of time, it is proposed that we set up a laboratory in the International Authority for the purpose of doing research work on peaceful and wartime uses of atomic energy. I cannot attempt at this time, I say to the Senator, to diagram that timetable for him. It might be that step No. 1 would take place this year, if the agreement were entered into; step No. 2 would take place the following year, or the next year; and the third step, 2 years later; the idea being that each of those stages is so worked up that we can retreat if we find the agreement is not being lived up to, without a total prejudice to our own security.

Why is it necessary, I ask the Senator, that the International Authority shall have the authority and the power and the duty of doing the research on weapons? That means all nations together, owning stock, if you please, in the Authority; and the reason will be obvious to the Senator when I point out that it is necessary for the Authority to keep ahead, in weapon experimentation and research, of any nation that would seek to break the agreement.

I will say to the Senator from Nevada and to other Senators, I have had the belief, unlike the Senator from Maryland, that we were doing the right thing in going ahead on atomic energy now. I think we should go ahead on atomic energy now and seek as we have sought to get an agreement to the propositions which we have advanced. I sympathize with the desire of the Senator from Maryland and other Senators who believe with him, in the desire that there shall be complete and total disarmament, but I know, and I think everybody else will know upon reflection, that unless we can get agreement on the control of atomic energy, we shall not get control of other weapons of war.

I have also been constrained to believe, Mr. President, that probably one of the hopes of making a lasting peace would consist in getting atomic energy into the useful and peaceful work of mankind. Ah, Mr. President, it is no idle dream to say, and I do not say it, but the scientists and the engineers who know the subject say it, if only mankind would get down to the basis of experimenting and using atomic energy for peaceful uses, that would do more to contribute to the peace of the world than any other thing we could do. We could harness rivers, we could turn deserts into blooming valleys, we could lighten the work load of the Chinese, and the Indians, and the other poor and downtrodden people of the earth.

Countries notoriously have fought over oil in the past, since oil became such an essential to our industrial society, but the competition in oil will fade into insignificance when it comes to the competition that will exist and the struggle that will exist to secure these materials that are the basis of atomic fission. It was because we felt that way, most of us, apparently, it was because we realized there was no defense; it was because we realized that we could not indefinitely hold on to this bomb, that we made what I believe is to be the most unique proposition in history, the most moral, the most decent proposition that has ever been made by a great people, a proposition which will do credit to the Government of the United States and to the people who proposed it and backed it.

We said to all the world "Here is this great thing that will bring you help, that will bring you wealth, that will bring you happiness, and all we ask in return is effective agreements; effective agreements that it will not be used murderously against us." If we could only get such agreements it would be the greatest achievement I can think of.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I will yield in a moment. If we could obtain such agreements I say that peace would dawn. If we can solve this first question I do not believe any other question that exists between us and Russia cannot be solved. If we can solve this problem a new day will have dawned.

I said to the Senate before, and I say it again, that there is no man in the Sen-

ate or in this country who feels more disappointment at the progress we have made in the last year than I do. I will say to the Senate that I do not believe we can forever carry on these negotiations, because I believe that every day other nations are drawing nearer to achievement of the bomb. The Senate will remember that only a few weeks ago it was reported that 7,000 engineers and scientists in Russia were engaged in making this bomb.

What I have never been able to understand is how Senators who have damned this proposition believe that they have any prescription for the security and safety of the American people except the operation of this plan. Do they feel that the possession of a large stockpile of bombs is going to protect this country? I say to the Senate, not half as eloquently as the Senator from Maryland told the Senate this evening, that the country which strikes first wins the war, and that there will be no warning. We in America are so susceptible to atomic warfare, with 52,000,000 people in, I think, some 60 cities. If those cities should be struck or even a goodly portion of them, then I say that this Nation could not continue as a fighting nation.

I wish I could see some proposal which would save this mad atomic armaments race in which we are engaged.

I said earlier but I repeat it, because I do not think the Senator from Maryland was present then, that while I share his desire, I cannot follow his reasoning when he calls for a general disarmament conference. We have had an atomic disarmament conference in existence, I will say to the Senator, since last June 14. We have made our proposals, we have discussed them, we have tried to secure agreements respecting them, and we have to this point failed. I have not given up hope, however. I cannot believe—and that is one of the reasons why I am for the Greek and Turkish policy—that we shall continue to fail. I cannot believe that if we demonstrate to Russia that we intend to present our proposals and maintain them firmly that she can, in the face of acceptance by all the other nations of the earth, finally reject them. So I live in hope. I live in hope, Mr. President, that the day will come when we will secure that agreement, and I say to the Senate that, in my opinion, there cannot be any change in its basic terms without weakening its effectiveness and thereby making it unacceptable.

I regret—and I said so on January 27—the undue stress that we have placed on the veto question. I think we have made a mistake psychologically in the stress we have placed upon it. Let me emphasize at this moment that I believe that any nation entering this contract should not insist on a veto. I think it is immoral to do so. Let us take that out of the argument immediately. But let me also point out that we proceeded to talk to Russia about the veto, on which at least she had some argument to make, because we insisted in San Francisco, just as Russia did, in writing the right of veto into the charter. Let me point out that last July, when we adhered to the International Court of Justice by a vote of 72 to 12, we inserted into the International Court's jurisdiction the right of our veto, and that was at a time 10 or 15 days after we had insisted in New York that we should eliminate the veto in connection with atomic disarmament.

I still believe, let me emphasize, that we should insist on the veto. But I say our mistake occurred when we did not focus the attention of the world on the fact that we were insisting on control and inspection, when we did not focus the attention of the world on the fact that those were the things which Russia really basically objected to. I say to the Senate that it is so important, so vitally important, that we make our record crystal clear so that it cannot be misunderstood in history. The moral obligation rests upon this Nation to make a proposition for the use of this force for mankind's good instead of mankind's destruction in the tradition of the first nation in the family of nations. That was our obligation, and I think we have fulfilled it to date.

It is necessary, however, for us to rally on our side the opinion of decent men everywhere, not only in our own country, as to the rightness of our proposals and the rightness of our intentions.

Now, Mr. President, suppose there is no agreement reached, what are the horrible alternatives? My friend Harold Urey, nuclear physicist, Nobel Prize winner, man of peace, one of the principal men in this science, wrote an article some time ago in which he said that unless we achieved agreement there was nothing for America to do but to go out and conquer the whole wide world. That did not surprise me because I had talked with Urey on many occasions. I knew of the man's good heart. I know of his sound intentions. I pointed out to him then and I point out to the Senate now that if America should be compelled to take that course the result would be that we would lose our democracy here at home, because, as some one has pointed out, the regimentation and regulation of this country would be bound to be such as to destroy our civil liberties and our Bill of Rights.

The regulation and regimentation necessitated by the last war would be a shadow in the wind to that which would be required in this country by the promulgation of any such program. Assuming that we could conquer the world and impose our will upon it, it would be necessary from then until the end of time to maintain occupation troops to see that the conquered nations did not get on their feet and manufacture the bomb and come back at us.

Then the other alternative has been suggested that we could form an atomic energy authority without Russia or without any disagreeing nation. At first that seems like a possibility, and rather an attractive one, but I think it would probably be rejected because it would be realized that without all great nations within the authority it would be certainly bad judgment for us to distribute fissionable material, as we would, around the world to make that many more points of contact for the securing of it by stealth and subversive activity.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator understand, and am I correct in assuming, that the chief difference between the so-called Lilienthal proposal and the Baruch proposal was that Baruch proposed the inspection which the Senator has outlined?

Mr. McMAHON. No. It cannot be too clearly emphasized that the Baruch proposals were identical with the Acheson-Lilienthal proposals, except for the addition of the political matter of the veto.

Mr. MALONE. Are they identical with respect to inspection?

Mr. McMAHON. The plans are identical. Inspection was a feature of both of them. The creation of a world authority was in both of them. The various stages which I have outlined were in both. That is the report which has received the unanimous approbation of the leading figures in American life.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Am I correct in understanding that Russia has refused such a proposal?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Earlier in the evening I asked the Senator why it is assumed in every conversation and every debate that if any one of the other nations in the United Nations Conference should discover the atomic bomb secret, we would immediately be attacked.

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned——

Mr. MALONE. Why does the Senator dwell so much upon such a threat?

Mr. McMAHON. So far as I am concerned I will say to the Senator that if I thought any other nation had this secret tonight, and our relations were in bad shape, I would not sleep as well as I shall probably sleep. I have developed, at least to my own satisfaction, a new definition of aggression. In my opinion—I may be mistaken—any nation which refuses to accept decent, fair, and objectively moral proposals for the control of atomic energy has committed an act of aggression against the rest of the world. It is my opinion that when a nation has refused to enter into such an agreement, given a certain period of time, which I believe to be from 3 to 6 years, no sensible person in the United States will go to bed at night knowing that he will get up in the morning, and no sensible man will get up in the morning knowing that he is going to bed at night. If that is the kind of world that those who condemn this proposal want to live in, I say that I want no part of it for myself or those who are near and dear to me.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not like to be a war-monger or one to throw a scare recklessly from the floor of this Chamber or anywhere else, on the subject of the imminence of war. However, I believe

that if another great nation, as the Senator has set forth, solves the secret of atomic energy and makes the atomic bomb, in the course of time the fears which will flow from the thought that two nations—and I am assuming that they are two great nations—each of which has this decisive force at its disposal, will result in confusion and misunderstanding between those two nations to the point where war will be almost inescapable.

It is my further conviction that if two great nations, each having the atomic bomb, go to war, there is not a man in the world who can begin to visualize or imagine with reasonable accuracy the dire consequences for civilization all over the face of the earth. It was for that reason that, while I opposed the Lilienthal plan in the committee, I did not carry the opposition anywhere else. I thought that perhaps if a start could be made progress could be continued from that point on through the other categories of weapons. However, I still would have preferred to have the whole question considered at the same time. I wish to endorse the point that unless we find a meeting of the minds between great nations capable eventually of discovering and producing the atomic bomb, there is very little hope for civilization on the face of this earth, in my humble judgment.

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator has very eloquently stated the point. I believe that the difference between the Senator from Maryland and myself is briefly this: In my judgment first things come first. I thought it was important that we get at the control of atomic energy immediately, hoping that we would achieve it. Then we would have something to give. Mind you, we have nothing to give in battleships or airplanes or other weapons of war. This is the only weapon with respect to which we have something to give the Russians and other participants in the plan. What we have to give, I have described as those things which will inevitably come from the use of this material in a peaceful economy.

Mr. President, there is much more that I could say, but the hour grows late. I expect to take a few minutes tomorrow to discuss one more facet of this problem. But let me say that David E. Lilienthal is the kind of man who understands this problem. David E. Lilienthal and the other men who wrote this report steeped themselves in the subject for many weeks. They have consulted with the engineers and scientists who have made the report. They know that this problem is desperate. They know what they are up against. They have rendered a report to Congress, which they are required to do under the law. I urge every Senator to read their first report. They clearly show that they realize that they must continue with all speed—unfortunately and sadly—in the development of atomic energy for military purposes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I know that the Senator would not like to leave any doubt in the minds of other Senators with respect to the investigation of the men previously mentioned in his speech. Is the Senator prepared to say that an FBI investigation and report were made on Mr. Volpe and Mr. Ramey prior to their being hired or retained by the Commission?

Mr. McMAHON. Let me say to the Senator that the facts which I have detailed and which the Senator has heard are, in my opinion, the exact record on those two gentlemen, and cannot be disproved.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator did not mention the FBI investigation. Is the Senator prepared to say that such an investigation was made in accordance with the law as laid down by the Atomic Energy Act?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; and those investigations are continuing things. As I understand, the rule of the Commission is that such employees do not engage in security activities.

Mr. MALONE. Is the Senator prepared to say that such an investigation was made?

Mr. McMAHON. An FBI investigation?

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Absolutely.

Mr. MALONE. And the report was made available to the committee?

Mr. McMAHON. It was made available in Ramey's case, so far as the investigation had been conducted at that time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will agree to make it his last.

Mr. MALONE. I will. Does the Senator know that no request was ever made to the FBI, either by the President of the United States or the Attorney General of the United States, for an FBI report on Mr. Lilienthal or any of the Commission members recommended?

Mr. McMAHON. I certainly do know it. Let me say to the Senator that when we have to get FBI reports on the Secretary of State, on nominees for the Presidency, on nominees for Justices of the Supreme Court, or on nominees for the United States Senate, I would think it entirely proper that the President of the United States should send scurrying around the country $4,000 agents—to do what? To manufacture evidence, or to consult people? To consult people, I assume. Everyone of these men has lived the past 20 years in a goldfish bowl, and every radio, every newspaper, and every weekly magazine has carried news of the hearings on their nominations.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I decline to yield. Everyone has been invited to come to the hearings and give them the "works." When the Senator examines this record what does he find with respect to the first nominee for the Commission. Admiral Strauss? Is there anything derogatory with reference to him?

Mr. MALONE. There was no investigation of him.

Mr. McMAHON. No. He has only been a rear admiral in the Navy; a partner in a banking house in New York, and a noted philanthropist. Do we need any FBI agent at $4,000 a year to tell us that?

William W. Waymack, of Iowa is known throughout the Middle West as a citizen of integrity. Do we need an FBI agent to go out to Iowa to discover that?

Robert F. Bacher is one of the principal scientists in the accomplishment of atomic energy. Do we need any FBI agent to investigate him?

Mr. MALONE. It might help me if the Senator will yield for one further question.

Mr. McMAHON. I am sorry; I cannot yield until I finish this.

Sumner T. Pike has been in this city for 15 years. He has been employed in various commissions. For many years he was with the SEC, living his life in a public goldfish bowl.

Lilienthal has been the subject of attack by those who resent the fact that he has made a success of that which he was charged by the Congress of the United States to do. After all the advertising, Mr. President, we held hearings, and some of the best citizens of the country came and testified.

Let me read to the Senator from the testimony of Father O'Connell, representing that great Communist organization, the Catholic Committee of the South.

> The Catholic Committee of the South honors itself in honoring David Eli Lilienthal who, like his namesake of old, contended with a menacing giant, this time the Tennessee River and conquered.
>
> Victory was his because he brought to the fray unshakable confidence in his fellow man, the burning love of an adopted son for the vast and hospitable region of the South; and a colorful genius for making every grass-roots farmer a warm friend, and for steering a true course through the eddying tides of partisan and political waters.
>
> America honors a most capable son, as Chairman of the International Atomic Bomb Control Committee; the southland honors him as the Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the "Man of 1946;" and the Catholic Committee of the South honors him for answering practically and courageously his own question: "Are machines to control man or are men to control machines, and direct them for the glory of God and the flowering of the human spirit?"

Speaking for the Catholic Committee of the South, Father O'Connell testified further:

> The Catholic Committee of the South believes that the eminent qualifications of Mr. Lilienthal which brought such great success to the TVA and such a bright new outlook to so many people of the South are exactly those needed by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Another witness was Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor of the Riverside Church of New York. Dr. Hughes, the oldest Methodist bishop in the United States, testified to what he believed to be the scandalous procedure of dragging this man's reputation and name through this kind of proceeding.

I do not think it is necessary for a $4,000 FBI agent to go chasing around the Tennessee Valley to see what he can dig up on David Lilienthal, because those who knew him best and worked with him, those who helped him fashion the TVA,

have come before the committee and said that his heart is sound and his mind is right.

Those who came to testify against him were not witnesses who would impress any jury in either my State or that of the Senator from Nevada. They were either disgruntled employees or persons like Remine, who went out looking at nudist camps in his pursuit of Communist activities.

If the Senate votes against this man's confirmation I say in all sincerity and from my heart that it cannot be done on the basis of this record. It cannot be done on the basis of anything that this man has done. It must be done outside the record, because there is in the record no evidence which I think would convince a fair man of Mr. Lilienthal's lack of qualifications for this position.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator understands, of course, that regardless of high standing in the community, when a man is being considered for the position of Federal judge or United States marshal or United States attorney it is customary to get an FBI report before he is recommended. Does the Senator understand that?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that probably I understand the workings of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—if I may say so, without any offense to the Senator—better than the Senator does. For a period of 9 months I had administrative supervision over the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice. I know quite a little about it. I administered the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice for several years. It is perhaps because I know so much about it that I am not brought to the point where I think we should send an agent receiving a salary of $4,000 a year to investigate the qualifications of a nominee of the President of the United States for a position on this Commission, because the men who have been nominated to this Commission are men whose reputation was untarnished, men whose reputation was not assailed until their names were brought before the Senate in this proceeding.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Am I to understand that the Senator, having been so close to the FBI and supervising it for a number of years, holds their work in contempt and as being unnecessary?

Mr. McMAHON. Not at all. The Senator seeks to strain my meaning. That is not the case at all. I have the highest admiration for the work of that great agency.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I understood the Senator to imply, at least, that the testimony and work of various esteemed gentlemen from various sections of the country, with perhaps no experience at all, or at least none shown in the record, in investigational work, might be considered to be superior to that of the FBI.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada has missed the point entirely. I think I have explained it. I do not wish to be impolite to the Senator, but he can read the RECORD tomorrow and see whether it has been explained to his satisfaction. I think he will find that it has.

Mr. MALONE. This has not been explained to my satisfaction: Inasmuch as it is customary, although not required by law, to have the records of all persons recommended for appointment as Federal judges and the records of all persons recommended for appointment as United States attorneys or United States marshals examined by the FBI, and since the Atomic Energy Act, as laid down and approved by the Senate, provides that all employees of the Atomic Energy Commission should be examined, even down to the scrubwomen, and including all employees up to the assistants, then why are the men who are to head this agency exempt—this agency which we all agree might be doing the greatest job in the world within a few months or a few years.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, Mr. Lilienthal has been a representative of the Government in one capacity or another for quite some time. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut this question: Before this debate began I was of the impression that the main reason why it was asserted that Mr. Lilienthal should not be confirmed for appointment to the Commission was because he was said to be a Communist. I elicited from the chairman of the committee which heard all the evidence the fact that the committee as a whole, even including the honorable Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] who will vote against confirmation of the nomination, agreed that there was not a scintilla of evidence to connect Mr. Lilienthal with communism or that he even leaned toward communism. I ask the Senator whether that is a fact.

Mr. McMAHON. I answer the Senator from Louisiana, I hope to his satisfaction, that is exactly the fact.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. Joseph Starnes, who as a Member of the House of Representatives had a principal activity as a member of the Dies committee and was vice chairman of the old Dies committee, was brought by us before the committee to testify on this matter. Let me read what he said:

> And I wouldn't for a moment endorse any living soul for any position of power and trust and responsibility unless I had unbounded faith in his judgment, his patriotism, and his loyalty to the Government of the United States and its people and their best interest.
>
> And I certainly wouldn't have said what I had today, Senator McKELLAR, for my life, about Mr. Lilienthal—my estimate of his character, his ability, and his patriotism—which if what I said had not come, as I said, through years of work with him as a man and as a public official.
>
> And I have absolutely no qualifications in my belief in this man's sincerity, his integrity of character, and his patriotism and loyalty to the United States of America and its institutions and its people.

Mr. ELLENDER. So such a statement as that nullifies what the distinguished Senator from Nevada has tried to bring into the debate.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, Mr. President, once a judge has been examined by the FBI and has served, is it necessary to go any further?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this man has never been examined.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. Lilienthal has been serving in the Government.

Mr. MALONE. He has never been examined.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes; he has been.

Mr. MALONE. Not by the FBI.

Mr. ELLENDER. He has been attacked by various persons for quite some time. The only reason why I, as a Member of the Senate, would vote against Mr. Lilienthal would be if it could be established that Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist or is in some way connected with communism. But I asked the Senator from Iowa, who is chairman of this committee; and he answered that the committee as a whole, even including the member of the committee who voted against making a favorable report on the question of confirmation of the nomination, agreed that there was nothing in the record to connect Mr. Lilienthal with communism or that he was in anywise agreeable to the principles of communism.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. In the first place, I, for one, do not understand that the only question before the Senate is whether Mr. Lilienthal is a Communist. Even if he is not a Communist or never has been accused of being a Communist, he might not be qualified to do the job for which he has been nominated.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, I say to the Senator, that is not the question today. As I have understood the question from its inception, it has been that Mr. Lilienthal has been accused of being a Communist and of leaning toward communism; and that was the main reason why many Senators were supposed to oppose him.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question—and that will be enough.

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to say that the only outfit——

Mr. McMAHON. I refuse to yield at this time, Mr. President. I wish to point out to the Senator from Nevada that before he came to the Senate the Senate confirmed Mr. Lilienthal for reappointment to the TVA.

Mr. MALONE. But I am here now.

Mr. McMAHON. The President of the United States has chosen Mr. Lilienthal,

and it is up to the Senate to determine his qualifications upon the basis of its investigation. That investigation has been as thorough and complete as anything I know of.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

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

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to indulge me in my own time, please, until I indicate that I will yield.

Mr. MALONE. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McMAHON. The investigation of Mr. Lilienthal has been, I suppose, as complete as that of any man, whose nomination has, within my memory, come before the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. It has been as complete as any that was ever made, because one of the chief opponents has, to my personal knowledge—and I have been in the Senate for 10 years—been complaining that Mr. Lilienthal was a Communist and therefore should not represent the Government in any capacity. Is not that true?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes.

Apparently the Senator from Nevada would like to substitute the Federal Bureau of Investigation as the agency to consent to the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal and other Presidential nominees. Despite the high repute of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its great Director, Mr. Hoover, may the day never come when the Senate of the United States bases its judgment on that of either the present or the past or any future director of the police agency of this Government.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Inasmuch as the Senator from Louisiana has said that he is now convinced that there is no taint of communism in Mr. Lilienthal, and that that was the only reason why he ever objected to him, why does he object to having an investigation made by the only agency which would be capable of finding out whether he is a Communist—namely, the FBI?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator from Nevada that I never objected to Mr. Lilienthal on that ground. Mr. Lilienthal has been a part of this Government in an administrative capacity for quite some time.

Mr. MALONE. Did not the Senator say that for 10 years he objected because he was a Communist?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I did not object to him, but the chief reason advanced for his incompetency was that he was a Communist.

Mr. MALONE. Would the Senator object now to an FBI investigation to see if he is a Communist?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I would not; but the Senator should know that Mr. Lilienthal has been a member of this Government, in some capacity, for the past 8 or 9 years. He has been accused during all that period of being a Communist, and all I have heard were accusations.

As to actual proof, there has never been any, and the best authority on the subject is the Committee on Atomic Energy itself, and its chairman said that every member of the Atomic Energy Committee concluded, after hearing all the evidence, that Mr. Lilienthal was not a Communist, and was not in any manner connected with communism. That applies also to the Senator who voted against confirmation.

Mr. MALONE. If he has been accused for 10 years of being a Communist——

Mr. ELLENDER. He has not been accused.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not about time he was investigated by the only outfit that could determine it?

Mr. PEPPER. A point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DWORSHAK in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. I think the Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Sometimes one would not think so here tonight. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Now we come to the end of a long and weary day. I suppose that every Senator has his mind pretty well made up as to what he is going to do.

I should just like to conclude, at least this evening, by reading into the RECORD again the names of the committee which heard the testimony. As I compute their joint service, it amounts to something like 73 years in this body.

First, there is the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Then there is the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the President pro tempore of this body, a man with whom I am proud to be associated and to call my friend.

Next is the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], whose sterling integrity and patriotism are not open to dispute by any man either in this body or out of it, a man with whom I frequently disagree in his economic theories and beliefs, but a man for whom I have the highest opinion as to his integrity and patriotism.

Then there is the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who, since his entry into the Senate, has impressed all of us with his sincerity, his integrity, and his ability.

Then there is the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], former Governor of his State, who disagreed on the basis of the record of five employees, more or less, whom the Authority had hired, and an analysis of those five employees shows that the Senator unfortunately has depended upon a very weak case.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] at no time concluded that Mr. Lilienthal was a Communist or in any wise connected with communism. He said he did not feel that Mr. Lilienthal was in any wise connected with communism, and that he was not leaning in that direction. Is not that true?

Mr. McMAHON. That is true, and I will say to the Senator that the only accusation that has been made of communistic activity or communistic feeling or of his being a fellow traveler has been made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. Of all the witnesses he has brought, not one, as I recollect from the record, has said one single word about Lilienthal being a Communist or a fellow traveler.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same accusation by the Senator from Tennessee has been made in the past 6 or 7 years every time Lilienthal has come up for confirmation before the Senate for any office. Is not that true?

Mr. McMAHON. That is true.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment, after I finish reading the names of the committee.

Next is the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], whose Americanism certainly needs no defense from me.

Then there is the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], whom we all know, and who also needs no encomiums from me as an American first, last, and all the time.

Then we come to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of this body, who has taken such a large part in shaping the foreign policy of this country during the last few years.

Ah, Senators, we listened to the testimony. The lawyers in this body know the value, if they have done trial work, as my colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] has, of seeing the witnesses, the value of hearing them testify, as against reading a cold record.

I think this committee has discharged its responsibility to the Senate and to the people of the United States, and after over 75 hours of deliberation, which we have given to this Commission and to its general manager, we have by a vote of 8 to 1 certified that not one of the nominees has been found wanting.

These men have been nominated by the President of the United States. No man will dare rise and impugn the patriotism of that man who chose them, dare to suggest that he would have chosen any man about whom a breath of scandal could be uttered.

Harry Truman has known—oh, I wish his knowledge had been shared by the Members of the Congress, at least by more of them—what happened when the nominations came up. It has weighed on his mind, it has weighed on his conscience, and he has had to carry that burden. He has carried it bravely, he has carried it well. When he sent to the Senate the nominations of the members of the Commission he discharged a duty that lies upon the Chief Executive of our country.

No; Senators will not find the reasons for the votes against these men in this record, they will not find them in Lilienthal's operation of the TVA, they will not find them in the only practical plan that has been proposed for the control of atomic energy, in which he had a decent and honorable part. No, Senators will not find the reason in that entirely creditable business arrangement into which he entered in Wisconsin. They will not

be able to predicate it on any claim of any proof that these five young gentlemen who have been hired to work on the Commission are anything else but loyal Americans.

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

Mr. McMAHON. Senators will be put to it to find the reasons somewhere else. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator like to continue his speech tomorrow?

Mr. McMAHON. I intend to speak for a few minutes tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I might ask the Senate to recess, if the Senator is not through, and I suggest to the Senator that I would ask unanimous consent that we recess in executive session until tomorrow morning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield while I ask the acting majority leader a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to propound this question to the acting majority leader, whether or not he would be willing to have the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, or whether he would be willing—I do not think it is necessary at all to have a quorum—to permit a very brief discussion of one of the most important issues that has been raised here tonight, namely, the so-called Wisconsin incident. I should like to get into the RECORD, about 10 minutes of discussion on the Wisconsin issue, so that the Senators may read it tomorrow, because I think it happens to be basic to this discussion. Here we are confronted with a unanimous-consent agreement tomorrow, which makes it impossible for some of us to have the necessary time to discuss that. I know the Senate is probably tired, but having gone this far tonight, I do not see why we should not be allowed to finish up this incident, and I should like to discuss it for about 10 minutes at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I would be willing to stay here as long as anyone, but he is not the only Senator who wants to speak on the Wisconsin matter. If 10 minutes were granted to him, it would simply mean that we would stay on for others who would also like to present their views. I should like to accommodate the Senator.

As to the suggestion about convening at 11 o'clock tomorrow, I think that is a good suggestion. The only draw-back is that we have committee meetings each morning. Without an announcement prior to this hour of the night, I think it would be impractical to follow the suggestion. I should like to accommodate the Senator, because I know he has a message, but if time is granted to him the same courtesy will have to be extended to other Senators. I should be glad to ask the Senator from Connecticut to retain the floor tomorrow, so he could yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and the opponents of the pending motion should give the time. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], I am satisfied, will grant the Senator from Oregon the time he asks, in which to make his statement about the Wisconsin incident. I am sure that when the Senator finishes there will then be others who will want to say something about that incident who have not had a chance to do so tonight.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut whether it would be agreeable to him for me to make a motion to recess, as in executive session? I shall be glad to ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator be recognized so he may complete his remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I ask the acting majority leader another question?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. Does he yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McMAHON. What the Senator from Nebraska suggests is perfectly satisfactory to me, and I rather think that we could finish the debate by meeting at 12 o'clock. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon when we meet tomorrow, as he wishes to make a brief statement on this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that suit the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. No; it does not suit me at all. All I am suggesting is that I should like 10 minutes' discussion in the RECORD tonight, so that my colleagues may read it tomorrow and make whatever reply they care to make

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. McMAHON. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Oregon that he wishes to get this material in the RECORD tonight, I now yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield the floor?

Mr. McMAHON. With the understanding, Mr. President, as the Senate majority has said, that I shall be recognized tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a second. First Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow at noon the distinguished Senator from Connecticut shall be recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that the Senate meet at 12 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the fact that an order has been entered by unanimous consent under which the time is to be equally divided between the two sides of the aisle, as of tomorrow, with a vote certain at the hour of 5.

Mr. WHERRY. And that the time of the Senator from Connecticut will be charged to the opponents of the motion. I make that unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a minute. I should like to know if there is any objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senate meets at 12 o'clock tomorrow, we will have at least 5 more hours in which to discuss the subject, and I plead with the majority that if and when we recess this evening, we meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock, because we have very important meetings of committees tomorrow, especially the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time will be equally divided between the two sides, controlled by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but what I am pleading for is that the Senate meet at 12 o'clock rather than at 11 o'clock, as has been suggested.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield the floor for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I entered the Chamber in the middle of the request by the Senator from Nebraska. I am not informed as to exactly the nature of the request, or what the proposition is that is before the Senate. I should be grateful to be informed.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator propounding the question to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am propounding it either to the Chair or to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to answer the question. I asked unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow at noon, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut retain the floor, and that the time he uses to conclude his remarks be included in the time of the opponents of the pending motion.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry. Did the Senator from Connecticut yield the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut yielded the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Another parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Did the Senator from Connecticut request that he be recognized tomorrow, on the convening of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senator that by unanimous consent there is an agreement that the time will be equally divided between the two sides tomorrow, and that a vote be taken at 5 o'clock; so the leaders of the two sides will have the right to the floor tomorrow, and whoever then will have their consent may speak to the question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry. I am familiar with the unanimous-consent agreement entered into prior to this time. I am merely trying to clarify

whether the Senator from Connecticut yielded tonight, and whether or not it is his desire to occupy the floor and to conclude tomorrow.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Iowa that I am not particularly concerned about being recognized when the Senate meets tomorrow, but what I would like to do is to be assured by the Senator from Iowa, and I assume there will be no trouble about it, that during the debate tomorrow I may have 20 minutes—not more than 20 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Connecticut, that he knows as well as I do that there are a certain number of speakers on each side to be accommodated tomorrow. I am sure he may rest assured that we have been working closely together in this matter, and that insofar as anything I can do in keeping with the rights of other Senators who desire to speak, and who would have the right to speak, is concerned, I shall be glad to have him conclude; but I also say in fairness that, of course, if the Senator speaks tomorrow, I see no other answer but that it will have to be charged to the time of the opponents of the motion. I mean that that would be my attitude. I can see no other.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, I do oppose the motion to recommit. But I will say to the Senator from Iowa that I think he and I will have no trouble in agreeing on an allocation of sufficient time for me to say whatever I want to say tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Do I understand the Senator to yield for either a parliamentary inquiry or to discuss the agreement which is before the Senate, or does the Senator yield to me so I may speak in my own right?

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President; I desire to move that the Senate take a recess. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for a question or for any observation he wishes to make respecting the unanimous-consent agreement, but I shall not yield to him for extended remarks. The Senator knows that. I do not have to advise the Senator in respect to that matter.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. No; not just now. Mr. President, I inquire if there is objection to the request I have made?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, then I move that the Senate recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Nebraska is not debatable. The question is on the motion. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to be recorded as voting "no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. MORSE. I call for a division.

On a division, the motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, April 3, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 2 (legislative day of March 24) 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John F. Simmons, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

Paul F. Alling, of Connecticut, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria.

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 2 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey to be Director of the Office of Selective Service Records.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Richard C. O'Connell to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 2 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

POSTMASTER

Carl E. Lindsay to be postmaster at Souris, in the State of North Dakota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 2, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of our spirits, we pray that we may realize the true values of life—its gold and not its tinsel, for no earthly affluence can possibly atone for poverty of soul. Help us, O God, to summon the resources of our beings—imagination, faith, hope, and love—that we may live in more constant companionship with the one perfect Man.

As we unveil the cross and behold infinite love struggling for infinite expression, forbid that we should ever crucify our Lord afresh. Enable us to take from our lives all malice, resentment, and the sins of negligence, and to find the compensating rest that comes with sorrow. He who stands at the door of our hearts and gives blessings; He who stretched forth His arm when we were burdened, saying, "Come unto Me, all ye that labor"—this is the Christ who shall be our King and our Lord.

Blessed Lord, give unto our beloved Speaker the ministry of Thy strength and wisdom, and abide with the Congress in the measure of good health and good cheer. In the honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk today and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

A BUTCHER'S VIEW OF THE GREEK-TURKISH LOAN

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I asked the butcher in a grocery store in a small town what he thought about the President's proposal regarding Greece and Turkey. He said, "A hungry man is a dissatisfied man, and therefore a dangerous man." So he approves the sending of a reasonable quantity of food to Greece, but he is absolutely opposed to the use of military force. He further said this: That if we go too far high prices of corn and other grain products mean high prices of meat; and when you get an excessive high cost of living, we will then have hungry people in this country, which will bring about the very condition we are trying to cure in Europe.

DEMOCRATIC MAYORALTY NOMINEE D'ALESANDRO

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. 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. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that his many friends in the House would like to be informed that the dean of the Maryland delegation, THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, yesterday won the Democratic nomination for mayor of the great city of Baltimore.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. SCRIVNER. 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 Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, when the legislative reorganization bill was un-

der consideration in the House in the Seventy-ninth Congress I called attention to the desirability of writing into title IV of the bill a limitation of recovery—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 25, 1946—only to meet the disapproval of the sponsors of the bill, who would entertain no amendments.

Though the Federal Tort Claims Act has now been in operation but a few months, the experience of the Federal agencies under the act has already demonstrated the wisdom of such a limitation in the law. For example, the War Department reports that a claim for $212 for damage to clothing is now the basis for a suit for $75,000 for personal injuries, and another for $1,047.29 for wearing apparel and personal property destroyed and for medical bills is now the subject of a suit for $50,000. The Navy reports similar experiences and cites a claim for personal injuries originally filed for $927 which was inflated to $25,000 when suit was filed, and another which increased from $4,500 to $51,200 when it was transferred to the jurisdiction of a court under the Tort Act. In a suit for $60,000 the Department of Justice advises that compromise settlement of $49,506.75 was under consideration—over 80 percent of the amount for which suit was brought.

It is too early yet to estimate the amounts which will be awarded in suits brought under this act. In fact, the availability of the courts is probably not yet known generally, but the suits being filed indicate that the damages asked are in an exorbitant volume. Some 138 suits known to have been filed since October 1, 1946, demand $4,331,653. This ratio, projected over a year, indicates a demand of possibly as much as $12,000,000. Judgments or compromises as authorized by the act would be less than the demand but obviously would represent a substantial increase in the cost of settling such claims over the amounts authorized when such claims were handled by the Congress.

I have, therefore, just introduced a bill, H. R. 2924, calling for the repeal of the Tort Claims Act, title IV of the Legislative Reorganization Act, and for the establishment of a Committee on Private Claims to consider private claims bills in all categories. The present law places a ban only on tort claims, leaving still a great number of private claims requiring the consideration of the Congress and placing thereby an extremely heavy load on committees of the Senate and the House whose Members find little time to devote to their study and determination.

For 3 years, as a member of the Claims Committee of this House, I was deeply impressed with the fairness and justice with which each private claim bill was treated. Particularly in tort cases, a person injured through the negligence of Government employees, civilian and military, first had their claims screened by their own elected Representatives. He then, being satisfied of the prima merit of the claim, yet not attempting to pass judgment on the matter, offered the claim as a private claim bill. He had no interest other than to see justice done.

In that Claims Committee the claim was assigned to a subcommittee. Then, much as does a court, the facts upon which the bill was predicated, as established by the claimant's statement, supporting affidavits, the reports of doctors, and the surrounding facts as developed through investigation by the Federal agency involved, were carefully studied. After deliberation the subcommittee reported its findings and its recommendations to the full committee, which, incidentally was composed of outstanding lawyers and judges from all over the country. Upon the facts presented the committee acted, guided by the rules of the committee which insured like consideration for claims based on comparable facts regardless of the locale of the accident, with fairness and justice to the claimant and consideration for the taxpayer who is required to foot the bill.

As a further check these private bills, when called from the Private Calendar, were subject to objections by recognized objectors from both sides of the aisle, or by individual Members, if it should appear that the committee recommendation was out of line.

Much the same course of action was followed in the Senate.

The practice of over 150 years of freedom from litigation due to personal claims which disposed of those claims with fairness, justice, and a reasonable regard for the taxpayer, has proved itself in the crucible of time and experience.

Mr. Speaker, the outstanding record of fairness established by Claims Committee procedure and the anticipated exorbitance of prospective claims, together with the unlimited power of compromise by district attorneys, convinces me, as I hope it will all Members of Congress, that the Tort Claims Act title should be repealed and the Committee on Private Claims reinstituted.

Also, this action will eliminate the necessity for providing additional employees and additional attorneys in the Department of Justice, and avoid the possible demand for an increase in the Federal Judiciary to handle this increase in litigation.

CENTRALIA MINE DISASTER EXPLOITATION

Mr. REEVES. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, this week America's 400,000 soft-coal miners are idle, although the Nation's need for coal was never greater. Whether or not they want to be at work, whether or not the loss of wages during this period will subject their families to hunger and hardship, they are all off the job. Why? Because one man has commanded them to do so in order to demonstrate his dictatorial power and to express his defiance of the Government and the decree of the Supreme Court forbidding the calling of a strike.

All of us are deeply moved by the terrible tragedy which struck down 111 lives in the Centralia, Ill., mines last week. None of us condones in any degree whatever deficiency in safety measures may have existed. But subsequent developments make two points stand out with crystal clarity.

The first is that the period of "mourning" which has been decreed is a thinly veiled and mocking strike, ordered with contemptuous disregard of the express terms of the decision of the highest court in the land.

The second is that, as is now reported, the miners' dictator has had, since last November, a copy of the report of Mine Inspector Frank Perz recommending numerous reforms in the Centralia mines. The record fails to show that he acted at any time to safeguard the men whose loss he now officially mourns.

It is obvious to every thinking citizen that Lewis is more interested in the prestige and power of John L. Lewis than he is in the welfare of his miners. And it is time to bring to an end this kind of exploitation of American labor and the American people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. SPRINGER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he recently delivered at Fresno, Calif.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting editorial that appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News in reference to one of our colleagues.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Chicago Tribune of last Sunday.

ANTICOMMUNIST LEGISLATION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Shreveport Times entitled "Anti-Communist Legislation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the contents of the editorial taken from a recent issue of the Shreveport Times and entitled "Anticommunist Legislation." This editorial comments very favorably upon the recommendations made by the House Committee on Un-American Activities published last January 2. Had these recommendations been placed into law a number of years ago, the House would not have been confronted by the disagreeable duty of passing upon the Supreme Court decision yesterday to pay three adjudged Communists the sum of $2,100 which came up before the House yesterday. I am certainly not in sympathy of paying Government employees who do not freely give loyalty to this Government. In fact,

I am thoroughly in accord with the President in his program to get rid of all Communists, and as quickly as possible. I hope the appropriate legislative committee will give these recommendations immediate consideration.

ANTICOMMUNIST LEGISLATION

When the House Committee on Un-American Activities completes its current hearings—which are yielding sensational testimony on the activity of Communists in the United States—the committee will presumably recommend a program of legislation to deal with communism.

Some hint as to the recommendations which may be approved is found in the final report of the same committee in the last Congress, when the committee was under Democratic control.

This final report, published last January 2, urged adoption of legislation having these purposes:

1. No Government employment for noncitizens.
2. No office in trade-unions for noncitizens.
3. Prompt deportation of all alien Communists.
4. Stringent screening of the political background of would-be immigrants.
5. Restriction of tax-exemption privileges for educational and relief bodies that are really Communist-front groups.
6. No second-class mailing privileges for (a) embassies and agencies of foreign governments that do not extend reciprocal privileges to officials of the United States; (b) foreign-language publications unless these carry English translations of the foreign-language content in parallel columns; (c) groups distributing subversive or un-American propaganda.
7. No organization using the mails or subject to Federal laws to have concealed or secret memberships under aliases.

While the old committee was attacked from many quarters, particularly by persons and groups now suspected of Communist leanings, there is nothing in this recommended program to indicate that it failed in its duty or was overzealous in its attack on subversive radicalism.

Virtually every recommendation listed has the approval of an overwhelming number of Americans. In a referendum, some would probably receive an affirmative vote of better than 95 percent.

The present committee should hew to the line of courageous action, setting up safeguards which will strip the Communist front in the United States of as much power as possible. Congress is in a mood to support a vigorous course if the committee recommends it.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES

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, on yesterday the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] presented to the House a letter he has written to the Attorney General, demanding that the Department of Justice prosecute the Communists in this country for not registering as agents of a foreign power.

I join the gentleman from New Jersey in that request, because every Communist in America is an agent of a foreign power, a foreign conspiracy, that is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government, and the destruction of the American way of life.

On yesterday I read to you an advertisement that the Communists published in the New York Times and the Herald Tribune asking people to write to President Truman and to me, urging us to oppose legislation that would protect this country against communism.

I am glad to inform the House today that those letters are coming in, and about nine-tenths of them are demanding that we outlaw the Communist influence in America and that we put a stop to this criminal conspiracy that is trying to undermine and destroy this Government and wreck American institutions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

ELECTION IN CHICAGO

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there was an election yesterday in the city of Chicago and Martin H. Kennelly, a Democrat, was elected mayor with 59 percent of the votes cast. A few days ago the Republican national chairman, Hon. Carroll Reece, said that the Chicago election was to be the GOP's second step toward the White House in 1948. It appears now the step was downstairs, perhaps in search of that bargain basement that the National Association of Manufacturers promised the people of this country would come if price control were only removed.

The Republican Party in Illinois insisted on fighting the mayoralty campaign on national and international issues. Mr. Reece, by his utterances, gave it national importance. The results speak for themselves.

ELECTION IN CHICAGO

Mr. OWENS. 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. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, after hearing the gentleman from Illinois I just want to say that his thoughts concerning the election in Chicago are entirely wrong, because we had seven aldermen prior to yesterday, and after yesterday we are going to have at least 17, and possibly 18, increasing by almost three times the number of aldermen we previously had.

Mr. DEVITT. Is the Kelly-Nash machine still active in Chicago?

Mr. OWENS. The Arvey-Kelly machine is still active, but the results of the election, as shown by the increase of Republicans who have been elected to the city council, proves that we have broken the back and the power of the machine in the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois, and the Republican Party will prevail there in 1948.

WISCONSIN PRIMARY RESULTS

Mr. HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that since reference has been made to certain recent election results, it might be of interest to report that there was a special primary in the second Wisconsin district yesterday. All but three of the precincts have reported. Without going into too much detail as to the figures, I can report that the Republican total vote in that primary was 64,887 and the total Democratic vote, was 16,044. So, it seems quite sure that the country is still very definitely Republican.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on Monday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by her before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on April 1, 1947.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on the subject of displaced persons.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on income tax revision.

JEFFERSON'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, April 13, is Jefferson's birthday. I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, April 14, prior to the legislative program of the day, someone appointed by the Speaker may read Jefferson's first inaugural address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ELECTION RESULTS

Mr. EBERHARTER. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader just called attention to the results of the special election in the State of Wisconsin. I understand that this was not a special election, but was merely a primary. I call the attention of the Members to the fact that all of the

Republican candidates in that primary publicly repudiated in their platforms the so-called Knutson plan of giving the least tax relief where it is most needed and giving the most relief where it is least needed, and that perhaps may be the reason why these Republican candidates polled such a large vote; because there was a repudiation of the tax bill that was passed here by the Republican majority last week.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. RICH. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remarks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just spoke and tell him that the reason we are economizing in Government is because of the fact that you and the New Deal have for 12 or 15 years been squandering the money of the taxpayers of this country. The country is in such a terrible condition that it is going to be impossible to get things going right unless you fellows join us in trying to economize. Vote once for economy. If we do not economize, I do not know what will happen. You are so ready to spend the funds of the taxpayers. Now, they need help, and we can help them if you will join us. Be wise and economize.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Where are you going to save this $6,000,000,000?

Mr. RICH. We will do it if you will only help us to save it. I have asked you for 14 years where are you going to get the money. Never once did it register with my colleague on the Democratic side of the aisle.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the House may be in session the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects in two instances.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes today after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

SAVINGS IN GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] referred to the $6,000,000,000 budget savings. Frankly, this Eightieth Congress will be in session for 2 years. We are not going to be deterred in our purpose to decrease expenditures, possibly six or seven or eight billion dollars. What we fail to do this year we will do next year, and you will find economies effected during this session of Congress that I am sure easily reach the figure that we voted for during this session. We are not going to do a half-baked job. We will reduce expenses, balance the budget, and meet every campaign pledge that we made last November. That will be a treat to the taxpayers of America after having had the New Deal walk out on every pledge it made to the American people during the 14 years of its existence.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, we will have to do that without the help of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]. If he had his way he would go right on spending untold sums of money that would have to be taken out of the taxpayers.

Mr. BENDER. On the one hand, you New Dealers object to our saving money, and on the other, you object to our not saving enough. Now, make up your minds and tell us what you want us to do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has expired.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. RAYBURN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois can get any comfort out of the election that was held in Chicago yesterday by electing 16 aldermen out of 50, and also by losing the city by a hundred thousand more votes than they lost it either in 1939 or 1943, then they may take that comfort and that unction to their soul.

As far as the Wisconsin matter is concerned, it is my understanding that one of the men who ran in the Republican primary at one time sat in this House not as a Republican, and that his vote, added to the Democratic vote, was more than the local Republican candidate received.

Now, coming to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], you have been in the minority a long time. You were full of promises last fall. You could have won the election last fall in the backwash of the great world disturbance without making any promises at all. But you made them. I do not understand now why you just did not say you were going to cut expenditures to the bone, and if you had saved a billion and a half or two billion, which is probably the limit of what you will save under the President's budget, you could have glorified yourselves with saving two big billion dollars. But the taxpayers of this country are going to ask you this year and next year, "Where is the other four billion that you so solemnly promised?"

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

ESTATE OF THE LATE MARSHALL W. PICKERING

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 154) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to the estate of Marshall W. Pickering, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 1 year's salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Marshall W. Pickering.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out "1 year's" and insert "6 months'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK FOR MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer the resolution (H. Res. 113) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the rate of $3,000 per annum each, for the employment of a clerk to the majority and minority whips, respectively.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSE ALLOWANCE TO COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 136 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective March 6, 1947, the expenses of conducting the study and inspection authorized by House Resolution 120 of the Eightieth Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held

in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSE ALLOWANCE TO COMMITTEE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 151 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and examinations authorized by section 202 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, incurred by the Committee on Appropriations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, in addition to the sum provided by House Resolution 61, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such study and examination or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSE ALLOWANCE TO COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 152 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) or rule XI incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Printing and binding" and insert "The."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWANCE TO SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 135 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 118, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$60,000" and insert "$40,000."

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "Printing and binding" and insert "The."

Page 1, line 9, in each instance where it appears strike out the word "Committee" and insert the word "sub."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 170) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 100, Eightieth Congress, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to the disposition of surplus property authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee or subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

"SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEETINGS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on tomorrow it stand adjourned until Monday next, and that when the House adjourns on Monday next it stand adjourned until the following Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will there be any legislative program on tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know of any, although we will meet tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

RECEIVING MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Wednesday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday next, April 9, 1947, to consider the Consent Calendar, and that on Thursday next, April 10, 1947, it be in order to consider the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that he will probably be absent on tomorrow and Monday and designates the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] to act as Speaker pro tempore.

SUPPORT OF COMMUNIST NEWSPAPERS

Mr. DONDERO. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, we applaud Secretary of War Patterson for his efforts in ridding the War Department of subversives and pinks, but it is rather discouraging to note that while he is making an effort to rid the War Department of Communists and subversives, he is inserting advertisements in a Communist newspaper asking for recruits in the United States Army.

What kind of recruits for the Army are we going to get from such advertisements?

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that fact, we are practically subsidizing the Communists in this country by contributing to their newspapers by inserting these ads. I have requested 10 minutes to address the House today at which time I shall go into more detail on that subject. In addition to what I have said, I have discovered that in Detroit, Mich., some courts are putting legal notices in

a Communist newspaper, probably paid for with taxpayers' money.

Just how bright are we in America?

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], whom he has just designated as Speaker pro tempore on Thursday and Monday next, has illness in his family which may preclude him from accepting the appointment; therefore, the Chair withdraws that designation and designates the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to act as Speaker pro tempore on Thursday and Monday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and in each to include other material.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts from House documents of the Massachusetts Legislature in each instance.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PENALTY IMPOSED ON THE VETERINARY CORPS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, in 1916 the Congress of the United States passed an amendment to the National Defense Act authorizing the War Department to establish and organize a Veterinary Corps as a part of the Medical Department of the Army. Although this was less than 1 year prior to our entry into World War I, this newly organized corps had an excellent record in that war, and its value and importance as an organized corps in the Army was recognized. This is evidenced in the National Defense Act of 1920 when the authorized strength of the Veterinary Corps was increased and the officers of that corps could advance through the various grades from second lieutenant to colonel, inclusive.

In 1935 due notice was taken again of the professional qualifications, the attainments, and the valuable service of the members of the Veterinary Corps as a part of the team of the three professional corps of the Medical Department of the Army—the other two being the Medical and Dental Corps. In 1935 Congress passed a law that members of the Veterinary Corps would be initially commissioned as first lieutenants. They have been so commissioned for the past 12 years.

We have been told that one objective of the War Department in the procurement of officers is to secure men of high caliber; secondly, that to accomplish this an attractive career and certain inducements must be offered.

Mr. Speaker, since 1935 Veterinary Corps officers have come into the Army as first lieutenants. As a result men of high scholastic attainment and high potential professional ability, far above the average of their graduating classes, have chosen the Army as a career. I predict that unless the inducements offered veterinarians to make the Army a career are as good or better than at present, the type of individual that I am sure the Army wants in the Veterinary Corps will not be obtained. Who will suffer? The Medical Department and the Army as a whole.

Under the proposed bill as it affects the Veterinary Corps, an officer would be given only 2 years' service credit. He would, therefore, come in as second lieutenant and serve 1 year in that grade before being eligible for promotion to first lieutenant. He would then be required to serve 4 years in the grade of first lieutenant, or a total of 5 years prior to being eligible for the next grade. Mind you, this is 2 years more than what is required under the present law which has been in effect since 1935.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 12 years, officers commissioned in the Medical Corps, Dental Corps, and Veterinary Corps have come into the Medical Department of the Army as first lieutenants. Furthermore, they have advanced through the various grades to include colonel at the same stated period of service. I have great admiration for the accomplishments of these respective corps during World War II. The entire Medical Department did a magnificent job. I offer no objection to any service credit proposed for the Medical or Dental Corps. However, I do protest the penalty imposed on the Veterinary Corps in this proposed bill by requiring veterinarians to be initially commissioned as second lieutenants. The profession of veterinary medicine has made tremendous advances during the past 30 or 40 years. There is a great demand for veterinarians in this country in the various sections of this field of science, such as pathology, bacteriology, virology, research, public health. All fields involve not only the diseases affecting the health of animals but those affecting the health of humans, especially in the field of preventive medicine. This applies equally to the Veterinary Corps of the Army.

Therefore, without equivocation or reservation, I will state that part of the bill which provides that veterinary officers will enter the Army as second lieutenants will cause a deterioration of this corps and result in a loss of effectiveness. I repeat, the type of professional man desired and necessary will not seek the Army as a career.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. REEVES. I wonder if the gentleman is aware that the shortage of qualified veterinarian personnel in the Army during World War II was such that it was necessary for the War Department to set up under the Army specialized training program special schools for the training of veterinary personnel for the armed services throughout the United States?

Mr. GILLIE. That is absolutely correct; the AST program. One of the large training centers for veterinarians and technicians that I am familiar with was at Beaumont Hospital at Fort Bliss, Tex. They did remarkably fine work there. They trained these young veterinarians and assistants, and they did a very fine job all during World War II.

Mr. REEVES. The gentleman probably knows that similar schools were established at Iowa State College, Kansas State College, and certain other schools throughout the United States. Then emphasis was being laid on making that particular branch of the service attractive to qualified personnel. I agree completely with what the gentleman has said today.

Mr. GILLIE. I am glad to get that information from my good friend from Missouri.

May I say in connection with the training of veterinarians that there are only 10 approved schools in the United States. We do not have nearly enough veterinary colleges in the United States to train these men. There are now only approximately 12,000 veterinarians in the United States and we need about 30,000 right now to carry on the work in the United States.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to compliment the gentleman on bringing this subject to the attention of the Members of the House. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the restrictions and limitations which have been placed upon the commissioning of veterinarians in the service is retarding the interest of veterinarians to enter the service at this time, when they are badly needed?

Mr. GILLIE. That is correct.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I think the gentleman's remarks are very pertinent at this time. The Committee on Armed Services, as you probably know, at present is considering the promotion law both for the Army and Navy. The gentleman raised a question a few moments ago which is also very pertinent. The fact is that the Army and Navy both had to go out and train not only veterinarians, but other professional groups also. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the integration law and the problem of integrating these qualified officers into each corps. At the present time I am not familiar with the Veterinary Corps. Is it completely filled at present or are they still having difficulty securing personnel to complete this corps as authorized by the Congress?

Mr. GILLIE. I understand they still need some additions to the Army Corps of Veterinarians. The point I want to impress upon the House is the fact that veterinary graduates will not come into the Army because they find other fields of endeavor that suit them better. I would like to see high-class veterinarians come into the Army, but you are not going to get them when you offer them a second lieutenancy.

Mr. DURHAM. Of course, the promotion law is for the promotion of not only veterinarians but other officers as well. Does the gentleman complain that promotion is not fast enough?

Mr. GILLIE. No; I do not claim that. They are all promoted in the same manner as far as I can see. That is to say, veterinarians and dental and medical graduates are promoted the same after they reach a first lieutenancy.

Mr. DURHAM. That is, in the beginning?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes, in the beginning, after they reach first lieutenancy.

Mr. DURHAM. But under the integration program at the present time, if the veterinarian also has belonged to the reserves, at the beginning he can be integrated with a higher rank or whatever rank his age qualifies him for. Does not the gentleman think that that takes care of part of the situation?

Mr. GILLIE. I think that would be all right, as far as I can see, but the new graduate coming in would have to take a second lieutenancy for a year before he becomes a first lieutenant. I believe dentists, chaplains and J. A. G., and medical doctors come in as first lieutenants.

Mr. DURHAM. The pharmacists do not. They come in on your level. I see the gentleman's point.

Mr. GILLIE. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. The pharmacist comes into the Pharmacists' Corps as a second lieutenant and not as a first lieutenant.

Mr. GILLIE. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. The very fact that the veterinarians are compelled to come in and serve a certain length of time as second lieutenants, rather than as first lieutenants, is causing many veterinarians to hesitate joining the Veterinarians' Corps in the Army. Is that not correct?

Mr. GILLIE. That is correct. I do not see how the Army will get a high-grade veterinarian at that level.

Mr. DURHAM. That is applicable to the young graduates coming from the veterinarian schools.

Mr. GILLIE. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. But it does not prohibit a man who has a good many years' experience as a veterinarian and who has belonged to the Reserve Corps from coming in on the same basis as anybody else and being integrated perhaps as a captain, if he happened to be in that age bracket and if he has had a certain number of years' experience in the Reserve Corps.

Mr. GILLIE. As I understand it, under the plan that has been worked out, any veterinarian who has heretofore been in the reserves and then wants to join the Army can join as a first lieutenant. Is that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. I agree with the gentleman, of course. I think all these professional groups should come into the service on the same level because the Congress has adopted a policy with reference to the Naval Academy and also the Military Academy of bringing these boys in when they graduate as first lieutenants.

Mr. GILLIE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the gentleman has given any consideration to the effect on the practice in the Veterinary Corps and on the Veterinary Corps itself of the discontinuance of the Cavalry and the transfer or liquidation perhaps of the Remount Service. The War Department has taken the position that the Remount Service will be ended as far as that Department is concerned. I had a letter from Secretary Patterson within the past week on the subject, stating that that was their final decision in the matter and that the Remount Service, unless transferred to the Department of Agriculture, or otherwise disposed of, will be liquidated from the 30th of June. In that connection I have introduced H. R. 2868 on last Monday, to provide for the transfer of the Remount Service to the Department of Agriculture. Of course I do not know what will happen to it. As the picture stands today, the War Department goes out of the horse business, so to speak, on the 30th of June.

Mr. GILLIE. And I am thankful for the horse's sake.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, I recognize that the veterinarians have much to do besides looking after horses. But my original question was, Had the gentleman considered the possible effect on the Veterinary Corps of this decision of the Army?

Mr. GILLIE. In view of the fact that horses have almost entirely passed out of the picture in the Army, the veterinarian still has a very important work to do, more important than ever, as I see it, in following food production from the time it is first processed until it gets to the front lines. That is a very important part of the work in the veterinarian's service. They have done a splendid job, and I think they should get more recognition than they are getting in the reorganization of the Army.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the lady from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I speak with a great deal of feeling and appreciation of what the veterinarians have done, inasmuch as I have had close connection with the National Guard of Ohio for a great many years, with 16 members of my family a part of it. The grief throughout our section at the decision of the War Department to abolish cavalry is very real. Some of us feel that it is not a wise decision at all; that just because they are against cavalry and horses at the moment does not at all mean that the use for them is gone, and particularly when it is considered in relation to the breeding of horses, with which the Army has had so very much to do. I want to thank the gentleman very much for what he has said today. I feel very eager to have some recognition given to the veterinarians for the splendid work they have done during all these years.

Mr. GILLIE. I thank the gentle lady from Ohio for that fine contribution. I may say in that connection that as far as the Army of the United States is concerned, the horse has almost passed out of the picture. Terrific speed counts today; but if you will remember, in the war in Europe, Germany used some 300,000 head of horses in their campaign in Poland. They used more than 500,000 head of horses in their campaign through central Europe, down through France, Denmark, Belgium, and the Netherlands, and so on.

Mrs. BOLTON. I remember that very well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WAR DEPARTMENT SUBSIDIZES COMMUNIST NEWSPAPERS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that the War Department, as of March 1947, is reported to be undertaking a campaign to eliminate subversives and pinks from its officers' staff and to eliminate enlisted men of that character from sensitive spots.

In the light of the disclosures made by our House Committee on Un-American Activities and the drastic action recommended by important private persons, as well as Government officials, regarding American Communists, it is gratifying to note the delayed recognition of our War Department concerning the Communist menace. I would suggest, however, that they be a little more forthright in their attitude toward this problem and instead of giving mere lip service show actually a more constructive and discerning attitude. I am compelled to make these observations because the War Department has been for some time, and still is, inserting advertisements in the Italian language Communist weekly, L'Unita del

Popolo, of New York City, soliciting enlistments in the United States Army. The most recent advertisement of this character was in the March 15 issue.

I submit that unless one were colossally ignorant, it does not make sense subsidizing a Communist publication which constantly criticizes our Government as an imperialist one and portrays our Army as lackeys of imperialism. It seems to me that any persons attracted by an advertisement in this paper should be top priority candidates for an exhaustive investigation by our Government as subversives, whose primary role would be to infiltrate our Army and impair morale. I suggest that Secretary of War Patterson might well impel his talents to investigate his own Department and ascertain how many other advertisements are currently being placed by the War Department in other foreign language Communist publications in the United States. By so doing, he may be able to obtain some concrete information about the misuse of Government funds and at least hold to a minimum the necessity for expenditures of Government money to investigate subversives in his Department.

These advertisements constitute in fact an official Government subsidy to this Communist and subversive publication.

I now cite the advertisements appearing in L'Unita del Popolo on the following dates:

[Translations]

Source: L'Unita del Popolo.
Date: March 15, 1947.

FORGET THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

You don't need to worry about the high cost of housing, food, or clothing when you are a member of the new Regular Army. All of these things are furnished free, in addition to the new, remarkable pay which you will be able to save almost entirely. These are the financial advantages of military life. If you are between the ages of 17 and 34, physically fit and mentally alert, then hurry to obtain all these things, by going to the nearest United States Army recruiting station.

A good job for you.

UNITED STATES ARMY.

Choose this fine profession now.

39 WHITEHALL STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. COX. In other words, they are extending an invitation to the people who are attracted by such a publication to become a part of the United States Army.

I want to commend the gentleman for taking note of this abuse of power and of public funds.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from Georgia is exactly right; and the danger which results from it is to infiltrate our Army with individuals who might come from that source who would read these Communist advertisements in a Communist paper and thereby undermine not only the morale of our own Army but endanger the security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I continue quoting the advertisement:

Source: L'Unita del Popolo.

A FINE CAREER AWAITS YOU IN THE ARMY

These are the things offered you:

New high pay, which you can practically save in entirety, with your food, shelter, clothing, and medical care furnished free.

Hygienic work with excellent conditions, with paid vacations which are twice as long as those offered by private industry.

Real security, with a pension plan which is most liberal—half pay for the rest of your life after 20 years, and three-quarters pay after 30 years of military service.

If you are physically fit and mentally alert, between the ages of 18 and 34 years (17 years with parents' consent), obtain immediately all detailed information from the nearest United States Army recruiting station.

A good job for you.

UNITED STATES ARMY.

Choose this fine profession now.

39 WHITEHALL STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Source: L'Unita del Popolo.
Date: February 1, 1947.

FINANCIAL ADVANTAGES OF MILITARY SERVICE

A worker in an American factory can expect an average of $191 a month. It is considerable pay, but how much of this money does he have left for spending and saving?

Consider the cost of rent, living expenses, income tax, doctor and dentist bills. He is fortunate if at the end of the month he suceeds in saving more than $25 in all. Now, the soldier escapes all these expenses. From his $75 a month he saves, on an average, more money than any civilian worker.

And this applies to the new regulations, which also offer every opportunity for promotion with increased pay. You will be given increments for foreign service, for paratrooper service, or for airborne and aviation service.

The soldier also receives pension credits without any cost through which he is able to retire after 20 years of service at half pay and after 30 years of service at three-quarters pay. Such a retirement plan would cost a civilian from $75 to $100 a month for 30 years.

Learn all the other benefits in military service. Go to the nearest United States Army recruiting center.

A good job for you.

UNITED STATES ARMY.

Choose this fine profession now.

Your Regular Army serves the Nation and humanity in war and in peace.

Source: L'Unita del Popolo.
Date: November 23, 1946.

There is a picture of a girl saying: "His pay is practically a saving.

"To be the wife of a soldier in the Regular Army is ideal for me from many points of view.

"Let us consider, for example, his pay. When Dick, my husband, enrolled as a private, his pay, $75 a month, seemed very little to me. Reconsidering, however, I had to admit that that wasn't all.

"For example, the Government itself took care of other things: dental and medical care, housing, clothing, postage, exemption from income tax of more than $1,500 extra a year. We also have an allowance for me, and Dick also hopes for one on maintenance. He also has paid vacations of 30 days a year. I can also save on social security, theater, railroad tax. Our deposits in the bank earn three times as much as civilians'.

"We can even save. For me, Dick's pay is practically a total saving. And this is not the only reason which makes me happy, knowing Dick is satisfied with his career and feels he is learning much and progressing."

A good job for you.

UNITED STATES ARMY.

Choose this fine profession now.

There are also ads in the following numbers of L'Unita del Popolo through the year 1946: October 5, September 28, September 7, July 27, June 29, June 15, April 27, and March 30.

These advertisements are 4 inches by 4 inches in size.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I note from the newspapers that the Turkish Government has been consulting for the last few days over whether or not they will accept a loan from us because the present bill requires that our observers, our newspapermen, and radio people be permitted to have full access to what is done with the money, how it is spent, and in general, to have free access to all parts of Turkey.

Obviously, a dictatorship such as exists in Turkey will not be happy to permit American public opinion to know the truth about how they will spend their share of the $400,000,000 that Mr. Truman has requested the Congress to appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, apparently Turkey has now over $75,000,000 of gold which the Nazis stole from Belgium and Holland. Our State Department has had some negotiations with the Turkish Government, requesting that they turn over this looted Nazi gold to us as a part of our reparations from Nazi Germany. So far, the Turks have not turned over the Nazi looted gold which they have.

In addition, our State Department apparently has made some small effort, however tiny, to persuade the present Turkish Government to turn over to us the millions and millions of dollars of Nazi assets which are today concealed in Turkey; yet so far, the Turkish Government, whatever the diplomatic pleasantries may have been, have not turned over one thin dime of Nazi assets.

Today, we have a national debt of several hundred billion and our State Department characters want us to spend ten or fifteen billions a year bribing every international bandit throughout the world, for God knows how long in the future. Mr. Speaker, we want to know the truth about Turkey. We want to know the truth about stolen gold. We want to know the truth about Nazi assets in Turkey.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to an Associated Press dispatch appearing in last Sunday's paper which gave the total foreign credits in this country as being in excess of $9,000,000,000. In that $9,000,000,000 Greece is listed as having $93,700,000 of credits in this country and Turkey $40,800,000 awaiting the time that we can manufacture merchandise for them to buy.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. As a matter of fact, if we had all the facts, we could approach these questions properly and would know exactly what the picture is. However, much of this is handed to us piece-meal and we are handicapped in

our consideration of these items because of that policy. Obviously, there are some people who by design fail to make all the facts known to the Congress of the United States, yet on that basis we proceed to legislate, we proceed to act without all the information that we should have.

It may just be the case, Mr. Speaker, that the looted Nazi gold which belongs to the American taxpayer, and the concealed Nazi assets in Turkey, which also belong to the American taxpayer, amount to more than the loan which our good President proposes to extend to Turkey.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here talking about the $250,000,000 in gold reserves which the present Turkish Government has in other foreign countries—I am not here talking about the several hundred millions of dollars that the Turkish Government blackmailed out of us in the war under the threat of sending chrome to the Germans; I am not here talking about the profiteering that the Turks engaged in during the war; I am not talking about the fact that 90 percent of all Turkish exports during the war went to Germany; I am not talking about the fact that Turkey refused to enter the war in 1943 when she was requested to do so by the Allies. Mr. Speaker, I am just talking about the plain fact that seventy-five millions of stolen gold and hundreds of millions of dollars of German assets now in Turkey belong to the American taxpayer. Why, Mr. Speaker, does our State Department refuse to give the Congress and the American people the truth about our relationship with the present Turkish Government? Why, Mr. Speaker, does not our State Department present to the Foreign Relations Committee of the House in executive session, if they want to, the correspondence with the Turkish Government in regard to the Nazi-looted gold and the Nazi assets in Turkey? I, for one, am sick and tired of the willful, deliberate squandering of the money of American taxpayers on foreign adventures in behalf of corrupt, dictatorial, undemocratic governments, under the pretense that by such squandering we are building a bulwark against communism.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman from Ohio allow the gentleman from South Dakota to hazard an answer to his question?

Mr. BENDER. I will be glad to have the answer.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, I will just hazard the guess that the reason is that the State Department would prefer to appease Turkey rather than to appease Russia.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is half correct; while we are appeasing Turkey we are at the same time appeasing Russia, we are doing business with Russia, and are providing the money and the relief for Russia and her satellite countries. You just have to see the whole picture; not just that part of it that is convenient for you to look at.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will yield further, I would not want to imply that I was justifying that position, but I do think it may be entirely possible that the State Department is being a little lenient with Turkey because it wants Turkey to stay in the picture. I am not sure what my final conclusion is going to be on this whole Turkish-Greek situation, and I would not want the gentleman's last observation attempt to commit me one way or the other on that.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I very much regret to see the gentleman taking the position that he does take; in other words, it is perfectly apparent to me that the gentleman is laying the basis for a very determined opposition to the proposal that this country go to the aid of Greece and Turkey. I regretfully say that I construe the gentleman's speech to mean water on Stalin's wheel. I hope the gentleman, when he shall have concluded his undertaking of gathering all the facts, may come to a conclusion quite different to what I now anticipate.

Mr. BENDER. Well, I am only interested in water on the American wheel, and I am not interested in pulling anybody's chestnuts out of the fire, for Stalin or anybody else. We have a vehicle through which we can function, and which we are a part of, and that is the United Nations. Now, with that vehicle, certainly we can approach this question as we did the problem in Iran.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it ought to be perfectly apparent to the gentleman that we are being very rapidly encircled by Russia, and that self-interest demands—that is, if we would save America—that we act, and act now, and it appears to be the best judgment of those responsible for the handling of our foreign affairs that we go to the aid of Greece and Turkey, and go quickly, and with that I am in accord.

Mr. BENDER. I would like to ask the gentleman, since when did the Government or the State Department see the light, or when did they get this religion that they now profess?

Mr. COX. I agree with the gentleman, if it is his disposition to criticise them for being slow to move, but I think they have come to the right conclusion, although they came to it late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In view of the fact that the gentleman's remarks are more or less exploratory and we are getting several figures of speech in here about water on the wheel, and so forth, I would like to pass along a metaphor or figure of speech suggested to me this morning. It comes from a woman who lives on a farm, who has had a good deal of experience in the raising of chickens. She said, "Just how far can the Government go?" She said, "I have had some experience in raising chickens, and I have found that there is a limit to how many eggs an old setting hen can cover."

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman for his observation. The farm lady certainly said a mouthful.

Today the Turks are stealing millions and millions of dollars from the American taxpayers and they have the unmitigated brass to demand from us another $150,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, do you trust the bandit who comes into your home to protect you from an enemy?

Mr. Speaker, the fancy footwork of our State Department characters, their easy-handed distribution of billions of American wealth has got to come to an end. Back in 1936 and 1938 we were worrying about a national debt of $60,000,000,000.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentlewomen from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. This is a little for the record, because I think the gentleman is a little misinformed if he thinks that the Turks are demanding with brass some assistance. I think the Turks are not coming to us at all in that spirit. They are coming to us asking for help. If the gentleman had been in Turkey, as I happen to have been, and had seen some of the situation there and had studied the position of Turkey, I think, perhaps, he would be a little more willing not to come to any final decision in his opinion on this whole matter before more of the real facts are known.

Mr. BENDER. I thank my good friend for her advice. I shall be glad, as usual, to take it, and I shall be glad to discuss the matter with her both privately or publicly.

Mrs. BOLTON. I just wanted the record a little straighter about the Turks.

Mr. BENDER. I respect the gentlewoman's opinion very, very highly, but, of course, each of us has to make up his own mind.

Mrs. BOLTON. Of course.

Mr. BENDER. Even though I have not been in Turkey, I have tried to inform myself on this subject as fully as possible myself by burning the midnight oil and by watching and observing.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I say that I am quite certain of that.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentlewoman. However, I want to say that I have absolutely no thought in mind other than that we in the United States should stop this crazy-quilt policy of ours in our relations with other countries everywhere throughout the world. If this threat of communism is as great as it appears to be and if, as has recently been discovered, after years of calling to their attention the things we have on and off the floor of this House, there is only one way to proceed, that is, by direct action, or by refusing to do business with Russia, we should take that course. Had we re-

fused to do business with Japan, and had we refused to do business with Germany, I am sure Hirohito and Hitler would not have been implemented as they were during the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr BENDER. Back in 1936 and 1938 we were worried about national bankruptcy when we owed $60,000,000,000. Today we have a national debt of approximately $280,000,000,000, not including the debts of States and municipalities and other political subdivisions. The American taxpayer cannot carry this load.

We want to know the truth of this situation. We want to know the truth about Nazi assets in Turkey. I have been taking this time daily to address the Members of the House because I believe this is the most momentous decision that the American Congress has ever had to make at any time in its history. We are departing from traditional American foreign policy. We are trying something new here.

If we once get into this Greek-Turkish deal, we will be asked to get into the Korean deal; we will be asked to get into all kinds of other deals. It will involve us anywhere from $10,000,000,000 to $11,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COX. What, in the gentleman's opinion, would be the result of doing nothing?

Mr. BENDER. I am not in favor of doing nothing. I am in favor of doing something, but I am in favor of doing it with all the cards on the table and knowing what we are doing.

As I see it, the State Department has not put all the cards on the table.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COX. With the information that the gentleman has, would he be able to indicate to the House what will probably be his position when this whole question comes to a vote?

Mr. BENDER. I have most emphatically indicated on the basis of the facts I now have that I am against it. I am very much against it, and I have been saying so every day since it was proposed.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What affirmative action does the gentleman recommend at the present time?

Mr. BENDER. First, I believe we should put our own house in order; next, we should get tough with the crowd which is menacing the peace of the world. There is only one way to get tough short of war, and that is by not implementing Russia, and that is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For quite a number of years after the inception of the communistic government in Russia, the United States and many other nations of the world refused to recognize the communistic government in Russia, and refused to transact business with them or to have an exchange of diplomatic representatives. Does the gentleman suggest, as some other statesmen have already suggested, that perhaps it might be wise to more or less ostracize this Russian communistic government and prepare to have the decent nations of the world support us in our attempt to bring about world peace and disarmament?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman says a mouthful; and, his comment is most timely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. I have been very much interested in the analysis that the gentleman is making of this entire picture. I received a very interesting letter from one of my constituents along this line. He pointed out that apparently at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam we made a lot of commitments to the Russians and that they were all right at that time.

Of course, I can understand that the war was not over at that time, and perhaps we had to do some things that we did not want to do. Then he pointed out further that after the war was over, at the United Nations Council, we let the Russians pretty much have their own way. He further pointed out that some people in this country seem to think Byrnes was getting a little too tough with the Russians. General Marshall was with Mr. Roosevelt at Tehran and Yalta and Potsdam as one of his advisers. He pointed out further that they recalled Pat Hurley from China because they thought Pat was getting too tough with the Russians. He finally said, "Just when did this great light of Damascus begin to shine in the faces of these people?" What was it that brought about overnight this apparent complete change? Well, it is a hard question for me to answer. The gentleman seems to be confused along the same line. Just what was the thing that apparently caused this whole change of attitude overnight?

Mr. COX. I think I can answer the gentleman's question, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I think that change of front came with the realization that public opinion of the country was turning to the right.

Mr. RIZLEY. Probably on November 5.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Roland Rogers, one of our greatest international students, has directed my attention to the fact that one of our members on our Foreign Affairs committee stated: "Are we going to call Russia's bluff?" The witness answered, "Well, I think for you to make that statement is one thing. For me to make it would be another." My question is, Why should a Congressman be denied information? They are the representatives of the people who always "stand up to be counted." We say, "Where do you stand?" and the witness in substance said to us, "I must not answer questions or make a statement." Why?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is referring to Roland Rogers, of Ohio, one of our greatest citizens. The gentleman has made a very fine observation and that is exactly what we are alking about here and have been talking about. Since public opinion, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] indicates, is moving in that direction, then it behooves our Government to be frank and honest in dealing with the American people and telling them the truth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Why do they not answer questions?

Mr. BENDER. I wish I could tell the gentleman why they do not answer questions, but obviously they do not. Does the gentleman think that if the people of America had known what was agreed to at Yalta, or if they had any voice in the matter, or at Potsdam or at Tehran, does the gentleman think those commitments would have been made? I do not think so.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COX. I am going to agree with the gentleman to this extent; that is, that we are in part, and a large part, responsible for the situation as we now find it. In other words, we have helped build the trap in which we find ourselves, but I insist that the power we still reserve should be used in an effort to extricate ourselves. I regret the attitude that the gentleman takes, because I think he increases rather than diminishes our trouble.

Mr. BENDER. Well, the gentleman has a right to his opinion, but I want to say this: The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has asked for time to read the words of Thomas Jefferson on the 13th, and I trust not only the words of Thomas Jefferson will be read but the words of Washington regarding our relationship with other countries. I hope that we get this American policy fixed in our minds and do some pretty straight thinking.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. The gentleman referred to the assets of the Nazis in Turkey. Does the gentleman mean we should unfreeze them and claim those assets for our taxpayers, or does not the gentleman believe that if they were unfrozen, the Russian demands would take all of those assets in this $10,000,000,000 reparation demand they are making? Does the gentleman think we would get a dime of that money?

Mr. BENDER. I think it is high time we began defining our relationship to Russia. While we are infusing money into Germany and elsewhere we must see to it that in turn that money is not made available to the Russians. I believe we have sufficient force and I believe we have the respect of the other democracies and other countries in the world as to enable us to begin unscrambling these eggs. The American taxpayers have financed and today are financing most of the world. We want to see to it that our dollars, if they go for relief, actually reach the hungry and starving and suffering people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. I wish to say to the gentleman that most of the others seem not to be thinking just the way he is on the question of military aid to Turkey and Greece and they have a perfect right to. No one knows for a certainty, of course, who is right about it. I want the gentleman to know, however, that he is not the only one in the House who believes as he does. I have spoken against it on the floor of this House, and unless I can see further light I agree with the gentleman that we should not give military aid to Greece and Turkey. I want the gentleman to know that he is not the only one who believes that way.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter sent to me as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands by the Honorable James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy. The letter is self-explanatory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1947.

Hon. RICHARD J. WELCH,
Chairman, Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Yesterday Congressman NORRIS POULSON, of California, charged that I had deliberately withheld from the Congress knowledge of a petition addressed to the Congress of the United States by the Eighth Guam Congress, requesting full citizenship and the enactment of an organic act for the government of the island.

I understand that such a petition was adopted by the Guam Congress on January 4, 1947, but the Guam Congress took no further action to implement this resolution, nor did it forward any copies thereof to the Governor of Guam or to me. Late in February the Governor of Guam directed the attorney general to request action on the part of the Guam Congress in order that the resolution might be forwarded. Copies of the resolution were prepared by the attorney general and, at his request, signed by the presiding officers of the congress. I understand that they were not delivered to the Governor of Guam for forwarding until March 15. They have not yet reached this Department and I do not have, and never have had, this petition.

Congressman POULSON also referred to an enactment of the 1945 General Fono of all the leading chiefs of American Samoa, petitioning the Congress of the United States for an organic act for government of American Samoa. It is inferred that I likewise withheld this from the Congress. In April of 1945 an assembly of Samoans adopted a resolution requesting citizenship, and transmitted it to the Governor of American Samoa, who forwarded the papers to Washington. These resolutions were submitted to the Fono of Samoa at its annual meeting in November of 1945, but no action on an organic act was taken by the Fono because the members themselves were not prepared to submit a proposed act.

In November of 1946 the matter was again introduced in the Fono and a resolution adopted requesting citizenship and an organic act. The records of the proceedings of the Fono was transmitted to the Hopkins committee, which had been appointed by me to study and make recommendations concerning the governments of Guam and American Samoa. This Hopkins committee returned to Washington from its visits to Guam and American Samoa on Friday, March 28. The resolution of the Samoan Fono, I understand, is embodied in the report of the Hopkins committee, which has not yet been submitted to me but which should reach my desk sometime this week.

Be assured that I have not deliberately withheld either of these matters from the Congress of the United States and that immediately upon their receipt I shall transmit them expeditiously.

Sincerely yours.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 2861) to protect the public health, safety, and interest from the cessation as a result of certain labor disputes of interstate or foreign commerce in essential public services, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a resolution by the Polish-American Congress and in the second to include an analysis of the Italian peace treaty.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Senator O'MAHONEY; and also separately to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 3, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

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. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 154. Resolution to authorize the payment of 1 year's salary and funeral expenses to the estate of the late Marshall W. Pickering; with amendment (Rept. No. 228). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 113. Resolution providing for the employment of a clerk to the majority and minority whips, respectively; without amendment (Rept. No. 229). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 136. Resolution providing expenses for conducting the study and inspection authorized by House Resolution 120 of the Eightieth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 151. Resolution providing an allocation from the contingent fund of the House to the Committee on Appropriations for expenses of studies and examinations; without amendment (Rept. No. 231). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 152. Resolution providing further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 232). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 135. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 118; with amendment (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 170. Resolution amending House Resolution 100, providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (h) (1) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARTLEY: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 2861. A bill to protect the public health, safety, and interest from the cessation, as a result of certain labor disputes, of interstate or foreign commerce in essential public services; with amendments (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2923. A bill granting to married persons living in Alabama the same Federal income-tax consideration and treatment upon filing joint tax returns as is now enjoyed and extended to those living in community-property States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2924. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act, repeal the Federal Tort Claims Act, and provide for the congressional handling of private claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2925. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2926. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2927. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2928. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 2929. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2930. A bill to provide for the transfer of title in certain temporary housing from the United States to educational institutions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 2931. A bill to increase the rate of pension for certain widows of veterans of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2932. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States, under a quota for Koreans, of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS (by request):

H. R. 2933. A bill to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2934. A bill to amend section 811 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the inclusion in the gross estate for the purposes of the estate tax of certain transfers taking effect at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2935. A bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2936. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Bayside, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 2937. A bill to provide that the laws of the District of Columbia relating to the insane may be applied to dangerous habitual sex offenders; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2938. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497; 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. Res. 171. A resolution authorizing the printing of the statement of J. Edgar Hoover before the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. Res. 172. A resolution to study and inspect the operations of the United States Post Office Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Res. 173. A resolution to create a select committee on foreign aid; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIAL

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to accepting amendments to permits from the Government of the United States for the construction of approach roads and toll-collection areas over certain rights-of-way leading to the Golden Gate Bridge, and relating to the retrocession by the Congress of the United States of jurisdiction over said rights-of-way as relocated and said toll areas, bridge ends, and bridge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 2939. A bill for the relief of John Aaron Whitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2940. A bill for the relief of the estate of Sutematsu Kida and estate of Kiichi Kida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sook Cha Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2942. A bill for the relief of John F. Guthridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2943. A bill for the relief of Manley O. Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 2944. A bill for the relief of Alexander Polychroniu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2945. A bill for the relief of Walwyn Erasmus Pennyfeather; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

298. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of 193 residents of Lowell, Mass., asking for the immediate passage of House Concurrent Resolution 4; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

299. By Mr. WELCH: California Assembly Resolution 33, relative to accepting amendments to permits from the Government of the United States for the construction of approach roads and toll-collection areas over certain rights-of-way leading to the Golden Gate Bridge, and relating to the retrocession by the Congress of the United States of jurisdiction over said rights-of-way as relocated and said toll areas, bridge ends, and bridge; to the Committee on Public Works.

300. By the SPEAKER: Petition requesting a full congressional investigation of the whole Czechoslovak question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 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:

Gracious Father, we, Thy children, so often confused, live at cross-purposes in our central aims, and hence we are at cross-purposes with each other. Take us by the hand and help us to see things from Thy viewpoint, that we may see them as they really are. We come to choices and decisions with a prayer upon our lips, for our wisdom fails us. Give us Thine, that we may do Thy will. In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Wednesday, April 2, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is now proceeding under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] to recommit.

APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL BY COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For what purpose?

Mr. BREWSTER. As in legislative session, I wish to ask unanimous consent for the introduction and immediate consideration of a joint resolution.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will yield under this condition: that if there is any objection, I will have to withdraw the consent.