

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1949

(Legislative day of Friday, March 18, 1949)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, we pray that the chosen representatives of our beloved country may meet the duties and responsibilities of their high vocation with loyal and steadfast devotion.

May they daily dedicate themselves humbly and heroically to the glorious task of building a social order in which the spirit of the Prince of Peace shall prevail.

Grant that they may accept the challenge of every noble adventure and lofty endeavor with a resolute faith in the guiding and sustaining presence of Thy spirit.

May they be inspired with the courageous mind which welcomes new revelations of knowledge and truth and the warm heart which is sensitive and responsive to the needs of struggling humanity.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 6, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 7, 1949, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 790) to grant the consent of the United States to the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED
BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Jose Babace;
S. 27. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 208. An act for the relief of Ella L. Browning;

S. 278. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

S. 629. An act to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

S. 748. An act for the relief of Charles L. Bishop.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS—
CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted, without debate, to present routine matters, including insertions in the RECORD, as though we were in the morning hour, without jeopardizing the parliamentary situation.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest to the able acting majority leader that we have a quorum call.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Butler	Humphrey	Mundt
Cain	Ives	Myers
Connally	Jenner	Neely
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Downey	Kefauver	Reed
Eastland	Kerr	Robertson
Eaton	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Ellender	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	McCarthy	Stennis
Flanders	McClellan	Taylor
Frear	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McGrath	Vandenberg
George	McKellar	Watkins
Green	McMahon	Wherry
Gurney	Malone	Wiley
Hayden	Maybank	Williams
Hendrickson	Miller	Withers
Hill	Millikin	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. PEPPER], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

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

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the junior Senator from Ohio

[Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official committee business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS AT COM-
MITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma subsequently said: Mr. President, at the roll call this morning certain Senators were absent by reason of the fact that they were in attendance on a joint session of the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the House Office Building. The Senators who are members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and who attended the joint session, are the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and myself, as chairman.

I ask unanimous consent that the official reporters be permitted to insert my statement immediately following the roll call which was had this morning.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if the request which he has made either expressly or by any implication includes a request that the names of the Senators mentioned by him shall be included as being on the roll call this morning.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I tried to make it perfectly plain. I asked that, immediately following the roll call, the official reporters be authorized to insert in the RECORD a statement showing the reason why the Senators were absent was that they were in attendance at a joint session of the Agriculture Committees of the two Houses. My statement had no reference to the roll call itself.

Mr. DONNELL. Reserving the right to object, am I correct, then, in understanding that the Senator is not asking that the names of those Senators be included in the roll of those who were present this morning?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator is entirely correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD as requested.

Mr. TYDINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, I have two matters which will take only half a minute. First, I should

like the RECORD to show, immediately following the quorum call this morning, but not as a part of the quorum call, that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] were in a meeting of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and were there from 10 o'clock this morning until 12:30 o'clock this afternoon, at which meeting there appeared the Secretary for Air, Mr. Symington, the three Chiefs of Staff—Denfeld, Bradley, and Vandenberg—and General Gates, of the Marine Corps.

The reason why we did not leave the meeting was that we felt that these were all busy men, and we did not want to take the time to come over and answer to the roll call and return, thus delaying them and keeping them away from their desks.

I should like to have this explanation appear, not as a part of the quorum call, but immediately following, so that our absence from the roll call will be properly noted in the Journal and the RECORD.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I assume that not only does the Senator mean that the explanation is not to be included as a part of the roll call, but that he is not asking that the names of these Senators be included in the roll of those who were present in the Senate this morning?

Mr. TYDINGS. The names of the Senators I have named will not be included in the roll call, and obviously the explanation could not be included in the roll call, but the explanation is to come immediately after it, so that when the absentees are noted, those who read the RECORD may know what detained them, as they were on more important business for the moment than if they had come over to the Senate Chamber and answered a mere roll call at the morning session.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in order that the RECORD may be absolutely clear, even to my mind, I ask the Senator if I am correct in my understanding that he is not, either expressly or impliedly, requesting that the names of these Senators be included in the roll of those who were present this morning at the roll call.

Mr. TYDINGS. Without using the exact words, the Senator from Maryland, in answer to the interrogatory of the Senator from Missouri, would say that in no manner, shape, or form, directly or indirectly, high or low, broad or narrow, large or small, is it conceived that the request of the Senator from Maryland in any way includes the insertion of the names of the eminent Senators he has referred to in the quorum call held earlier on this floor in this Chamber today.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, by the use of the word "eminent" the Senator is

including all the Senators on the list. Is that correct?

Mr. TYDINGS. With the exception of the chairman.

Mr. DONNELL. He is not asking that he himself be included in the roll call? Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I have no objection. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the Chair will recognize Senators for routine matters, without debate, and without interfering with the parliamentary situation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

HERBERT L. HUNTER

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NON-PROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders of the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, together with a complete and detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reason for ordering suspension of deportation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE FUND (S. Doc. No. 41)

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, and the Federal Security Administrator, members of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting, pursuant to law, the ninth annual report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid by that Commission during the calendar year 1948, under the Federal Tort Claims Act (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMPACT BETWEEN STATES OF WYOMING AND SOUTH DAKOTA

A letter from the representative of the United States, Cheyenne River Compact Commission, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a compact entered into between the States of Wyoming and South Dakota to provide for the most efficient use of the waters of the Cheyenne River Basin for multiple purposes, together with a copy of his report and recommendation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twenty-seventh annual report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EFFECTS OF TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM ON UNITED STATES TRADE

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Executive Order 10004, a report entitled "Effects of the Trade Agreements Program on United States Trade," being part V of the first annual report of the Tariff Commission on the Operation of the Trade Agreements Program, June 1934 to April 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

W. P. BARTEL

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a statement of facts covering an exception taken by the Comptroller General of the United States to the payment of a claim, together with a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of W. P. Bartel, certifying officer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

EDUCATION OF CERTAIN CHILDREN

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the education of children residing on certain nonsupporting federally owned property, and children residing in localities overburdened with increased school enrollments resulting from Federal activities in the area, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 14

"Concurrent resolution protesting and remonstrating against certain provisions contained in a bill introduced in the Senate of the United States under date of February 25, 1949, by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, entitled 'A bill to foster the cooperative agriculture education work of the extension services; to free the extension services from the performance of nongovernmental functions and political activity; and to promote economy in the expenditure of public funds for the conduct of cooperative agricultural extension work; and for other purposes'.

"Whereas it is necessary and essential that the Agricultural Extension Service be permitted to work with and to assist organizations of farmers, cooperative corporations and associations in order to accomplish the object and purposes of the agricultural extension program; and

"Whereas in the carrying on of the agricultural extension program in Kentucky no funds or other assistance have been accepted from farmers' organizations or other private interests in Kentucky with any conditions attached which would in any way impair or compromise extension agents in the conduct of their work as public servants; and

"Whereas no relationships or activities not proper to the performance of their duties as

public servants have been established or performed by cooperative extension agents in Kentucky; and

"Whereas the bill introduced by Senator THOMAS carries implications of improper activities which in fact have not occurred in Kentucky; and

"Whereas certain of the provisions of the bill introduced by Senator THOMAS would curtail and hamper many of the legitimate and proper functions of the Agricultural Extension Service as conducted in Kentucky; and

"Whereas the effectiveness and usefulness of the Agricultural Extension Service would be seriously impaired and the agricultural economy of Kentucky would be jeopardized if the bill proposed by Senator THOMAS should become law; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"That the bill identified and described in the title of this resolution be and it hereby is condemned and denounced as an unwarranted and unacceptable obstruction of and interference with the proper and advantageous operation of the agricultural extension program.

"That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from Kentucky be and they hereby are requested and urged to oppose by all means at their command the passage of said bill.

"That the chief clerk of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky be and he hereby is directed to forward copies of this resolution, forthwith, to the President of the United States, the Vice-President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the United States Senators from Kentucky, and the Representatives in Congress from Kentucky.

"*LAWRENCE W. WETHERBY,*
President of the Senate.

"*T. HERBERT TINSLEY,*
Speaker, House of Representatives.

"*EARLE C. CLEMENTS,*
Governor."

A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 20

"Concurrent resolution condemning the trial and conviction of George R. Jones, of Owensboro, Ky., and Clarence R. Hill, of Jackson, Miss., and calling upon the President of the United States and the Secretary of State of the United States of America to use all of the means at their command, including the full power and resources of our National Government and economy, to effect their immediate release

"Whereas shocking news has been received that George R. Jones, of Owensboro, Ky., and Clarence R. Hill, of Jackson, Miss., recruits in the United States Army, were tried in secrecy by the Czechoslovak Government and, without regard for the rights of the accused or without the protection of the normal safeguards provided by free and independent governments for the protection of those accused of law violations, were sentenced to 10 and 12 years, respectively, in prison at hard labor; and

"Whereas the youth of the Commonwealth of Kentucky and from every other State of the Union had given their lives and of their safety, security, and fortunes in order to establish orderly procedure and due process of law all over the world, and for which a terribly horrible and shocking war had just been fought; and

"Whereas the safety and welfare of our form of government demands the full and complete protection of the members of our armed forces, wherever they may be or what-

ever duty they may be given, so that we at home and those other freedom-loving people throughout the world may be able to enjoy the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: Be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"1. That the Commonwealth of Kentucky, as a free and sovereign State, but as a part of the Union of States comprising the United States of America, does hereby condemn as vicious, cruel, inhuman, and unjust the arrest, secret trial, conviction, and sentences of Recruits George R. Jones, of Owensboro, Ky., and Clarence R. Hill, of Jackson, Miss., by the Czechoslovak Government;

"2. That it is necessary in order to insure the welfare and security of our form of government and the maintenance of the armed forces thereof that the security of our citizens, and especially those members of our armed forces, who have been sent abroad be protected and secured at all costs;

"3. That the President of the United States and the Secretary of State of the United States are hereby called upon to use all of the means at their command and at the command of the National Government to effect the immediate and unconditional release of these two members of our armed forces, and to this end, and by this resolution, the Commonwealth of Kentucky pledges its aid, assistance, power, and resources; and

"4. That the clerk of the house of representatives certify sufficient copies of this resolution and that he forward same, via United States registered mail, air-mail special delivery, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, to each Member representing Kentucky in the Congress of the United States, to the family of each of the men affected, and that suitable copies be furnished the press with the request that same be published to the end that all free-thinking and loving people may be informed hereof."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the forty-fifth legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session, respectfully represent, as follows:

"Whereas since the founding of our Nation, the States have exercised sovereignty over the tidelands, the submerged lands, including the soil under navigable inland waters, and soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not; and

"Whereas under the common law and civil law the States' sovereignty and authority over and title to said lands has been long acknowledged, affirmed and respected by the Federal Government whose only powers were expressly delegated to it by the States at the time of the formation of our Government; and

"Whereas the States did not delegate unto the Federal Government authority or power over or title to said lands but retained same to and for the States; and

"Whereas the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of United States against California, while not deciding the question of ownership of the tidewater lands of California, casts a cloud on that State's title to said lands and the minerals and other natural resources beneath; and

"Whereas this decision of the Supreme Court recognizes that the matter of owner-

ship of said tidewater lands is still a question for the Congress to decide; and

"Whereas the title to the tidelands and submerged lands of the States is clouded by this decision and the language therein is so broad as to be extendible to the soil under navigable inland waters and soils under the navigable waters within the territorial jurisdiction of the States, and even to the minerals and other natural resources or important elements on or beneath the soil of the States; and

"Whereas this cloud of uncertainty affects minerals, fisheries, and all other natural resources and should be removed by the Congress, thereby acknowledging and reaffirming ownership to the States; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress passed a bill, reaffirming and acknowledging ownership in the submerged lands and resources of the respective States and quitclaiming all right and title thereto to the respective States reserving only a paramount right to the Government in case of national defense, by a vote of 198 for to 26 against, but the measure died in the Senate by the adjournment of the Eightieth Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States be and the same hereby is memorialized to further consider and enact suitable legislation for the purpose of acknowledging and affirming ownership of submerged lands and resources thereof to the respective States in accordance with the heretofore long recognized constitutional rights of the States; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to each House of the Congress and to each Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Oregon and to each of the United States Senators from this State, and urge that they individually and collectively give wholehearted support to bring about the enactment of such legislation.

"Adopted by senate March 7, 1949.

"WM. E. WALSH,
President of Senate.

"Concurred in by house March 28, 1949.

"FRANK J. VAN DYKE,
Speaker of House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution 89

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a joint resolution, bearing number House Joint Resolution 29, which contains the following title, recitals, and resolve:

"Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as 'Interfaith Day'"

"Whereas the United States of America was founded on the firm basis of freedom of thought and conscience; and

"Whereas the fomenting of antagonism between Americans on a basis of sectarian creed is contrary to American traditions and to the spirit of the guarantees of freedom of worship embodied in the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas it ought to be, and is hereby declared to be, the policy of Congress to encourage the mutual understanding of all people of good will; and

"Whereas the program of the interfaith movement offers a practicable means for encouraging such mutual understanding: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fourth Sunday in September of each year is hereby designated as 'Interfaith Day,' and the Pres-

ident of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such day, and urging the participation of all Americans and all religious groups in the United States, regardless of sect or creed, to participate in the observance of such day by such means as they may deem appropriate; and

"Whereas the great State of New York, as well as the entire Nation, draws its strength and inspiration from all races and creeds and should by its example set a standard for the entire world: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed House Joint Resolution 29; and it is further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That His Excellency, the Governor of the State of New York, shall issue, publish, and declare an appropriate proclamation to the people of the State of New York designating and setting aside annually the fourth Sunday of September to be known as 'Interfaith Day' and inviting the people of the State of New York to observe this day in churches and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies designed to remind all people that the Fatherhood of God is best exemplified by living in brotherhood with all mankind; and it is further

"Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York.

"By order of the assembly.

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,

"Clerk."

"In senate, March 30, 1949, concurred in without amendment.

"By order of the senate.

"WILLIAM S. KING,

"Clerk."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas certain real property in the heart of the business district in Seattle, familiarly known as the Metropolitan Tract, has for many years been owned by the University of Washington; and

"Whereas said tract has long been held under lease by the Metropolitan Building Company, a private corporation, and occupied by several large office and other buildings; and

"Whereas, said Metropolitan Building Company has paid tremendous amounts to the Federal Government by way of income taxes; and

"Whereas the aforesaid lease will expire by its terms on November 1, 1954; and

"Whereas public controversy has arisen on the question whether such lease should be renewed by the University or not, such controversy stemming from the fact that the operation of the buildings aforesaid by the University, rather than by a private corporation, would obviate the payment of Federal income taxes, and to such extent would result in greater income to the University; and

"Whereas the welfare of the State of Washington in this critical period would be materially advanced by a Federal grant to said University in the amount of the income taxes above mentioned; and

"Whereas such a grant, while tending to abate the public controversy within the State of Washington, would unquestionably conduce to a promotion of the Federal weal by providing additional revenue for higher education: now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Washington in the thirty-first regular legis-

lative session assembled, That the Congress of the United States be requested by appropriate legislation to provide for a grant to the University of Washington for university purposes in the amount of the Federal income taxes heretofore paid to the National Government by the Metropolitan Building Company, aforesaid, and for the payment to said University for the same purposes of such amounts as may in future be received by the National Government by way of income taxes from said Metropolitan Building Company; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be immediately transmitted to the Honorable, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Washington Congressional delegation."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas there is deep concern about the intention of the Atomic Energy Commission of the United States to condemn the Wahluke slope, which is situated in Grant and Franklin Counties, in the State of Washington, and constitutes some of the best farm land in the entire Columbia River Basin; and

"Whereas the land sought to be condemned represents about 20 percent of the potential productivity of the entire Columbia River project and has the longest-growing season of any land in the State of Washington; and

"Whereas if this land is taken the State will lose about \$30,000,000 annually in new wealth, which will entail a loss of many millions of dollars in taxes badly needed by the State; and

"Whereas the reason given for condemnation of this property is to protect the health of the farmers residing and to reside on this property; and

"Whereas this does not make sense for the reason that under the law and regulations of the Columbia Basin project, there will be only about 2,000 farms on the Wahluke slope to be occupied and used by about 2,000 families, or about 10,000 people, whose health would be involved; and

"Whereas the cities of Pasco and Richland, Wash., and the 20,000 people now employed at the atomic-energy plant near Richland, or an approximate total of 100,000 people, will be as close or closer to the plant than will the residents of the land in question; and

"Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission, upon hiring people to work in the plant, assures them that working in or near the plant will not be injurious to their health; and

"Whereas the taking of this land will also deprive approximately 2,000 war veterans of an opportunity for a farm and being able to make a good living on some of the richest farm land in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington in thirty-first legislative session assembled, That this highly important matter to the people of the State of Washington and the Wahluke Slope Landowners' Association receive immediate attention and that the effort to condemn this property be stopped in order that the Bureau of Reclamation may proceed with canals and ditches now in process of construction to bring this property in a proper state of productivity as soon as possible as heretofore planned; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the honorable, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Washington congressional delegation."

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

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 29

"Concurrent resolution endorsing the project for a harbor at Kawaihae, Island of Hawaii, and requesting the Congress of the United States of America to appropriate Federal funds for said project

"Whereas the port of Hilo is the only port of the island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, where deep sea vessels can dock; and

"Whereas because of the possibility of tidal waves and other circumstances there is need of another such port on the said island; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, pursuant to Public Law 525, Seventy-ninth Congress, has reported favorably upon and recommended such a port and harbor at Kawaihae, island of Hawaii, at an initial cost to the United States Government of \$5,525,500 and to the Territory of Hawaii, for local cooperation, of \$1,478,000; and

"Whereas by Act 95 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1947, the board of harbor commissioners of said Territory was authorized to issue revenue bonds and the sum of \$1,000,000 was appropriated out of proceeds from the issuance of said bonds 'for overseas terminal, Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii, including plans, land acquisition, improvements to land and other necessary expenses,' subject to the proviso that no expenditures, except for surveys and design work, should be made for such project until the United States engineer department approved the project and agreed to cooperate through the development of said Kawaihae Harbor: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fifth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the project for a harbor at Kawaihae, island of Hawaii, as planned and recommended by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, be, and it is hereby endorsed; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby requested to appropriate the aforesaid Federal funds for the said project; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, expressing appreciation to the people of France for sending to the people of Oklahoma the Merci Car; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See context of concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on April 4, 1949, p. 3852, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the Long Beach (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of legislation to curtail Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by A. Santacaterina, president, Italian Women's Community Hour Club, of Chicago, Ill., relating to the return of former colonies of Italy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the James Wallace Costigan Post No. 11, the American Legion, Department of Kentucky, of New Port, Ky., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit communism in America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by W. E. Pelk, president, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and dean of the College of Education, University of Minnesota, of Minneapolis,

Minn., and sundry other officials of colleges of the United States, relating to Federal aid to public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Resolutions adopted by the Weiser (Idaho) Chamber of Commerce; the Medical Society of the County of Albany, N. Y.; the Eighth District Dental Society, of New York, and the Fort Worth District Dental Society, of Fort Worth, Tex., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Mrs. Walter Carroll Anderson, State president, and Mrs. Claude Palmer Stephens, State recording secretary, Kentucky Society, United States Daughters of 1812, of Lexington, Ky., together with a resolution adopted by that society, relating to the Freedom Train; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 42. A bill for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson; with amendments (Rept. No. 229);

S. 408. A bill for the relief of Barbara O'Brien Farquar; with amendments (Rept. No. 230);

H. R. 594. A bill for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 227);

H. R. 595. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 234);

H. R. 1094. A bill for the relief of Nellie M. Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 222);

H. R. 1164. A bill for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey; without amendment (Rept. No. 223);

H. R. 1169. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz; with an amendment (Rept. No. 228);

H. R. 1176. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hahn; without amendment (Rept. No. 224);

H. R. 1271. A bill for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.; with amendments (Rept. No. 235);

H. R. 1280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes; without amendment (Rept. No. 225);

H. R. 1286. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland; without amendment (Rept. No. 226); and

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution for the relief of the First Citizens Bank & Trust Co., administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr.; with amendments (Rept. No. 231).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations to the Federal Security Administrator in addition to those authorized under title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 233).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 526. A bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 232).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 576. A bill to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to

Myton, Utah; with amendments (Rept. No. 238);

H. R. 220. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301); without amendment (Rept. No. 236); and

H. R. 1998. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 237).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 221) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-7793367, Acevedo, Ramona nee Diaz Galetty.

A-6683184, Adam, Emmanuel Konstantinos or Emanuel Constantinos Adam.

A-5880692, Altmann, Anton Frederick (Friedrich).

A-6758166, Alves, Domingos Esteves.

A-6115712, Angulano-Alcazar, Felix alias Agustin Valencia alias Agustin Valencia Angulano alias Felix Angulano alias Felix Angulano.

A-3224363, Andersen, Knud Kaspar.

A-2940833, Anderson, Axel Hjalmar alias Axel Hjalmar Carlsson.

A-9577267, Apeessos, Ioannis Pndelis alias John P. Apeessos.

A-6679669, Appelthaler, Katerina.

A-6679668, Appelthaler, Kurt Robert.

A-2211955, Arellano, Domingos Ramos.

A-1393347, Arellano, Soledad Valadez or Soledad Maria Valadez.

A-6071241, Arellano, Innocencio.

A-6071239, Arellano, Domingo, Jr., or Dominic Arellano.

A-6071240, Arellano, Juan or John Arellano.

A-3779214, Arlt, Hans Erich Lothar.

A-1153452, Arrighi, Alessandro or Alexander or Alessandro Arrigo.

A-6301280, Bagniewski, Wanda Stanislaw or Wanda Stanislaw Klernik.

A-6321666, Bastide, Genevieve Marcelle.

A-2118744, Bau, Siu-Tsung or Marguerite Janet Bau Chang.

A-3419857, Baum, Betty.

A-3151534, Baumann, Henrik Chaskiel or Henry Baumann.

A-6026888, Beitelstein, Anton, Anton Stein, Tony Stein or Anton Beidelstein, Anton Beitelstein.

A-7765476, Berard, Jorge Vandesmet.

A-5920168, Berkle, Ivera Romalia.

A-6434078, Bernheimer, Ludwig.

A-5153633, Bianchi, Luigi.

A-5932160, Blake, Eulalie Constanca or Eulalie Constanca Turnbull.

A-6760216, Blake, Helena Ketruda or Helena Ketruda Powell.

A-3113337, Bober, Maria Theresia Gerber.

A-6466991, Borraccia, Lorenzo.

A-628235, Bronner, Eugenia Michael formerly Eugenia Gavriloff, nee Losseff.

A-6288068, Bronner, Helen Tamara Mariana formerly Helen Tamara Marianna Gavriloff.

A-6316110, Brouwer, Frans Hieronimus Borgman.

A-6625552, Brown, Doris nee Singh.

A-2673048, Brown, Morris Simon alias Movsa Braunreit.

A-6701608, Burgers, Willem Adolph Johan.

A-6645933, Butterick, Janet Barry or Janet Barry Mack.

A-7651629, Candia, Jose alias Jose Candia Urguidi or Jose Urguidi or Joe.

A-9769688, Carro, Alfredo or Alfred Carro.

A-3299176, Castillo, Geronimo or Giro Castillo.

A-6336616, Chalmers, Bromley Russell Scott.

A-6336617, Chalmers, Jill.

A-7041842, Chin, Yuen Chew or Chin Yuen Chew or Chew Yuen Chinn.

A-5138325, Chui, Wan; Chui Wan; Hang Kin Chui; Hankin Hunt.

A-1581731, Clesia, Ludwik.

A-5179937, Valdes, Maria Hortensia Clemente y Sanchez McDonald; or Hortensia Clemente y Sanchez McDonald Valdes nee Hortensia Clemente y Sanchez; Maria Hortensia Clemente Sanchez or Maria Hortensia Clemente McDonald.

A-5611302, Cohen, Joseph.

A-4860986, Cohen, Gertie Gertrude.

A-2554813, Conradt, Ernst Heinrich Wilhelm or Ernst Henry Conradt.

A-6262074, Cucullu, Francesca R.

A-2113086, DaGoutis, Louise Emille nee Masse.

A-6404432, Davis, Diane May.

A-6404433, Davis, Eileen Marie.

A-6404431, Davis, Philip Bennet.

A-2945357, Dawson, Harriet Mae or Hattie Mae Lloyd or Harriet Mae Gibson.

A-4746398, De Escalante, Alicia Adriana Vara or Alicia Adriana Vara-Solis DeCordero.

A-3197506, De Gomez, Rita Avena alias Rita Avena.

A-6079055, Dimakos, Christos alias Christos Demakos.

A-4665465, DiPietro, Sebastiano or Pietro Petrillo or Grido Cardella.

A-9836789, Drioli, Salvatore.

A-9671716, Elvir, Cesar Augusto.

A-4785369, Engles, Elsie Violet nee Elsie Violet Huffman.

A-5906567, Fahie, Adeline nee Nibbs.

A-3481412, Fahie, Joseph Alfred.

A-5832029, Fahie, Rebecca.

A-3193626, Fekete, Agnes Elizabeth nee Pauza now Kourcosk or Korsak.

A-6774677, Frank, Annie or Ann Frank or Ann Burtinik Frank or Annie Burtinik Frank.

A-6716135, Frazer, Joseph Wellington.

A-6464484, Frenkel, Mayer.

A-6020425, Gabriel, Manuel Gimenez.

A-6405609, Gallegos, Manuel or Manuel Medina.

A-3750703, Garcia, Juan or John Garcia.

A-6063595, Garcia, William Joseph.

A-5140522, Garlipp, Franz Hermann or Frank Herman Garlipp.

A-5048436, Ghinelli, Germano or Jerry Ghinelli.

A-6051631, Gobb, Marguerite Elinor nee Aaron also known as Marguerite Elinor Aaron.

A-6500830, Gomez, Maria Pilar alias Olivia Gomez alias Maria Olivia Gomez Pedroza or Maria Pila Gomez Quesada.

A-6288439, Greaves, Anne Marie nee Anne Marie Erneste Pierre Monlouis-Eugene.

A-6630053, Gson-Niebling, Goesta Bertil.

A-3053878, Hanko, Joseph Ewald or Joseph or Jozef Hanko.

A-6413603, Harvie, Meryl Lorraine or Meryl Lorraine Grayson.

A-6369265, Hernandez-Gutierrez, Jose Maria.

A-4463931, Haimburger, Rudolf Gustave or Rudolf Haimburger.

A-6590997, Huggins, William Archibald.

A-6425288, Jacobs, Olive Jane.

A-6446194, Joanta, Florence nee Florence Antonescu.
 A-9505156, Johansen, Kristian Rudolf.
 A-4624493, Kimbell, Ofelia Aycardi nee Aycardi.
 A-9706894, Kokolis, Jonnes Peter; or Kokolis, John Peter alias John Nicholas Kokolis or Ioannis Kokolis or Ioanis Gianaris or Ioannis Panagiotis Kokolis or Ioanis Koukalis.
 A-6489767, Kostrzak, Lita Foerster, nee Lita Foerster.
 A-6440727, Kovar, Anton or Anton Joseph Kovar.
 A-6208118, Kromhout, Arie Jan.
 A-4549342, Laeske, Hedwig Anna, formerly Browne nee Bardeleben.
 A-6484122, Lansford, Ethel Matilda, formerly Ethel Matilda Molohon, nee MacDonaid.
 A-2773539, Lee, Ruth Mo or Ruth Lo-Tak Mo.
 56122/739, Lencovich, Joseph Peter.
 A-1304739, Lepore, Salvatore, alias Samuel or Sam Lepore alias Samuel Le Poce.
 A-4769421, Lettsome, Edward, or Edward Letsome.
 A-1424552, Levitsky, Thomas.
 A-6261599, Longos, Katina.
 A-1322447, Lopez-Martinez, Juan.
 A-2365797, de Lopez, Maria Valadez-Romero.
 A-4388670, Lo Surdo, Sebastiano.
 A-2145986, Lucas, Lieselotte, or Lieselotte Muenzer or Lotte Muenzer or Munzer.
 A-6706960, Luschning, Klaus Oswald or Klaus Carnival.
 A-4584463, Mac Clymont, David, or Thomas Wood.
 A-5777765, Mahlman, Bruno William, or Bruno William Dietrich Mahlman.
 A-4052648, Malerba, Domenico, or Domenick Malerba.
 A-6095324, Mantzuranis, Evagelia, or Evagelia Mantzuranl or Evagelia Stratigakis.
 A-6645782, Mar, Judy, alias Judy Muck.
 A-6645783, Mar, James, alias James Muck.
 A-6566614, Mariades, Helene Agouras, formerly Helene Andrea Agouras.
 A-6612108, Marquez, Arturo.
 A-6612107, Marquez, Maria Del Carmen.
 A-6694634, Martinez, Cruz.
 A-6689502, McDougall, Joseph Ignatius.
 A-3024922, McGill, John Joseph.
 A-6603045, Mendoza, Julio.
 A-6608918, Mendoza, Jose Salome.
 A-9578104, Montgomery, Clem.
 A-5694677, Muller, Mathias, or Mathew Muller.
 A-5694675, Muller, Barbara, nee Messner.
 A-3869778, Munoz, Maria Amparo Gegunde Gomez, nee Maria Gegunde.
 A-2481845, Munroe, Harold Bruce.
 A-9801088, Newton, Arthur.
 A-4026037, Nimenneh, Thomas Kun, or Thomas Nimenneh or Thomas Nimenneh-Bey or Thomas Kun Nemerea or Keen Nimenneh or Sam Nimenneh or Keen Nimeh.
 A-4651936, O'Dwyer, Elizabeth nee Ahern alias Elizabeth Organ.
 A-6611843, Ottley, Robyn Josephine.
 A-9836874, Palceira, Vicente or Vicente Palceira Perez.
 A-2201575, Palermo, Rosario or Richard Ross Palermo or Ross Palermo.
 A-3140422, Palermo, Salvatore or Samuel Palermo.
 A-3236433, Palermo, Vincenzo or James Palermo.
 A-3140520, Palermo, Anna.
 A-9769360, Pane, Antonino or Anthony Pane or Antonio Pane.
 A-6256122, Papadakis, Georgia N.
 A-4642742, Parasiliti, Nicola Sebastiano Collazzo or Nicola Sebastiano Parasiliti Collazzo or Nicholas Parasi or Benny Pernite or Nicholas Benny Pernite.
 A-6374752, Paul, Alvin Colton Thomas Theophilus.
 A-6321342, Piekarz, Hersz.
 A-6633957, Pilostomos, Christos Antonios.

A-7598205, Questel, Francois Marie Edouard, or Edouard Questel.
 A-5369159, Ramos, Anastacio.
 A-3586557, Ramos, Anacleto.
 A-5711339, Rando, Bartolo.
 A-4798904, de Rangel, Rita Morales or Rita Arroyo.
 A-7703612, Rehen, Estrid Viola Margareta or Estrid Viola Margareta Tengwall nee Sundberg.
 A-9582529, Reinsma, Otte or Otto Reinsma.
 A-6290531, Reiter, Fanny nee Diamond or Fany Reiter.
 A-4030409, Resch, Frank or Frank Reck or Franz Resch.
 A-6608814, Reynolds, Bernard Douglas.
 A-5917858, Robles, Isidro.
 A-6001963, Roberts, Norma Elizabeth or Norma E. Roberts or Norma Roberts.
 A-7757524, Rodgers, Naomi Elizabeth.
 A-6113669, Roman-Rodriguez, Antonio.
 A-3680851, Rostar, Victor.
 A-6373974, Rothstein, Izydor.
 A-6373973, Rothstein, Helena.
 A-6611826, Rudd, James Sidney.
 A-3667351, Ruiz-Carillo De Quintero, Maria or Dolores Cardenas-Soto.
 A-2548950, Rullo, Hazel Ann nee DeLisie.
 A-9776541, Russo, Salvatore.
 A-5155756, Sagert, Clarence James.
 A-5573562, Schenk, Otto alias Otto Lehman.
 A-5151143, Schneider, Richard Georg.
 A-4728863, Schoenberg, Wilhelm Heinrich August or William Schoenberg.
 A-6376906, Semega, Maria nee Maria Palovick.
 A-5314309, Shee, Ong Kwok or Ong Kwock Shee or Roy Ong.
 A-6378078, Shumis, Artemis Troyannou or Artenoula Trogiannou or Artemis Troiannou or Artemis Troyannou.
 A-1963646, Sirianos, George or Georgios Theodore Sirianos.
 A-6446698, Smedley, Shane Karen Douglas.
 A-4699538, Sommer, Oscar Felix or Oskar Felix Sommer or Felix Sommer.
 A-5465763, Stevens, Annie Isabella.
 A-6772017, Sturmer, Gerlinde Maria.
 A-4433087, Tackolander, Leonard Helge, alias Leonard Quire.
 A-5880975, Tatem, Edmund Adolphus.
 A-7539649, Tomas-Morely, Jose or Jose Tomas, Jr.
 A-5357499, Tornow, Marie nee Wejnis or Marie Fischer.
 A-6345256, Trapatsa, Chrysoula.
 A-9836782, Ullah, Anfar.
 A-6346062, Valdes, Olga nee Rafaelades.
 A-9727432, Valjas, Artemi.
 A-6459280, Vasquez, Jorge Carrion alias Robert Franco.
 A-1114647, Vestes, Stratos or Ernest Vestes alias Efstiatios Vestis.
 A-6690309, Villegas, Ramon, alias Ramon Villegas-Ortiz.
 A-6785838, Wallace, Ezra.
 A-1052865, Wasserman, Benjamin or Bernard Wasserman or Benjamin Wasserman.
 A-5750607, Wayditch, Julia alias Julia Bornyaszi Oroszy.
 A-4392874, Whearty, James Patrick or James Wheatley.
 A-6431871, Willman, Philip John Archibald.
 A-4777885, Wilson, Arthur Rutherford.
 A-7799625, Wilson, Walter Allen.
 A-6078139, Wright, Lourdes Dizon.
 A-6757818, Yang, Chao-Chen.
 A-6739338, Yang, Dzing-Tsch Shun.
 A-2963680, Yuelling, Joseph or Yoesef.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 7, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Jose Babace;
 S. 27. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 208. An act for the relief of Ella L. Browning;

S. 278. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

S. 629. An act to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

S. 748. An act for the relief of Charles L. Bishop.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1524. A bill for the relief of Edith Scheiber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH (by request):

S. 1525. A bill to provide for the appointment of a deputy disbursing officer and assistant disbursing officers for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1526. A bill for the relief of Helena Vieira de Sa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MILLER, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SCHOEFFEL, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 1527. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON (for Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 1528. A bill for the relief of Elmer Belier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1529. A bill for the relief of Amy L. Hefington; and

S. 1530. A bill for the relief of public utility district No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 1531. A bill for the relief of Mayer Minikes; and

S. 1532. A bill for the relief of Alfred F. Bosche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOHN D. MAGRATH MEMORIAL VETERANS' HOSPITAL, WEST HAVEN, CONN.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, on March 24, 1949, I had the pleasure of introducing a bill, S. 1387, which provides that the proposed Veterans' Administration hospital in West Haven, Conn., be officially designated on the public records as the John D. Magrath Memorial Veterans Hospital, a fitting tribute to Connecticut's great American, who was killed in action just 4 years ago today. I have a statement in connection with that bill which I would like to have printed in the RECORD.

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

On the field of battle in Italy on April 14, 1945, John D. Magrath, then in his twentieth year of age, gave his life for his country in an action that has since been designated to be "gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty."

John D. Magrath was one of Connecticut's many great and illustrious sons who went forth to do battle for those ideals which all of us who are true Americans believe in.

This young Connecticut youth, in the action which resulted in his death, captured

an enemy machine gun, killed eight enemies and wounded six others before making the supreme sacrifice. His individual action and bravery resulted in his being awarded posthumously the Medal of Honor.

The citation, as signed by President Harry S. Truman, and which now reposes on the mantel of the Magrath home in East Norwalk, Conn., overlooking the beautiful blue waters of Long Island Sound, where John Magrath went swimming and played as a boy, reads as follows:

"Magrath, John D.: Rank and organization: Private, first class, Company G, Eighty-fifth Infantry, Tenth Mountain Division. Place and date: Near Castel d'Alano, Italy, April 14, 1945. Entered service at East Norwalk, Conn., G. O. No. 71, July 17, 1946. Citation: He displayed conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty when his company was pinned down by heavy artillery, mortar, and small-arms fire near Castel d'Alano, Italy. Volunteering to act as a scout, armed only with a rifle, he charged headlong into withering fire, killing two Germans and wounding three in order to capture a machine gun. Carrying this enemy weapon across an open field through heavy fire, he neutralized two more machine-gun nests; he then circled behind four other Germans, killing them with a burst as they were firing on his company. Spotting another dangerous enemy position to his right, he knelt with the machine gun in his arms and exchanged fire with the Germans until he had killed two and wounded three. The enemy now poured increased mortar and artillery fire on the company's newly won position. Private Magrath fearlessly volunteered again to brave the shelling in order to collect a report of casualties. Heroically carrying out this task, he made the supreme sacrifice—a climax to the valor and courage that are in keeping with the highest tradition of the military service."

FEDERAL AID TO CERTAIN SCHOOL DISTRICTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. KERR, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. McCLELLAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 834) to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments for the construction of additional school facilities, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, ordered to be printed, and printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 8, after the word "Administrator," insert the following sentence: "No loan or grant shall be made hereunder unless the school facilities proposed to be provided therewith shall have been approved by such State educational authority as may have jurisdiction or control of such school facilities."

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, between lines 6 and 7, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 5. Section 350 (a) (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out so much of the proviso as precedes the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Provided, That—

"(A) the President shall suspend the application to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of any country which, through restrictive quotas, discriminatory taxation, or other restrictive trade practices, discriminates against articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States, its Territories or possessions; and

"(B) the President may suspend the application to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of any country because of any other discriminatory treatment by it of American commerce or because of other acts (including the operation of international cartels) or policies which in his opinion tend to defeat the purposes set forth in this section."

"(2) By adding at the end thereof the following:

"Any suspension pursuant to subparagraph (A) of the preceding paragraph shall continue in effect so long as the country to which it applies continues such discriminatory practices. During such period no agreement pursuant to this section shall be entered into or renewed with the government of such country or any instrumentality thereof, and any such agreement then outstanding with such government or instrumentality shall be terminated as soon as may be possible under its terms."

"On page 2, lines 7 and 18, redesignate sections 5 and 6 as sections 6 and 7, respectively."

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and myself I submit a resolution dealing with the Missouri River Basin, which I ask to have appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD together with a statement which I had expected to deliver on the floor of the Senate; but in order to save the time of the Senate, I am willing to have the statement printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the resolution and statement by the Senator from Kansas will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 104) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Whereas there is now before Congress large requests for appropriations for projects in the Missouri River Basin for flood control, irrigation, navigation, domestic and industrial water supply, power development, and other purposes; and

Whereas the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government has filed with Congress reports declaring there is wholly inadequate assurance that the projects undertaken are feasible, and that the objective of maximum benefits at the lowest cost is being obtained; and

Whereas we are told that it would be foolhardy to undertake a further expenditure of billions of dollars without revision of both policy and organizational arrangements and the task force further recommends at least a partial moratorium on further projects; and

Whereas the task force report and the report of the Commission constitute a warning to Congress that enormous amounts of money are being expended on the Missouri River Basin notwithstanding the fact that there is no coordinated plan in existence to justify such expenditures; and

Whereas the economic feasibility of many existing and proposed projects in the Missouri River Basin have been seriously questioned in the report of the Commission on

Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government and by other engineering authority; and

Whereas there is not now before Congress an over-all study to enable Congress to determine the impact of one program upon the other in the Missouri River Basin; and

Whereas a unified, independent and competent study and investigation of the total needs of the basin is necessary before Congress can properly pass upon pending and future requests for appropriations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to appoint a committee of independent, competent, and experienced persons, including competent engineers, to make a survey and investigation of the needs of the Missouri River Basin, taking into consideration present and proposed programs for flood control, irrigation, navigation, domestic and industrial water supply, power development, and all other matters pertinent thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That such committee is hereby directed to make its report together with its recommendations to the President and Congress on or before the 30th day of September 1949.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee should be authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places as it deems necessary, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants, to request the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the service, information, records, data, and facilities of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. It is suggested that the sum of \$250,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution be made available.

The statement by Mr. REED is as follows:

COMMENT OF SENATOR REED, OF KANSAS, ON HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO THE PICK-SLOAN PLAN FOR MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Kansas is nearly equally divided, territorially, between the Missouri River Basin and the Arkansas River Basin. The population of Kansas is also nearly equally divided between these two basins. I have lived all my life in Kansas. My children were born in Kansas and grew up in that State. Everything I own is in Kansas. I am tremendously concerned with the fullest possible development of the Missouri River Basin. Along with many others who view this situation objectively, but with deep interest, I have had growing doubts as to the adequacy of what is known as the Pick-Sloan plan for development of this basin. There seems to be an almost utter lack of actual coordination between the Army engineers, who are responsible for flood control and navigation, and the Bureau of Reclamation which is responsible for irrigation. Power development is divided between these two agencies. Neither pays any attention to soil conservation. When representatives of each of these agencies appeared before the Senate committees of which I am a member, I failed to find anyone who had an adequate conception of the whole Missouri Basin policy and development.

Along with the people of the country, generally, I welcomed the recent report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, known as the Hoover Commission, and the report of its task force on natural resources. Among the people, I find universal approval of the purpose of that report in the way of greater efficiency and less cost, including extravagance of Government. I have not heard dissent from

the objectives set out in the Hoover Commission report from a single citizen, whether from Kansas or any other part of the United States.

After having given much thought and study to the Missouri Basin general picture, I was not surprised to find on page 30 of the Hoover task force report this comment:

"The result (the combined Pick and Sloan plans) is in no sense an integrated development plan for the basin, and there is serious question whether agreement between the two agencies (the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation) is not more costly to the public than disagreement."

Much has been, and is being, said from time to time, about how adequately the so-called interagency has met, and can continue to meet, the various problems. My own observation has been that the interagency committee is not really effective. It is made up of governors and representatives of the various States which meets from time to time and generally accepts conditions laid down by Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. There has been scant consideration by the interagency committee of the economic soundness of many, perhaps most, of the projects that have been listed by these two agencies. I have conversed with representatives from some of the various States and find them without adequate conception of the whole problem. They are mostly concerned in the amount of money to be spent in their respective States.

Therefore, I was not surprised to find this comment by the Hoover Commission task force.

"The committees have failed to solve any important aspect of the problem of interagency coordination because the dominant members, the corps and the Bureau, have been unwilling to permit interagency committees to settle their differences. . . . It has been demonstrated time and again that neither by voluntary cooperation nor by executive coordination can the major conflicts be ironed out."

The task force, without any recorded opposition, ordered published as a part of its report a study of the Missouri Basin operations of the Army and the Bureau as an example of present bureaucratic mismanagement and waste.

On page 119 of the task force report we are told that in July 1948 the estimated cost of the then planned Missouri basin projects was set at \$6,359,711,399. This is a huge sum of money even in these times of Government extravagance and reckless spending. Beginning at page 136 of the report I am discussing, the task force states cogent reasons why the Pick-Sloan plan should not be used as a pattern for river basin developments. I am quoting briefly from that report:

"1. The program as a whole has not been properly evaluated in terms of the national interest. As far as can be determined, the relative merits of extensive subhumid irrigation development as compared to other means of increasing agricultural production have not been considered. . . .

"2. The program has been planned very nearly backward. . . .

"(a) The programs started with the big dams and other engineering structures of some size. They were planned without reference to multiple demands for the same water, and without knowledge of the likely over-all pattern of social and economic development. . . .

"(c) Probably most serious is the fact that the programs were planned in many of their phases without adequate data on soil fertility, irrigability, water amount and quality, consumer acceptance of irrigation, and other basic economic data. . . .

"3. A corollary of the lack of basic data is the fact that planning has been undertaken, and construction started in the face of funda-

mental uncertainties which may lead to a waste of public funds. . . .

"4. The organization for administering the program for the basin as a whole lacks flexibility. Twenty-four Federal agencies are already concerned, and a few more should be. Each of these is administratively responsible to Washington, and only a few of them are so organized that the basin falls under a single management for them. . . . The result is lack of "cross-fertilization," even at higher administrative levels, lack of consultation on day-to-day decisions, a tendency to consider plans crystallized once they have been authorized. . . .

"6. After mention of the complicated organization now concerned with Missouri Valley development it perhaps is superfluous to say again that there is no program for the valley as a whole."

Every Member of this Senate should study this task force report, and the special report on the Missouri Basin with a view to an investigation of the agencies and some of the men who have come before committees of Congress and represented to us that they sought appropriations for a unified, coordinated Missouri Basin development plan. This report shows that they knew better.

The task-force study tells us, at page 130, that personnel in the Bureau of Reclamation at one time warned Congress against certain projects, but after negotiating a compromise—a deal—out in Omaha, Nebr., they took the cynical view that they had no obligation to the people who employ them to warn against continuation of the plans for those wasteful, unnecessary projects.

One engineer bluntly stated:

"When the Bureau opposed the Garrison and Gavin's Point Dams there was no complete program. When we reached an agreement we withdrew from the fields of flood control and navigation. We shall be the sole judge of requirements for reclamation. If the Army engineers say those dams are required for their functions, we have no opinion."

That is the attitude, Mr. President, of men upon whom this Congress is forced to rely for engineering guidance, for sound engineering, for honesty, and for facts upon which to base our judgments in the appropriation of hundreds of millions—yes, billions—of dollars of money. They were ready to shut their eyes to waste, to maintain silence while hundreds of millions were poured into projects which were of little or no value. They stood ready to have no opinion while this went on.

This report shows we have been misled; this Congress was not told the whole truth; enormous appropriations were made while the men who should have warned Congress stood aside deliberately silent to protect their own bureaucratic prerogatives in the Missouri Basin. For a time they warned about wasteful proposals, but later they made a deal to keep mum about each other's extravagances and waste.

The chairman of this task force was Leslie A. Miller, a former Governor of Wyoming, who is known to many of us as a man of great ability and integrity. Next is Horace M. Albright, former director of the National Park Service. There are two more former governors—one from each party—former Governor John Dempsey, of New Mexico, and former Governor Ralph Carr, of Colorado.

The other men are also eminent citizens. They are Donald H. McLaughlin, president of Homestake Mining Corp.; Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president of Johns Hopkins University; Dr. Gilbert White, president of Haverford College, and Prof. Samuel T. Dana, dean of the school of forestry and conservation at the University of Michigan.

These eminent men tell us that this Congress has appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars on the advice and testimony of ad-

ministrators who failed to give us the true picture of their operations.

The full implications of this report, Mr. President, actually add up to a scandalous episode in the history of our Government. I believe we should call before an appropriate committee the men who have been telling us that this was a unified, coordinated plan to get appropriations and see what they say now. I think that we might start with that publicity release which Senator GILLETTE recently quoted to the Senate, when the Pick-Sloan scheme was first floated, and bring out into the open the motivations—the complete cynicism of men in high places about use of the people's money—which a rereading of that press release now reveals.

Let me repeat the excerpt which Senator GILLETTE read to us. The Army and the Bureau had 2 days of discussions at Omaha and on November 8, 1944, told us that they had developed:

"The best practical plan for the Missouri River Basin for navigation, flood control, irrigation, reclamation, power, and all other beneficial uses of the water of the Missouri River and its tributaries."

Today we are told by the eminent men I have named that it was no plan at all, and that the participants were moving forward to obtain from the Congress and expend more than \$6,300,000,000 in pursuance of their scheme.

What has happened to standards of public service? What sort of political morality is it that men, entrusted by the people to protect their interests, can permit themselves to make deals to close their eyes to gigantic waste? They propose to spend \$6,300,000,000 without any plan except an inside agreement not to expose each other's stories before the public and this Congress.

I direct your attention to the fact, Mr. President, that in the Department of Interior report of the Hoover Commission, the conclusions of the task force are quoted with approval. Some of the passages I have read to you were picked up by Mr. Hoover and his associates. The report finds that Pick-Sloan was not a plan, and the interagency committee was not solving the conflicts which really existed, although the public had been told that there were none.

There were dissents about a proper reorganization, but I do not find any member of the Hoover Commission contradicted any of the statements which I have quoted.

There is a growing criticism of, and lack of confidence in the work of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The country can fairly hold the Army engineers to the highest standard of professional morality and accuracy. They are lifetime servants of their country, most of whom were educated at the country's expense. They are very proud of themselves and have no hesitation in promoting their own interests. Certainly they are entitled to severe criticism in this situation.

From matters that have recently come to the attention of the Senate committees, of which I am a member, conditions in the Bureau of Reclamation are actually scandalous. There are charges of corruption, incompetence, waste, and extravagance to a degree that makes one wonder if the Bureau set-up should not be completely overhauled and revised.

The Senate has not been without warning as to the actual situation with regard to the Pick-Sloan plan failing to answer the whole problem in the Missouri River Basin. There is no Senator with whom I more frequently disagree than Senator MURRAY, of Montana. I do, however, want to give Senator MURRAY credit for standing on the floor of the Senate and utter repeated warnings very much along the lines that the Hoover Commission report finds justified—that the Pick-Sloan plan is not a

coordinated or unified program of development. Senator MURRAY has not yet convinced me that his MVA plan is the answer, but the Hoover Commission report has certainly made valid all of the criticism that he has uttered. That report also makes crystal clear the absolute necessity for immediate consideration, by objective and competent engineering judgment, of the economic feasibility of many of these Pick-Sloan projects. Some of them are fantastic and apparently are completely lacking in justification. Time is of the essence in stopping a wholesale waste of taxpayers' money.

In view of the disclosures made, it must be obvious that there must be a complete, thorough, and searching investigation so the people may know the huge expenditures have a justifiable basis. I call your attention to another statement made by the Hoover Commission task force. On page 18 of their report is found the following:

"It would be foolhardy to undertake a further expenditure of billions of dollars without thorough revision of both policy and organizational arrangements; and unless and until such revision is forthcoming, the committee recommends to both Congress and the Executive at least a partial moratorium on further projects."

I have clung to the hope the Interagency arrangement would work out the conflicts and confusion of the rival Pick and Sloan plans. But it has not done so. Appropriation requests are before Congress now asking for more tens of millions which do not reflect an iota of correction. Witnesses are telling the same old story, which has now been exposed as false.

Mr. President, above all things the people out in the Missouri Basin must not be punished for the mistakes that have been made. They have been abused enough by floods and pestilence and bureaucrats. But this Congress should not whip the people of the Missouri Basin—punish them further—for mistakes which were not theirs.

Congressman ALBERT COLE, of Kansas, sensing the truth about Pick-Sloan, a month ago proposed over in the House that there be a 3-year investigation of the Pick-Sloan plan by a joint committee of 27. The Hoover Commission advises us of projects about which the Army and the Bureau were sharply critical before they made their deal.

There should be an investigation of the most searching sort.

The Missouri Basin is rich in resources. It has millions of acres of rich, irrigable lands, waiting to produce an abundance of food for the Nation when it is watered. The basin has mineral resources awaiting development including materials now in critical shortage. The basin can prosper and be a stronghold for the Nation.

Today, except for the State of Kansas, the basin is losing its population, its young people move away, it is fearful of floods and drought, its resources are underdeveloped or not developed at all.

These requests for funds are before us now in a dozen different items. They are not submitted in one package but are to be found in Interior appropriations, Army appropriations, Agriculture, and probably others.

I want to see proper development of the Missouri Basin as much as anyone in the Senate. It becomes obvious, however, as demonstrated by the Hoover Report, we cannot permit the Pick-Sloan plan to continue if we are to honestly and sincerely represent the citizens of this country and especially those living in the Missouri River Basin.

I, therefore, propose to the Members of this Senate what I consider necessary steps to permit us to arrive at an honest appraisal of the needs of the Missouri River Basin. I suggest the following:

1. The appointment, by the President, of a board of competent, independent engineers,

to make a comprehensive study, investigation, and survey of the Missouri River Basin.

2. The Board to make its report and recommendations to the President and Congress on or before September 30, 1949.

3. That Congress restrict appropriations for the Missouri River Basin until such report is received by the President and Congress. I earnestly believe, in light of the findings of the task force of the Hoover Commission, and of the existing circumstances, that this is the only practical solution of the problems of the Missouri River Basin.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY TO THE SENTRY CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator WHERRY before the Sentry Club of Philadelphia, April 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR HOLLAND ON THE PROGRAM MEET THE PRESS

[Mr. RUSSELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Senator HOLLAND by newspaper reporters, on the radio program, Meet the Press, on March 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLITICS HAS A PART IN INTERNATIONAL OIL—ARTICLE FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Politics Has a Part in International Oil," published in Life magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR WILEY'S LEGISLATIVE RECORD

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a list of bills introduced by him in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENTS ON LABOR LEGISLATION BY REPRESENTATIVE WERDEL, OF CALIFORNIA

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD comments on labor legislation recently made by Hon. THOMAS H. WERDEL, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO ABOLISH THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of a letter which was published in this morning's Washington Post, and which refutes in a very wise, and I believe accurate and authoritative manner, the complete misconception which exists in a few quarters regarding the operation of Senate Joint Resolution 2, which is the proposed constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and count the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote. The letter is very brief; and because it relates to a constitutional amendment which I hope will soon be before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

ELECTORAL-VOTE REFORM

The April 4 letter from Mr. J. Harvie Williams criticizes the constitutional amendment which abolishes the office of presidential elector and provides for an automatic counting of electoral votes in direct proportion to the popular vote on the grounds that

it is "based squarely on the principle of proportional representation" and would encourage, therefore, a "multiplicity of parties."

There is actually no resemblance at all between proportional representation as applied to the election of a group (such as a legislature or board of aldermen) and electing a single officeholder as proposed in the pending constitutional amendment. Electing a legislature by proportional representation gives a voice to so many shades of opinion that it often becomes impossible to find a common meeting ground on any course of action. We have seen this weaken government in many of the parliamentary democracies of Europe. But in the case of a single officeholder that reasoning does not apply. Even the cleverest surgeon cannot divide one man up—proportionally or otherwise—and expect him to live.

The reform we propose does not, of course, seek to do that. It seeks, as the Washington Post has often pointed out, simply to reflect more accurately the will of the people in counting the electoral votes. If we were electing three Presidents to hold office concurrently as a sort of modern triumvirate, Mr. Williams' criticism would have some validity. But the reform proposed in the pending constitutional amendment is no precedent for that sort of election at all.

The Brookings Institution very ably summarized the often-heard and wholly unsound contention that this amendment would foster multiple parties. In a letter to me last year, it was said of this proposal that—

"It will practically remove the chance that small minority groups can attain and exercise great power over Presidents, presidential candidates, and political parties because they hold the balance of power in pivotal States. These minority groups will have no power beyond that justified by their number of voters in a presidential election."

The proposed amendment would strip splinter parties of their bargaining power (so evident in the 1948 elections, as for example, in New York) and would oblige them to seek popular support on the basis of their real appeal rather than on their ability to shift so-called pivotal States to one or the other of the major parties under the present all-or-nothing system. This reform would, therefore, definitely discourage rather than encourage a multiplicity of splinter parties. Their future success cannot conceivably depend on the very slight advertising value which might accrue from their being credited with an unimportant number of electoral votes.

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senator from Massachusetts.
WASHINGTON.

ARMED FORCES DAY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I note that the new Secretary of Defense, Hon. Louis Johnson, has announced that next year Army Day, Navy Day, Marine Corps Day, and Air Force Day are all to be merged into one Armed Forces Day. I feel this is a step in the right direction, that it gives moral support and prestige to the new loyalty which must develop if we are to have real national security, and I therefore applaud Secretary Johnson for taking this forthright stand. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Armed Forces Day."

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

ARMED FORCES DAY

Gen. Omar N. Bradley said many things of significance in his Army Day speech Tuesday night, but none was of more importance nor more quickly realized than his proposal to

end the separate service commemoration days in favor of a single day for all the armed services. Within 24 hours it came to pass. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, to whom unification means unification, has made calendar history by merging four days into one. No more Army Day, Navy Day, Marine Day, or Air Force Day, but henceforth only Armed Forces Day. This is a significant contribution to unity. Why not go further and, we tremble to write it, abolish the Army-Navy game? Is it not time to recognize in all these symbolic ways that the real mission of the three services is to be part of a larger entity—the defense of the United States?

EXTENSION OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the amendment. The amendment which I have proposed, would simply provide that loans to the ECA countries for rehabilitation and construction of industry would be placed on a basis comparable to loans to American citizens through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the same purpose.

CRIPPS AND FREE TRADE

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an excerpt from a statement by Sir Stafford Cripps, of England as contained in an article entitled, "Enlightened" United States Tariff Held Vital by Cripps," called in the body of the article an enlightened policy of importation by the countries of the Western Hemisphere, published in the New York Journal of Commerce of April 7, 1949.

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

ENLIGHTENED UNITED STATES TARIFF HELD VITAL BY CRIPPS

LONDON, April 6.—Sir Stafford Cripps told the House of Commons today that Britain's ability to earn enough dollars to exist was dependent on an enlightened policy of importation by the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer made this statement in the course of presenting his 1949-50 budget in which he disappointed most hopes for reduced taxes.

MEANING DEBATED

Whether his reference to imports, by Western Hemisphere countries, was to be regarded as a bid for further tariff concessions by the United States or a warning that Britain might have to take further cuts in purchases in the United States and Canada if imports fell off was a matter of conjecture here.

"In broad terms," Sir Stafford said, "We have succeeded in carrying out the policy of restricting our dollar expenditure to what can be covered by our dollar earnings together with the aid at our disposal, and we intend to continue that policy for the rest of the ERP period."

SECOND STEP—FREE TRADE PROGRAM

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this statement of Sir Stafford Cripps leads directly to the consideration by this body of the second step of the three-part free-trade program—the 3-year extension of

the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade principle upon the theory that the more they divide our markets with the countries of the world, the less their trade-balance deficits will be—then Mr. President the next rivet is to be driven into the coffin of jobless men—the International Trade Organization.

ECONOMIC EQUALITY—LEVELING

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "ERP Goal Shifted to Economic Union," published in the New York Times of April 7, 1949.

This article points the way to an economic union of which we would eventually be an integral part, through the three-part free-trade program, which would bring into this country the products of low-wage living standard labor of Asia and Europe, unhampered by any tariff or import fee, equalizing the standards of living.

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

ERP GOAL SHIFTED TO ECONOMIC UNION—WESTERN NATIONS, WITH TOP UNITED STATES BLESSING, CONSIDER UNIFORM MONEY AS A FIRST STEP

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, April 6.—The ground work is being laid for a complete revamping of the Marshall plan soon after Congress completes action on next year's appropriation.

Separate strands of the ideas growing in Europe and in top Government circles in the United States are being pulled together in preparation for a drastic new action to make European economic integration a reality instead of just so many words. One big idea for 1950 already deeply implanted in the convictions of top United States and European officials responsible for directing the recovery program is that the time has come for both Europeans and North Americans to take some risks on creating a permanent economic union in western Europe.

On the European side, it is now recognized that the United States Congress is unlikely to appropriate huge amounts for a third year of the Marshall plan on the basis of a dated-up version of the same recovery story. To come back again with nothing more to report than greater output, improved exports, better balanced budgets and frustrated Communists, the Europeans realize, will fail to impress either Congress or the United States public. That story is true and important, but it has been told too often.

PRESSURE OF CONGRESS IS FELT

Straws in the wind are the reactions during this year's hearings on the Marshall plan of individual Congressmen who are favorable to aid to Europe but nervous about the lack of progress toward what looks like something durable in the way of a more viable economic system. At least as important is the pressure from continental countries, particularly Belgium, for some progress toward the goals of freer trade, greater convertibility of currencies and the opening up of long-barred market avenues.

On the United States side, the feeling is that, having made irrevocable commitments in the military sphere, it is time for western Europe to make irrevocable commitments in the economic sphere. It is felt that little more can be gained from more planning, more committee meetings, more long-term projects. This feeling is shared by the highest officials of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, who see the

workings of European cooperation from the inside.

One such unity measure now in high favor is to establish now, while United States aid is still available, a complete currency union in western Europe. This means not just removing exchange controls and restoring the prewar freedom of convertibility, but literally having the same colored paper, bearing the same pictures, circulating throughout the area. This is the kind of step that brings a host of the other measures of coordination in its train, not as a matter of mere good intentions but as a matter of inherent necessity from which national governments cannot escape.

RISKS ENTAILED FOR UNITED STATES

To establish a uniform currency now would entail great risks for all the participating countries. Some would suffer unemployment in industries now protected by exchange control regulations; others would have to impose new taxes or forego popular social progress.

The step would also entail risks for the United States. Instead of allocating dollars, the United States role would become that of underwriting the dollar deficit of the participating countries. For some time the whole area would have to adopt some controls to keep dollar expenditure within bounds.

The immense advantage over the present system, however, would be that European business could at last begin the painful process of adapting itself to competitive conditions. Ultimately, continental experts feel, this would bring about such an improvement in productivity that Europe's inferiority to United States industry would be reduced to unimportant differentials.

Some of the keenest European observers of United States congressional and public opinion believe that it is in the nature of the North American character to be prepared to take a considerable risk in exchange for certain achievements of a broad political ideal—and Europe has finally recognized that the United States desire for European unity is a basic American urge.

The Benelux countries already have begun to plan for the inclusion of western Germany in a western European economic union. The logic of incorporating west Germany in any such plan is that it is better to have a rapidly growing German industry under the same roof than to deal with it as foreign competition.

Continental economists do not believe that Britain can or should join any tight European economic union: the complications of Britain's position as the center of a worldwide currency system of her own are too great. What they hope is that Britain at least will not seek to prevent some risky experiments in unity on the Continent. The British record in the European economic organization does not give them much hope that this will be the case.

BRITISH OIL—AMERICAN MARKETS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "British Oil Due Soon To Invade Dollar Markets," published in the New York Journal of Commerce of April 6, 1949.

The purport of this article is that the British Government expects, through the free-trade policy to bring into this country the petroleum and petroleum products produced in the low-wage living standard countries—without any import fee or tariff to equalize the high-wage living standards of this country with the low-wage living standards of the European, Middle East and Asiatic areas.

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

BRITISH OIL DUE SOON TO INVADE DOLLAR MARKETS

A British Government agency made it clear yesterday that the United Kingdom was planning to increase its oil-refining capacity in order to export oil products not only to sterling-area countries but also to invade dollar oil markets.

Declaring that Britain was pushing ahead on an eightfold increase in its petroleum refining capacity, the British Information Service, which identifies itself as an agency of the British Government, said: "One objective is to cut down imports from dollar sources," and added:

CAN SUPPLY STERLING AREA

"At the same time British oil companies will be able to play an increasing part in supplying sterling-area countries, western Europe, and other parts of the world with petroleum products which can be paid for in sterling, and not dollars."

"Britain's oil expansion program is not confined to multiplying here home refining capacity," the agency added. "Plans are underway," it said, "to increase foreign oil production of British companies by 1953 to double the 1947 rate, and to increase overseas refining capacity 40 percent during the same period."

"The plans now in hand for increasing overseas resources include a new refinery in Venezuela, and the enlargement of existing refineries in the Middle East and East Indies. Increasing output from the Middle East will entail additions to existing pipe lines and the laying of new ones. Including current maintenance, all the various plans will call for 3,500,000 tons of steel between now and 1953."

UNITED STATES GAP SEEN FILLED

Describing the gradual shift of the United States from a net exporter to a net importer of oil as a significant development in world markets, the agency said: "British oil concerns are taking a big share in filling the gap which this has created."

UNEMPLOYMENT RESULT FREE TRADE

Mr. MALONE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Connecticut Jobless Found at 11-Year Peak," published in the New York Journal of Commerce of April 6, 1949.

This article outlines in some detail the unemployment situation in one of the 48 States of this Union, and is a part of the present nearly 4,000,000 jobless and of the 9,500,000 part-time presently unemployed of this Nation, brought on through the administration's three-part free-trade program.

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

CONNECTICUT JOBLESS FOUND AT 11-YEAR PEAK
HARTFORD, CONN., April 5.—Unemployment has reached an 11-year peak in Connecticut.

The State labor department reported today that for the week which ended Saturday, a total of 67,974 claims for unemployment compensation were filed.

Lay-offs because of lack of work in all fields of manufacturing in Connecticut were blamed.

New claims stood at a 7,888 total as compared with 6,919 for the previous week. Such claims have averaged about 7,000 a week since the first of the year, the department said.

The total number of claims filed for the same week a year ago was 24,363, of which 2,582 were new claims.

Idle pay allowances for the past week amounted to \$1,122,967.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very hopeful that Senators will aid us in speeding the bill along today. We have been considering this measure for 2 weeks. The debate has been rather ample. We do not desire to shut off any Senator. However, there has been a great deal of debate on matters not directly related to the bill. I hope Senators will help us to speed along and get this bill out of the way. A number of other important measures await action. We cannot proceed with the legislative program, in which many Senators on both sides of the aisle are interested, until we dispose of the pending bill.

I appeal to every Senator to be as brief as possible in his discussions. It is not difficult to form a conception of these problems without long and extended debate. I very much hope that Senators will bear these things in mind and aid us in speeding along.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I am fully in sympathy with the sentiments expressed by the Senator. I should like to ask him a question.

This morning I received over the telephone some information which is not official or verified, but I should like to ask the Senator whether he has received information of a similar character. The information was to this general effect:

A young man who has just recently returned from Italy is of the opinion that the ECA is not doing any substantial good for the people of Italy in the southern area of that country. He mentions that in the city of Naples alone there are 40,000 people out of work. He made the statement, in substance, that today the price of labor, generally speaking, in Italy—I am not sure whether this applies throughout the country, but in some parts—is between 400 and 500 lira a day, which I understand is about a dollar a day. He also states that a small-sized loaf of bread, the weight of which I do not know, but which was described to me as a small-sized loaf, sells at 150 lira, which would mean that if a man were working for 450 lira a day, or a dollar a day, he must spend, for one small loaf of bread, about a third of his daily wage. I wonder if the Senator has any information along that line, and if he can tell the Senate what, in his opinion, is the actual operation of the ECA.

I ask this question with the utmost earnestness, and without any desire to impede the progress of the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas has no detailed information at the moment, but many American visitors who go abroad for a few days seem to think that they have all the answers.

Mr. DONNELL. As I understand, this young man has been there for about 2 years. He is with one of the Government commissions, so I do not believe that he has the inadequate basis of knowledge to which the Senator refers.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did he lose his job?

Mr. DONNELL. I do not know. I think he went there for a 2-year period, and has now returned at the end of that period.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to undertake to discredit the young man, but I have received a great many letters and have talked with a great many persons about conditions here and there. I find that some American visitors can spend two days in a country and tell more about conditions than one could accumulate in a year of intensive study.

I was in Italy last year. I saw Mr. Zellerbach, our representative in Italy, in Rome. He had just returned from a trip to southern Italy. I know that he is giving attention to the conditions there.

No organization can merely wave a wand and restore everyone to a job, and give everyone all he wants to eat and wear. Such a thing is not possible. The theory of this bill is to provide for the people, not by giving them doles of bread from day to day, but by providing instrumentalities and industries which will give them employment so that with their earnings they can buy the things in which they are interested and which they need.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption at this point? My question included a recital of the information which came from the young man to whom I referred. It was not he who spoke to me, but his mother. She had been informed by him that in Naples there are 40,000 persons out of work at this time. The Senator spoke about the purpose of providing opportunities for work.

Mr. CONNALLY. The unemployment problem in Italy is bad, and has been bad, because of the fact that the country has a surplus of population. There are not sufficient jobs to go around. The bill carries a provision, which was adopted a few days ago, for ships for Italy in which to send their surplus population to South America and Central America. We are doing all that is humanly possible to relieve that situation, but it cannot be done by writing a line or two in a bill. It cannot be done by eloquent speeches. We have to solve the problem by reasonable, sensible means, and that is what we are trying to do. Mr. Zellerbach, who is in charge of the American program in Italy, was here two or three weeks ago. We conferred with him. We stimulated him. I think he is doing everything humanly possible with the resources at his command.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Does not the able Senator from Texas think it is appropriate in this instance to point out that as between northern and southern Italy there is a vast difference in the economy? From the standpoint of pure economics, it might be said that they are two entirely separate countries. Whereas constant improvement is being shown in the condition in northern Italy, the problem in southern Italy has not yet been solved.

I should like to point out in that connection, and as a part of this question,

that every effort is being made to solve the problem in southern Italy, which is primarily an agrarian problem. I think progress has been made. Does not the able Senator from Texas believe that that fact should be made clear?

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator, and I thank him very much for his interruption.

Everyone knows that northern Italy is the industrial section of Italy. The main factories and industrial plants are located in northern Italy. In southern Italy the economy is quite different, as suggested by the able Senator from New York. There it is largely an agrarian economy. We are working on it and the ECA is working on it. We are doing all we possibly can, with the resources at hand and with the machinery which has been set up, to solve that problem.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Texas mean to imply that ECA does not work as well in agricultural and agrarian areas as it does in industrial areas and centers?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, please; I have not finished my question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator had finished; it seemed to me it was a good, long question.

Mr. WHERRY. It is a double-barreled question, and I hope it will be listened to by the Senator from Texas, for whom I have the most profound respect.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope that will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope so, too.

Mr. President, there seem to be some difficulties in respect to southern Italy, because if ECA can help only in industrial centers, but not in agricultural areas, that fact, if it be one, would prove conclusively that the question before us is only one of financing foreign trade to help industrial centers, rather than to help the whole economy.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. In that connection, I should like to emphasize what I previously stated in the question I posed to the able Senator from Texas, namely, that the problem in southern Italy is primarily agrarian. But that does not mean that the ECA undertaking is restricted primarily to industrial projects and foreign trade applicable only to industrial projects and industrial undertakings. For the most part, the land in southern Italy is a very poor type of soil. The mountains are not conducive to very much production of agricultural commodities or to very much agricultural activity. The soil there must be built up.

Under the ECA program, measures are being taken to build up the soil, so as to put southern Italy into such a condition that, from an agrarian standpoint, it will be able to take care of itself.

Furthermore, I wish to point out that the great population problem in Italy is

peculiarly acute in southern Italy, and that also bears on this matter.

But let it not be understood that the ECA is not interested in this type of effort or is not doing anything in this field. I, myself, happen to have had some direct contacts in southern Italy in recent months, and I know that a particular effort is being directed in that area of Italy, all under ECA.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I hope the Members of the Senate will recall the plea I made a little while ago to help speed the bill along today and be as brief as possible in the discussions and debates, so that we may obtain some action, because this bill and the disposal of it are affecting the entire legislative program of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Texas, I should like to say that I have made it a point to listen carefully to the debate on the floor of the Senate for the past 2 weeks. I have heard no Senator depart from the economic subject that so vitally affects our Nation. I have listened carefully to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], for example, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELLY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and other Senators; and I wish to say for the RECORD that none of the Senators have departed from the debate on the economics of our Nation as this bill affects them.

THREE PART FREE TRADE PROGRAM

Mr. President, this measure is the first of a three-part or three-phase program for free trade for the American people, and it strikes at the heart of the workingman of America. The next thing we shall have before us will be the 1934 Trade Agreements Act extension bill. That is the act under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade policy over a period of 10 or 12 years, on the theory that the more the markets of the United States are divided with the nations of Europe and of the rest of the world, the less will be their trade-balance deficits; and it is well known and acknowledged that the purpose of the ECA is to make up their trade-balance deficits with the hard-money countries each year in cash—our chief export is cash.

Mr. President, with 4,000,000 persons out of work in this country, and with nine and one-half million of our people on part-time work, and with 67,974 claims for unemployment compensation in 1 week at Hartford, Conn., as shown by a dispatch coming from there, it ill behooves this Nation to worry too much about the 40,000 jobless in Italy, while our own people are being forced out of their jobs through our own actions here in fostering the importation of the low-wage living standard labor of Europe.

I wish to emphasize again, Mr. President, that the bill, presently before the Senate, is but one part of the three-part

free-trade program, and that many other bills which are or will be before the Congress will shove us further along the road of economic equality with Europe and Asia—forgetting that we broke our economic ties with Europe in 1776 because of the treatment we were then receiving as a colonial possession of Great Britain. The pending measure is No. 1 of that group; the 1934 Trade Agreements Act extension bill will be No. 2; the International Trade Organization bill will be No. 3; and after it there will be many more, which can be named. All of them constitute one large over-all program to level the wage-living standards of this Nation with the low-wage living standards of Europe, Asia, the South Seas, and Africa; and Mr. President, it will not be long before the people of the United States will realize that fact.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to take a minute or two to join in the comments of the Senator from Nevada in regard to the importance of this issue and the other great issues which are about to come before the Senate, and also to add my word in emphasizing the importance of subjecting them to full debate. I think we may just as well face the reality that the Senators who have been speaking in opposition to ECA in this debate—and as the voting record shows, I do not share their opposition—have nevertheless been representing what I consider to be a growing sentiment in the United States in regard to United States foreign policy. I think it is well and wise that they present their point of view on the floor of the Senate and that those who entertain an opposing point of view answer them, because I think that unless they are answered and unless we can have a full and lengthy debate on this subject, we may discover in the not-too-distant future that increasing numbers of the American people will be asking for the answers. I know of no better place to give the answers than here on the floor of the Senate. I join with the Senator from Nevada in saying that I think the record of this debate on these issues speaks for itself. The debate thus far has been on the merits of the issues.

It was not so long ago, Mr. President—and if Senators on the Democratic side are so anxious to make haste in the Senate on this issue, they should reflect upon this—that the entire program of the Senate was bogged down as the result of a prolonged extraneous discussion which certainly had nothing to do with the need of efficiently and effectively transacting the business of the Senate. We saw the spectacle of a large number of Democratic Senators, on the Democratic side of the aisle including the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] engaging the Senate for days in what constituted a filibuster. The Democrats who participated in that filibuster were not heard to cry for speed in considering civil-rights legislation.

We have had approximately 2 weeks of debate on the ECA subject which involves the expenditure of several billion dollars of the taxpayers' money. Yet we on this side of the aisle are frequently almost constantly, being needled by Democratic Senators to make haste. I

say the type of haste they are asking for will make for a great deal of waste, too, if we do not have a full and lengthy discussion of these issues.

Mr. President, I repeat now, and I shall say it again in the future, that so long as the Democrats seek to steam roll issues through the Senate, there will be resistance from the Senators on this side of the aisle.

DR. EDWIN G. NOURSE'S COMMENTS ON ECONOMIC SITUATION

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I think the statement just made by the eminent chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas, is most surprising, in view of the article that appeared in the newspapers this morning giving an account of the address made by the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse. I hold in my hand a copy of the account of the meeting at which he spoke, taken from the Washington Post of this morning. I am sure it must have caught the eye of the Senator from Texas, if he read the Washington Post this morning. The headline is, "Cost of arming Europe may curtail defense and ECA spending." Under it is the sub-heading, "Economic chief's warning serves to complicate security set-up." I read from the article:

America's current security programs—defense and ECA—should be trimmed to offset at least part of the cost of sending arms to Europe, President Truman's chief economic adviser declares.

This warning from Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers—delivered at the Pentagon with Mr. Truman's advance approval—had immediate repercussions throughout Washington.

It certainly would influence the forthcoming Senate fight over ratification of the North Atlantic Pact, as Members had already been asking questions about the cost of implementing it with arms.

So, Mr. President, I do not think any Senator who asks such a question on the floor of the Senate need apologize. The article continues:

CERTAIN TO AFFECT ECA BILL

The ECA appropriation authorization bill, now before the Senate, was certain to be affected.

Further, the job of whipping the administration's military aid bill into shape for presentation to Congress and the course of that legislation on Capitol Hill was further complicated.

And, Nourse's suggestion of further cuts in America's armed forces caused not only concern at the Pentagon, but promised to affect plans of the House Appropriations and Armed Services Committees.

The former was reported early this week to be ready to boost Air Force appropriations by some 800 million dollars, through trimming Army and Navy funds. Many members of the House Armed Services Committee plan amendments to increase the latter outlays also when the armed forces spending bill reaches the floor next week.

The article then recounts certain statements made yesterday, on the occasion of Army Day, with reference to the necessity of maintaining the armed strength of America throughout the world.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska for a question?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I read that article, and I ask the Senator, does he interpret Dr. Nourse's statement to mean that if we were to ratify the North Atlantic Pact and pass the implementing legislation, a review should be made with the idea of taking money from ECA funds and placing it in the fund to implement the North Atlantic Pact so far as arms are concerned? Did the Senator from Missouri get that interpretation from Dr. Nourse's remarks?

Mr. KEM. I can answer that in the direct words of Dr. Nourse, as quoted in the article.

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

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. KEM. Dr. Nourse is quoted in the article as follows:

"It would be wrong to conclude," Dr. Nourse said in alluding to this plan, "that we can, without concern, add these expenditures, whatever they are, to the present budget items for national security."

Does that answer the question of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, if I understand correctly—and I ask the Senator if this coincides with his interpretation—a review should be made, with the idea of examining the complete set-up and taking funds here and funds there, adding them together, and not going beyond the danger point suggested by Dr. Nourse as being recognized by him.

Mr. KEM. There can be no other conclusion. The article continues:

Additional taxes or deficit financing would follow such a budget increase, he said. Nourse added—

I ask the Senate to attend particularly to this language—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. Did the Senator make a request?

Mr. KEM. No. I saw the attention of the Presiding Officer was engaged, and I waited as a matter of courtesy until he was free.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I thank the Senator. The Chair was engaged momentarily, but he should not have been. The Chair sometimes is engaged in fighting off Senators who want to engage the attention of the Chair.

Mr. KEM. The article continues:

Nourse added that the basic issue is—

"Does the North Atlantic Pact increase our national danger and therefore require us to make additional outlays to restore the proper measure of military security? Or do we propose, by joining in a plan of mutual assurance, to lessen the danger to each of the parties, and particularly to ourselves as a prime target of possible aggression?"

Nourse agreed with the latter and went on to say:

"Under this integration we expect to buy better security at the same cost or even, in due time, at lower cost than would otherwise be required."

Nourse also said that Marshall-plan funds must be regarded as an integral part of the plan of American security. He continued:

"The relative parts to be played by military and by industrial preparedness in each of the participating countries, and the relative roles to be played by each arm of the military service at the most effective points must be reexamined in the light of the new strategic concept and with no dangerous backward look at traditional positions of prestige, historical rolls, or impressive trappings."

"We cannot afford to make the costs of its implementation a simple addition to other military plans as they stood before the new alignment."

So, Mr. President, it seems that what has been said on the floor of the Senate, perhaps in some detail and perhaps with some repetition, in regard to the ECA program, by those who are seeking to have the present appropriations reduced, is not without recognition in the very highest councils of the administration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Vote!

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator for his courtesy, but I shall continue to speak until I have expressed my view in much more detail than may be agreeable to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator I thought he had concluded. I meant no discourtesy whatever.

Mr. KEM. I shall make it clear to the Senator from Texas, by resuming my seat, when I have completed my remarks.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course. I do not deny the Senator's right to do that. I meant no discourtesy. I thought the Senator had concluded his remarks. I apologize if he took any offense. It was not so intended.

Mr. KEM. I should like to say to the Senator from Texas, if he thinks by performances of that kind he can in any way intimidate the Senator from Missouri or curtail the remarks he otherwise may make, he is very much mistaken.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for the cordial way in which he accepted my apology and my explanation.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do accept the apology of the Senator from Texas. But may I indulge in the hope that during the course of the debate he will not repeat the practice which he has started.

In addition to repercussions felt here in Washington, it is apparent that the effect of what has been said on the Senate floor has been felt abroad. On the first page of the New York Times this morning there is a very interesting dispatch from Geneva. I quote:

GENEVA, April 6.—The ground work is being laid for a complete revamping of the Marshall plan soon after Congress completes action on next year's appropriations.

Separate strands of the ideas growing in Europe and in top Government circles in the United States are being pulled together in preparation for a drastic new action to make European economic integration a reality instead of just so many words. One big idea for 1950 already deeply implanted in the convictions of top United States and European officials responsible for directing the recovery program is that the time has come for both Europeans and North Americans to take some risks on creating a permanent economic union in western Europe.

On the European side it is now recognized that the United States Congress is unlikely to

appropriate huge amounts for a third year of the Marshall plan on the basis of a dated-up version of the same recovery story. To come back again with nothing more to report than greater output, improved exports, better balanced budgets, and frustrated Communists, the Europeans realize, will fail to impress either Congress or the United States public. That story is true and important, but it has been told too often.

Straws in the wind are reactions during this year's hearings on the Marshall plan of individual Congressmen who are favorable to aid to Europe but nervous about the lack of progress toward what looks like something durable in the way of a more viable economic system. At least as important is the pressure from continental countries, particularly Belgium, for some progress toward the goals of freer trade, greater convertibility of currencies, and the opening up of long-barricaded market avenues.

The article concludes with this interesting statement:

Continental economists do not believe that Britain can or should join any tight European economic union; complications of Britain's position as the center of a world-wide currency system of her own are too great. What they hope is that Britain at least will not seek to prevent some risky experiments in unity on the Continent. The British record in the European economic organization does not give them much hope that this will be the case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles from which I have read, one from the Washington Post and the other from the New York Times, be incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post of April 7, 1949]

COST OF ARMING EUROPE MAY CURTAIL DEFENSE AND ECA SPENDING—ECONOMIC CHIEF'S WARNING SERVES TO COMPLICATE SECURITY SET-UP

(By John G. Norris)

America's current security programs—defense and ECA—should be trimmed to offset at least part of the cost of sending arms to Europe, President Truman's chief economic adviser declares.

This warning from Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers—delivered at the Pentagon with Mr. Truman's advance approval—had immediate repercussions throughout Washington.

It certainly would influence the forthcoming Senate fight over ratification of the North Atlantic Pact, as Members had already been asking questions about the cost of implementing it with arms.

CERTAIN TO AFFECT ECA BILL

The ECA appropriation authorization bill, now before the Senate, was certain to be affected.

Further, the job of whipping the administration's military aid bill into shape for presentation to Congress and the course of that legislation on Capitol Hill was further complicated.

And Nourse's suggestion of further cuts in America's armed forces caused not only concern at the Pentagon, but promised to affect plans of the House Appropriations and Armed Services Committees.

The former was reported early this week to be ready to boost Air Force appropriations by some \$800,000,000, through trimming Army and Navy funds. Many members of the House Armed Services Committee plan amendments to increase the latter outlays

also when the armed forces spending bill reaches the floor next week.

MORE TAXES OR DEFICIT

Dr. Nourse's warning that an arms-for-Europe program "would contribute to the need for additional taxes or to the making of a budget deficit" was made Tuesday. He spoke before a closed session of top defense officials and prominent civilian guests attending the Second Joint Civilian Orientation Conference. Nourse made the statement public yesterday.

The impact of his address was particularly felt, as officials previously had indicated that the military-aid program could be piled on top of the President's defense budget and ECA spending plans without economic trouble.

The Nourse statement came as military leaders delivered a series of Army Day addresses, emphasizing that America must prepare to hold western Europe in the event of war, and not count on defeating an aggressor in Europe by atomic attack from the air.

Army Secretary Kenneth Royall said that if an aggressor is allowed to overrun Europe, the war will last 10 to 20 years or even longer. Former Under Secretary of the Army, William H. Draper, declared that American strategy must contemplate indefinitely a retention of strength on the continent of Europe.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Army Chief of Staff, set the pace for the Army Day speeches in an address in New York Tuesday night. He firmly backed arms aid to western Europe, declaring that we would be foolish to follow any strategy of letting an enemy overrun the Continent and attempting to come back later.

Their statements were regarded as the opening guns of the administration drive to ratify the Atlantic Pact and back it up with arms assistance. Legislation now being readied for Congress is reported to total \$1,800,000,000 for arms shipments—including continuation of Greek-Turkey aid and the value of supplies sent to western Europe from current American stocks.

"It would be wrong to conclude," Dr. Nourse said in alluding to this plan, "that we can, without concern, add these expenditures, whatever they are, to the present budget items for national security."

Additional taxes or deficit financing would follow such a budget increase, he said. Nourse added that the basic issue is:

"Does the North Atlantic Pact increase our national danger and therefore require us to make additional outlays to restore the proper measure of military security? Or do we propose, by joining in a plan of mutual assurance, to lessen the danger to each of the parties, and particularly to ourselves as a prime target of possible aggression?"

Nourse agreed with the latter and went on to say:

"Under this integration we expect to buy better security at the same cost or even, in due time, at lower cost than would otherwise be required."

Nourse also said that Marshall-plan funds must be regarded as an integral part of the plan of American security. He continued:

"The relative parts to be played by military and by industrial preparedness in each of the participating countries, and the relative roles to be played by each arm of the military service at the most effective points must be reexamined in the light of the new strategic concept and with no dangerous backward look at traditional positions of prestige, historical rolls, or impressive trappings."

"We cannot afford to make the costs of its implementation a simple addition to other military plans as they stood before the new alignment."

[From the New York Times of April 7, 1949]

ERP GOAL SHIFTED TO ECONOMIC UNION—WESTERN NATIONS, WITH TOP UNITED STATES BLESSING, CONSIDER UNIFORM MONEY AS A FIRST STEP

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, April 6.—The ground work is being laid for a complete revamping of the Marshall plan soon after Congress completes action on next year's appropriation.

Separate strands of the ideas growing in Europe and in top Government circles in the United States are being pulled together in preparation for a drastic new action to make European economic integration a reality instead of just so many words. One big idea for 1950 already deeply implanted in the convictions of top United States and European officials responsible for directing the recovery program is that the time has come for both Europeans and North Americans to take some risks on creating a permanent economic union in western Europe.

On the European side, it is now recognized that the United States Congress is unlikely to appropriate huge amounts for a third year of the Marshall plan on the basis of a dated-up version of the same recovery story. To come back again with nothing more to report than greater output, improved exports, better balanced budgets, and frustrated Communists, the Europeans realize, will fail to impress either Congress or the United States public. That story is true and important, but it has been told too often.

PRESSURE OF CONGRESS IS FELT

Straws in the wind are the reactions during this year's hearings on the Marshall plan of individual Congressmen who are favorable to aid to Europe but nervous about the lack of progress toward what looks like something durable in the way of a more viable economic system. At least as important is the pressure from Continental countries, particularly Belgium, for some progress toward the goals of freer trade, greater convertibility of currencies, and the opening up of long-barricaded market avenues.

On the United States side, the feeling is that, having made irrevocable commitments in the military sphere, it is time for western Europe to make irrevocable commitments in the economic sphere. It is felt that little more can be gained from more planning, more committee meetings, more long-term projects. This feeling is shared by the highest officials of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, who see the workings of European cooperation from the inside.

One such unity measure now in high favor is to establish now, while United States aid is still available, a complete currency union in western Europe. This means not just removing exchange controls and restoring the prewar freedom of convertibility but literally having the same colored paper, bearing the same pictures, circulating throughout the area. This is the kind of step that brings a host of the other measures of coordination in its train, not as a matter of mere good intentions but as a matter of inherent necessity from which national governments cannot escape.

RISKS ENTAILED FOR UNITED STATES

To establish a uniform currency now would entail great risks for all the participating countries. Some would suffer unemployment in industries now protected by exchange control regulations; others would have to impose new taxes or forego popular social progress.

The step would also entail risks for the United States. Instead of allocating dollars, the United States role would become that of underwriting the dollar deficit of the participating countries. For some time the

whole area would have to adopt some controls to keep dollar expenditure within bounds.

The immense advantage over the present system, however, would be that European business could at last begin the painful process of adapting itself to competitive conditions. Ultimately, continental experts feel, this would bring about such an improvement in productivity that Europe's inferiority to United States industry would be reduced to unimportant differentials.

Some of the keenest European observers of United States congressional and public opinion believe that it is in the nature of the North American character to be prepared to take a considerable risk in exchange for certain achievements of a broad political ideal—and Europe has finally recognized that the United States desire for European unity is a basic American urge.

The Benelux countries already have begun to plan for the inclusion of western Germany in a western European economic union. The logic of incorporating west Germany in any such plan is that it is better to have a rapidly growing German industry under the same roof than to deal with it as foreign competition.

Continental economists do not believe that Britain can or should join any tight European economic union: the complications of Britain's position as the center of a world-wide currency system of her own are too great. What they hope is that Britain at least will not seek to prevent some risky experiments in unity on the Continent. The British record in the European Economic Organization does not give them much hope that this will be the case.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, we have been admonished and criticized rather consistently, supposedly for delaying tactics in connection with the Marshall plan. It has been stated several times that many extraneous matters have been injected into the debate. I rise for a moment to explain my position. I did make one extended speech on the subject in the past 2 weeks. I think I took approximately 2½ hours of the Senate's time. During the 2 years and 3 months in which I have been a Member of the Senate, I have used very little of the Senate's time. I thought I made my position clear. I admit that in my remarks I talked about the North Atlantic Pact and other projected pacts; I talked about our domestic problems; I talked about our great national debt; I talked about our taxes and the proposed increase in taxation.

It is my sincere belief that because the Marshall plan is a piece of legislation to be considered at this time, we cannot completely isolate it and separate it from the other great problems which confront us, both in connection with our foreign policies and in connection with our domestic policies.

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

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MALONE. Then the Senator does not agree with the tactics which have been employed in the past few years with reference to each one of these matters, the Marshall plan, the ERP, the ECA, all one plan, referring to them as legislation to meet a great emergency; and he does not agree that the trade agreements extension bill is to meet a great emergency, or that the International Trade Organization matter, which will level the living standards of this country with those of

Europe, is a great emergency, standing by itself. Or does he believe, in view of Sir Stafford Cripps' remarks this morning in a newspaper interview, that America must be educated along the lines of lower tariffs and import fees so that British products can more easily enter the United States, that there should be some general plan of operation?

Mr. JENNER. That is what I was trying to make plain to my colleagues. I do not think we can consider any one of these programs and isolate it, and say we will talk about the ECA program, then we will talk about reciprocal-trade agreements, then about the North Atlantic Pact, then about the labor bill, then education for the people of the United States, then about reclamation for the benefit of the people of the Nation, and then about taxes, as isolated matters. I do not think that can be done. I have tried to make my position plain.

I am not trying to delay the business of the Senate. It is my honest belief that we cannot accomplish all the things we need to accomplish at home, and all the things which may be necessary in the world at large, and still remain an economically and militarily strong Nation. The Marshall plan itself may be fine; the North Atlantic Pact may be fine; I think all these things may be necessary, but if the ultimate end means bankruptcy for the Nation, then we shall have destroyed the last stronghold of freedom in the world.

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

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it the Senator is not implying that the North Atlantic Pact is a necessity or that it is advisable. Is that correct?

Mr. JENNER. I am not. All I am trying to do is to make my position clear. It is not easy for a Senator to take the position which I take in the Senate. He is lost in a hopeless minority. A Senator who takes the stand which I take is branded as a know-nothing, an isolationist, and a reactionary. It is not easy to be in a hopeless minority, as has been evidenced by the vote on my amendment. I offered an amendment to the bill, and it was rejected. Knowing that agriculture is one of the basic industries of this Nation, knowing that we had had approximately 7 years of bumper crops, and that another bumper crop was in prospect, I offered an amendment which merely provided that when the American farmers have raised a surplus of key crops, such as cotton, wheat, corn, rye, soy beans, and so forth, the Administrator of ECA should not be permitted to take the American taxpayers' dollars and purchase such products in a foreign country, such as Canada, as was done last year. The Administrator purchased \$354,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat at a time when we had 360,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat. On the 360,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat a subsidy equivalent to the parity price had to be paid. My amendment received 32 votes out of a possible 96 votes.

What I am trying to say, Mr. President is that it is not easy to fight for what one honestly believes in, when he is

in a hopeless minority, and when all these various proposals are put together and coupled up with the other problems confronting our economy. The propaganda has already started on the North Atlantic Pact, and it is a 100-to-1 bet that it will be ratified by this body.

The pact itself, standing by itself, might be all right; I am personally inclined to think it is; but when we put the price tag along with the pact, we must reflect that we are going to assume to rearm Europe, that we are to commit ourselves to arm for a ground war in Europe, at a probable cost of around \$20,000,000,000. Certainly we start with \$1,800,000,000, but that is merely the ante in the poker game. Twenty billion dollars is a truer figure than \$1,800,000,000.

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

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. Am I correct in my impression, however, that notwithstanding the Senator's remarks about the Atlantic Pact as a separate entity, he is holding his mind open to hear all the arguments on the Atlantic Pact before he arrives at a final conclusion?

Mr. JENNER. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. He is not intending to state to the Senate that he has arrived at the conclusion that the Atlantic Pact is either necessary or desirable, is he?

Mr. JENNER. No; I have not arrived at any final decision. I merely say that the pact itself, just a piece of paper with the 12 names written on it, probably means that the American taxpayer will have to spend a tremendous amount of money.

Mr. DONNELL. It may mean, however, may it not, that the American Government is obligating this country to go to war in the event of certain contingencies, and without requiring the approval of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. JENNER. It may mean that, but my personal reasoning is that we have gone to war in Europe twice when there was no pact in existence. As a matter of fact there were neutrality laws in which we took the exact opposite view from that reflected in the pact. Therefore I would assume, the American people being what they are, wanting liberty and freedom preserved throughout the world if possible, that they would probably go to war a third time pact or no pact. What I am trying to show, and I think what the debate has brought out, is that when we take a 42 or 45 billion dollar budget for the costs of the Federal Government; then include five or six billion dollars, the cost of the Marshall plan; include another billion dollars for the cost of the occupation of Germany and Japan; include, in addition, probably \$600,000,000, or perhaps more, for Greece and Turkey; include, to begin with, a \$1,800,000,000 for the North Atlantic Pact, with a projected figure of probably nearly \$20,000,000,000; and when we include the possibility of lend-lease with which to do the same thing we are doing in the North Atlantic; then include a Pacific pact; then bring in all the domestic problems, and

consider that we now need \$12,000,000,000 to rebuild and bring up to par our national defense and strategic materials; and when we think of the fact that there are 6,000,000 children in this country who have to go to school in the next five years, and there are not sufficient physical facilities to enable them to attend school, which will mean the expenditure of a billion or two billion dollars to bring the school facilities up to what they should be, unless we are to raise a Nation of hoodlums; when we think of the old people in this country, with whom we play politics in each election, who are getting the miserable pittance of \$21 a month; and when we think of the old age group increasing in number all the time; when we think of the problems of power and reclamation; when we think of the problems of conservation; when we think of the fixed obligations of the Government—when we consider all these things, I say we can not isolate the Marshall plan and talk about it exclusively.

When we couple with all this the projected Fair Deal of Mr. Truman, which it is estimated will take another ten to twenty billion dollars a year, I say we cannot take seventy or eighty billion dollars out of the American economy and continue as a strong, solvent, free Nation. That is why I oppose the New Deal and Fair Deal. I do not think it is the sincere purpose of their proponents to preserve a free and strong economy in this country. I think they are gradually, step by step, through hopping from one emergency to another emergency, from one crisis to another crisis, deliberately leading this great free Nation into socialism.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a document which is being circulated among Government employees, not down on Pennsylvania Avenue, but here in this very Capitol, here in the very shadow of the Senate Chamber. Let me read parts of it; it is too long to take up the time of the Senate to read it all, and I do not care to be accused of delaying tactics, but I am fearful we are being led to overextend ourselves, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has said, and when we overextend ourselves and head into bankruptcy, then we are going to lose our liberties, we are going to lose freedom in this country, and then who is going to be the great leader we are now supposed to be in the world?

I ask Senators to listen to this. It refers to an ADA study trip to Britain in the summer of 1949. This has been circulated among Government employees here in the shadow of the Senate Chamber. Worse than that, it has been circulated to young boys, 15, 16, and 17 years old, here within the shadow of this very Senate Chamber. Do we hear talk about preserving freedom and liberty? Listen to this:

This is a summer trip of 1949 under the auspices of the Americans for Democratic Action.

Oh, Mr. President, how the word "democratic" has been abused and perverted. One would think we were a democracy. If you want to sell a program to the American people, call it democratic.

Mr. President, we are not a democracy. We never were intended to be a democracy. This Nation is a Republic, a representative Republic, and there is no reference in the Preamble, in the Constitution, in any of the debates at the Convention which framed the Constitution, or in any of the sacred documents of this great Nation, which calls us a democracy. But we are fast getting to be a democracy, because we are becoming a government of organized gangs.

Here, circulated in this building, is this pamphlet from the Americans for Democratic Action. The address of this organization is 1740 K Street NW., Washington 6, D. C. The telephone number is Executive 8160. The officers are listed, headed by one of our distinguished colleagues from Minnesota, Mr. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. He is the national chairman of this organization, and the other officers are listed. I do not care to read all this, but let me read portions of it so that Senators may see what is going on.

ADA has a deep and sympathetic interest in the program of Britain's Labor Government. ADA has held that what Britain is accomplishing may be one answer to the challenge of communism. For here freedom and planning—

Both those words are underlined, Mr. President—

are essentials of a mature and vigorous democracy.

There is that word again.

Britain has lost none of her democratic practices with the planning she has had to do to rebuild. In fact she has added new privileges of citizenship with the broadened participation required by her health, housing, town and country planning, and other social welfare legislation.

Let us stop right there. Britain has lost none of her freedoms. Those who prepared this document are writing to our young men, employees, if you please, of this very Senate, urging them to go to England and study the great British Labor government, when we are today spending billions of dollars to keep that great British Labor government on its feet.

They have lost no freedoms over there. My wife was born in that country. Her relatives are still in that country. I know from first hand information that if a man is a coal miner and wants to quit his job and go into some other industry he cannot do so without receiving permission. He must go to the bureaucrats to receive permission.

By the way, there are more bureaucrats in England today than there are in this great country, but there are only 45,000,000 people in that country, whereas there are 145,000,000 people in our country.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator from Indiana if the language which he has quoted in regard to Great Britain has a very striking similarity to the language

which occurs in the speech of Christopher Mayhew, Member of Parliament, to the United Nations Economic and Social Council on Wednesday, February 23, as follows:

The years since the war have seen a great ferment of ideas and social experiment in Britain. We have set in train a great expansion of education—including technical education—a unique system of national insurance, linked with a comprehensive system of industrial injury insurance and a complete national health service, great plans for town and country planning—

I pause to ask the Senator: Is not that a program for town and country planning contained in the document which the Senator has just read?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; of course.

Mr. DONNELL. I continue reading from Mr. Mayhew's statement:

And the reorganization of our key industries and services under public ownership. Some have asked if we can afford all this. They have missed the point that these developments are an integral part of our great economic expansion.

Does not the Senator think that the language and the sentiment expressed both in the document he has read and the statement of Mr. Mayhew are strikingly similar?

Mr. JENNER. They are very similar. This thing, Mr. President, is going on in the shadow of the Capitol. From my background I suppose I should be one of the great give-away boys, because my generation has not been a very happy one. We came through one great world war, and then we lived through an economic catastrophe in this country for about 10 years, and then our generation ended up in the middle of a second world war. So it would be easy enough for people of my age and my understanding to be numbered among the great give-away boys.

But think of men circulating in this very Senate Chamber to young boys like the page to whom I referred telling 15-year-old boys to try to go to England to look over the great privileges offered by that great Labor Government, under which a man cannot work where he pleases, under which he must obtain government permission to get a job, or to change from one job to another—a country the government of which tells a man where he shall live, how much he shall pay for his quarters, what he may buy, where he must line up to obtain almost everything he needs and which issues a man a \$50 toupee paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, and when it is found that a \$50 toupee is not good enough, says "We will call back the \$50 toupee and give you another one." And we in this country suffer heavy taxes to pay for such damn foolishness.

Of course, Mr. President, I shall take all the time I want to talk about these things.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Inasmuch as an organization with which I am affiliated

and of which I serve as the active national chairman, has been brought up for discussion on the floor of the Senate I should like to ask a few questions pertaining to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Indiana. Did I understand you to say that democracy was nothing more or less than an organization of gangs?

Mr. JENNER. I said the type of government we are getting in this country is organized gang rule. If you have the biggest gang if you wield the biggest political club, you are going to have the biggest power. I say we are intended to be and always were intended to be a representative republic, and I hope and pray to God that we do not degenerate into having gang war and being dominated by organized gangs. This organized gang situation weighs on my mind. They do not care what happens to America. It is time somebody stood on the floor of the Senate and denounced all gangs. It is time somebody stood on the floor of the Senate and stood for America regardless of his political future. What will anyone's political future amount to in this body if we lose our freedom, if we lose our liberty and if we lose the greatest country under God's sun. I am not going to have a part in bringing about such loss.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield further to the Senator from Minnesota for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was wondering whether the Senator in discussing what he calls the rule of gangs was again trying to identify the rule of gangs with the concept or principle of democracy. I gathered that from his remarks.

Mr. JENNER. If you want to get into what I think is a true definition of democracy, I will say true democracy exists when the people themselves actually run the government. That is not the intention of our Government. We did not become this great Nation under a democracy. We became this great Nation as a Republic in which the people exercise the right of a free ballot, in which the people of a district elect a Representative to Congress who speaks for them. If the people do not like their Representative they can recall him. But the idea of the people, the gangs, dictating the laws and the legislation is what I am objecting to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to understand—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield for a further question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to understand that you are opposed to the people dictating—using your words—the laws of this country?

Mr. JENNER. I do not want the people as a gang dictating the laws. I want the people to elect their representatives and then let their representatives in Congress speak and represent them as they honestly think is best. If the people do not agree with the thoughts of their

representatives they have the right, in the case of a Representative in Congress, to recall him within 2 years; yes, even sooner than that, because the primary comes earlier in the year; and if the individual is a Senator the people can recall him at the end of his term.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield for a further question?

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator will find within his understanding of the term "democracy" such basic freedoms as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly? Would you find those factors—

Mr. JENNER. I find all those factors incorporated under the Republic of this country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator find all those within his understanding of the concept of democracy?

Mr. JENNER. I find all those incorporated, I answer the Senator again, under the Constitution of the United States, which created the Republic:

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect—

Not democracy, but a more perfect republic.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield for another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota for another question?

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the Constitution says "in order to form a more perfect union?"

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not a republic; a more perfect union.

Mr. JENNER. In order to form a more perfect union and in order to establish and retain this Republic.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not possible for us to have a republic which is a structure and a form of government which utilizes the procedures and the structural organization of government within the spirit, within the concept of what we call democracy?

Mr. JENNER. Not if organizations such as the ADA, of which the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is the national chairman, go around trying to get young men 15 or 16 years old to go to London, England, this summer and study the great progress of the British Labor Government. No; we will not stand for that.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I to interpret from the Senator's remarks that he does not believe that people ought to have the privilege or ought to enjoy, let me say, the opportunity to study forms of government and political organization by visiting our neighboring countries, our allies?

Mr. JENNER. Let me read again the purpose ADA has:

ADA has held that what Britain is accomplishing may be one answer to the challenge of communism. For here freedom and planning are essentials of a mature and vigorous democracy. Britain has lost none of her democratic practices with the planning she has had to do to rebuild. In fact, she has added new privileges of citizenship with the broadened participation required by her health, housing, town and country planning, and other social-welfare legislation.

I do not know what town and country planning means, but I was over there. I visited some friends, a man and his wife, who had a son and a daughter. It came time to go to bed. There was one bedroom. The little girl was about 15 years old. I said to my friends, "Where do we sleep?" They said, "Well, if you do not mind, you will have to sleep with the children." I, a grown man, slept with a little girl 15 years old and her brother. The mother and the father slept in the other bed.

I said, "Why does this situation exist?" They said, "Well, the city of Kirkcaldy, Scotland owns this housing project, and we have to live in a one-bedroom apartment until Mary is 16 years of age. Then the government will give us an additional bedroom."

Mr. President, I do not want that kind of a government, and I do not think it is a good idea for the boys and girls of this country to be spending their money to go to England to see what broad additional privileges the great socialistic experiment has given the people of England.

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

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator of the mind that any government which may be termed a labor government is ipso facto undesirable and unworthy of our consideration, our study, and our concern?

Mr. JENNER. What are you trying to do, put me on the political spot? Are you playing to the gangs again, young man?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I ask a further question?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask that the rules of the Senate be observed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must admonish all Senators that they are prohibited by the rules and by immemorial practice from addressing one another in the second person.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is that the Senator from Indiana has the floor, and he has yielded to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

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

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question only.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator be kind enough to read us the names, one by one, of the other officers of ADA, which he says are on the document?

Mr. JENNER. I shall be glad to do so. I read the name of the Senator from

Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the national chairman. The other names are: Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., chairman of the executive committee; George Edwards; Hugh Ernst; Paul A. Porter; Emil Rieve; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., vice chairman; Louis H. Harris, treasurer; David Ginsburg, Secretary, National Board; James Loeb, Jr., national executive secretary; Mrs. Frances Adams, study-trip director, 3720 Thirty-ninth St. NW., Washington, D. C., Woodley 1754; Fritz Mondale, executive secretary, Students for Democratic Action; and David Williams, director of the London office.

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

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. I am wondering if the Senator has any information as to whether or not the David Williams mentioned is the labor member of Parliament from the Neath Division of Glamorgan.

Mr. JENNER. It may appear in this mimeograph circular. The circular was handed to me by one of the pages this morning. It enraged me to think that here in the Chamber of the United States Senate, in this great free country, organizations are stimulating young men and women to go abroad to see the progress of the socialistic experiment in England which we as taxpayers are paying for through the legislation which is before us at this very moment.

Mr. DONNELL and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator know if Paul A. Porter, to whom reference is made, is the same Paul A. Porter who was formerly Deputy Administrator in charge of the Rent Division of the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. JENNER. I am not sure, but it would be a natural connection, I should say.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. Can the Senator tell me whether or not the name as it appears on his document is "Paul A. Porter"?

Mr. JENNER. It is "Paul A. Porter."

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. JENNER. I have read only the first short paragraph, and I should like to proceed and read some more of this very interesting circular:

ADA's purpose in organizing a group of its active members from all parts of the United States for summer study in Britain is to forge a stronger link between our two great English-speaking democracies—

There is that word again—

as well as to give the participants an opportunity to study at first hand just what have been the accomplishments of the Labor Government since 1945.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. JENNER. I yield for a question. I should like to read a little more of this, so that we may know what we are discussing. I yield for one further question.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator know that Paul Aldermandt Porter, whose name is listed in Who's Who in America, was the campaign publicity director of the Democratic National Committee in 1944?

Mr. JENNER. No; but I would surmise it.

I read further from the circular:

We believe that this summer will be particularly interesting in view of the planning which will be going on for the general elections of 1950.

Transportation will be via planes which have been procured at special student rates by Youth Argosy, Inc., "an educational, philanthropic, nonprofit making and tax-exempt organization cooperating with mutually interested groups and individuals which exists for the following purpose: To provide safe and inexpensive transportation for all worthy young people to the ends that they may find friendships that will link youth with youth the world over; may enjoy the educational and cultural benefits of travel; and may come to have a greater knowledge, understanding and love of the world." Departure date will probably be some time around the second week in July. You will be advised as soon as we have definite confirmation, as to date, time, and point of departure.

The group will be composed of undergraduate and graduate students who are affiliated with SDA and persons past college years who are active in civil, labor, religious, political, and other community activities. All members will be carefully selected and will be required to present a written report on the summer program when they return in September.

The group will be provided with reading lists and will be expected to study this source material before they come to Washington or New York for orientation. The orientation program will be given during 2 or 3 days preceding the date of embarkation.

The orientation program will tackle the dual job of (1) preparing the group for England to help each member get the most out of the experience, and (2) to help each person be a more effective ambassador of good will for the United States. To this end, the group will meet with British people from the Embassy, the British Information Service, British newspaper offices, and others. On point (2) the group will meet with ADA and SDA officials as well as representatives from the labor movement, from the ECA and from Government agencies such as the Department of State and the Department of Labor, which are particularly concerned with projects of this nature. The students will be expected to focus their own projects and aims during this period of orientation, and a syllabus containing the kind of questions to which the summer should provide the answers will be prepared. The 8 weeks in England will be spent at summer sessions of the Labor Party, Fabian Society, Workers Education Association, and Trade Unions Congress.

Mr. President, I believe the Fabian Society was originally organized by George Bernard Shaw.

I read further:

In addition, there will be trips to industrial and rural areas.

On arrival in England, there will be further preparation and orientation before the students go out to the summer sessions. ADA's London representative will work out several seminar sessions where the group will

meet Government, labor, and educational officials who will help to guide them in their studies. The group will be housed in London on a low-cost basis, and headquarters will be maintained during the 8-week period so that those who are not out at sessions will have a home base in London.

Following is an estimated cost for the project.

Then it goes on to tell about the program in England and about the Fabian schools that will help them study, and about the Labor Party schools, the League of Youth Rally, the Workers Education Association, and the Trade Unions Conference. Mr. President, I should like to have this circular printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

ADA has a deep and sympathetic interest in the program of Britain's Labor Government. ADA has held that what Britain is accomplishing may be one answer to the challenge of communism. For here freedom and planning are essentials of a mature and vigorous democracy. Britain has lost none of her democratic practices with the planning she has had to do to rebuild. In fact she has added new privileges of citizenship with the broadened participation required by her health, housing, town, and country planning and other social welfare legislation.

ADA's purpose in organizing a group of its active members from all parts of the United States for summer study in Britain is to forge a stronger link between our two great English-speaking democracies as well as to give the participants an opportunity to study at first hand just what have been the accomplishments of the Labor Government since 1945. We believe that this summer will be particularly interesting in view of the planning which will be going on for the general elections of 1950.

Transportation will be via planes which have been procured at special student rates by Youth Argosy, Inc., an educational, philanthropic, nonprofit making and tax-exempt organization cooperating with mutually interested groups and individuals which exists for the following purpose: to provide safe and inexpensive transportation for all worthy young people to the ends that they may find friendships that will link youth with youth the world over; may enjoy the educational and cultural benefits of travel; and may come to have a greater knowledge, understanding and love of the world. Departure date will probably be sometime around the second week in July. You will be advised as soon as we have definite confirmation, as to date, time, and point of departure.

The group will be composed of undergraduate and graduate students who are affiliated with SDA and persons past college years who are active in civil, labor, religious, political, and other community activities. All members will be carefully selected and will be required to present a written report on the summer program when they return in September.

The group will be provided with reading lists and will be expected to study this source material before they come to Washington or New York for orientation. The orientation program will be given during 2 or 3 days preceding the date of embarkation.

The orientation program will tackle the dual job of (1) preparing the group for England to help each member get the most out of the experience, and (2) to help each person be a more effective ambassador of goodwill for the United States. To this end, the group will meet with British people from the Embassy, the British Information Service, British newspaper offices and others. On

point (2), the group will meet with ADA and SDA officials as well as representatives from the labor movement, from the ECA and from Government agencies such as the Department of State and the Department of Labor, which are particularly concerned with projects of this nature. The students will be expected to focus their own projects and aims during this period of orientation, and a syllabus containing the kind of questions to which the summer should provide the answers will be prepared.

The 8 weeks in England will be spent at summer sessions of the Labor Party, Fabian Society, Workers Education Association and Trade Unions Congress. In addition, there will be trips to industrial and rural areas.

On arrival in England, there will be further preparation and orientation before the students go out to the summer sessions. ADA's London representative will work out several seminar sessions where the group will meet government, labor, and educational officials who will help to guide them in their studies. The group will be housed in London on a low cost basis, and headquarters will be maintained during the 8-week period so that those who are not out at sessions will have a home base in London.

Following is an estimated budget for the project. It is understood that this represents the most accurate estimate possible, but should living costs in England exceed the amount, members of the group will be required to pay any additional costs. On the other hand, should costs be lower than estimated (and we have tried to make maximum allowance for all items) the saving will be refunded at the end of the trip.

Each member of the group will be required to pay \$640 before leaving the United States. This will cover the following budget:

Round trip flight via Youth Argosy planes	
8 weeks' lodging (this will include board, room, and tuition at school sessions, and board and room in London and visits to other parts of England)	\$379
Registration and leadership fee (not returnable in case of cancellation for reasons beyond our control)	240
	21
Total	640

To be noted:

1. This does not include train fares in England and other out-of-pocket expenses. These will vary depending on the program selected by student.

2. A small number of students may defray a portion of their expenses as much as \$50 weekly by electing a week of work in harvest camps.

3. Persons who wish to spend 1 or 2 weeks of the time on the continent will be refunded the amount which is not used for board and room in England.

4. Low-cost accommodations will be arranged for the 2- or 3-day Washington or New York orientation period and are not included in this budget.

5. Each person making the trip will be required to make his own arrangements for the following:

- Trip to orientation headquarters.
- Passport and visas.
- Vaccination and inoculation.
- Insurance.

PROGRAM IN ENGLAND

Each member of the group has the opportunity to make his own program insofar as is practical. Sometimes he will have to accept his second and third choices, but his wishes will be our guide in planning his summer program. He may elect the number and type of summer sessions, amount of time to be spent in London, or in the field, or any combination thereof. He may also elect harvest

camps, visits to Birmingham, Manchester, mining, and rural areas.

LONDON

London will be headquarters, and there will be a program including visits to Government ministries, the Parliament (insofar as circumstances permit) conferences, housing projects, community centers, and other activities including a recreational and cultural program.

FABIAN SCHOOLS (FROM THE FABIAN APPLICATION FOLDER FOR 1949)

Ever since the early days of Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb, the annual summer schools of the Fabian Society have been a special feature in the calendar of the British labor movement. What happens at a Fabian summer school? You will find a hundred or so Fabians in a large house in the country, at Cirencester in Gloucestershire, or Beatrice Webb House, near Dorking, in Surrey. At the Beatrice Webb House there will be a lecture each morning by some celebrity, such as a Member of Parliament. After lunch you can swim, play tennis, walk, talk, or sleep. After tea there are discussion groups which you can join or not, according to your fancy. After supper there may be a debate or brains trust or dancing or a visit to the local pub. At Cirencester the program will be similar, but there will be more study-group periods instead of lectures. There is great value in the informal discussions which are encouraged by the free and friendly atmosphere of the schools. You could not find a better introduction to the British labor movement than a week spent at a Fabian summer school. If you would like to spend one or more weeks at a Fabian summer school you would be made very welcome.

The Fabian Society will be holding five schools in 1949. Three weeks will be spent at the Beatrice Webb House, Pasture Wood, near Dorking, Surrey, in lovely wooded country. At the first week (July 23-30) the lectures will deal mainly with the Labor Party election program for 1950; at the second (July 30-August 6) the lectures will cover a variety of home and international subjects; and the third (August 6-13) will be devoted to international, including commonwealth, affairs.

Two weeks will be spent at the Royal Agricultural College, Cirencester, in the famous Cotswold country. Here the study-group method will be applied first to Labor's Election Program (August 13-20) and then to the problems of Socialism and the Individual (August 20-27).

LABOR PARTY SCHOOLS (FROM 1949 FOLDER)

The 1949 series of national summer schools, the last before the general election, will be held at the centers:

Oulton Hall Hotel, Clacton-on-Sea, from June 11 to 25; at St. John's College, University of Durham, from July 2 to 16; and at Beatrice Webb House, Leith Hill, Surrey, from August 27 to September 17.

Key workers are given valuable training and experience to fit them for competent and responsible leadership in their local parties and trade-union branches. This year the approach of the general election lends a new perspective to our educational activities and makes it more vital than ever for the party to have as many active and well-informed members as possible.

The educational program: At each of the schools there will be a number of general lectures by authoritative speakers including members of the Government and the national executive committee. In addition, students will be divided into groups to make a more detailed study of particular subjects under the guidance of expert tutors.

At Durham and Beatrice Webb House, there will be courses in local government as well as the general-election program, and electoral organization and publicity.

A fourth subject, International Policy, will be available at Beatrice Webb House during the 2 weeks beginning August 27 and September 3.

Social and recreational activities: These activities are a most important feature of the summer-school program, and full advantage will be taken of the excellent facilities provided at the various centers. Students are encouraged to make their own program of entertainment during the week and are asked to come prepared with suggestions and to take active part in the social arrangements.

LEAGUE OF YOUTH RALLY (FROM 1949 FOLDER)

This will be a get-together for the youth division of the Labor Party. Classes will be arranged on home policy, international affairs, and local government as well as individual lectures on topical subjects. There will be classes in public speaking, as well as the finals of the national contest.

This will be the first annual rally of the Labor League of Youth at Butlin's holiday camp at Fliley, Yorkshire, for 1 week, from September 17-24, 1949.

WORKERS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

A joint committee representing labor and academic thinking have made plans for a series of summer sessions to be held at several universities. WEA courses deal with a variety of subjects, some aimed directly at labor education, others of a cultural nature, and others with emphasis on contemporary affairs.

TRADE-UNIONS CONFERENCE

TUC schools are particularly concerned with labor problems, labor law, and other areas of particular interest to the trade-union member. This summer's sessions will also take up organized labor's part in the election program for 1950.

HARVEST CAMPS

The British have organized camps where participants help with the harvest. There is opportunity to see life in rural areas, as well as to earn something toward the trip.

INDEPENDENT PROJECTS

To provide for persons who would like to make other plans for housing and study in England but whose general purposes are in keeping with those of the group, a limited number of students with their own project plans will be permitted to join the group. Each of these students will be required to submit a detailed project plan which must be approved by the selections committee. Cost for these students will be air fare plus registration fee.

ABOUT THE DIRECTOR

The project director attended summer schools in Britain last year and was so enthusiastic about them and about the Labor Government's program, that she proposed making such a trip possible for other ADA members at as low a cost as possible.

Mrs. Adams is a graduate of the University of Minnesota. After a stint as director of research for a Chicago advertising agency, she and her husband went to Mexico. Later they worked in Ecuador where Mrs. Adams was radio representative for Nelson Rockefeller's Office of Inter-American Affairs. As consultant to the Inter-American Institute of Education, she organized special educational projects, and was also active on the coordination committee which was charged with responsibility for inter-American cultural exchange including exchange of persons. She is particularly interested in the exchange of peoples between nations as a means of building international understanding, and as a member of ADA believes that there should be more exchange of like-minded liberals throughout the world.

At present, she is active in the Washington chapter of Americans for Democratic Action as well as in other community activities.

Last summer she was recreation director (also assisting with orientation and evaluation) on the Tabinta and Volendam student ships.

ADA study trip to Britain, summer 1949, auspices of Americans for Democratic Action, Washington, D. C. Hubert H. Humphrey, national chairman; Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., chairman, executive committee; George Edwards; Hugo Ernst; Paul A. Porter; Emil Rieve; Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., vice chairman; Louis H. Harris, treasurer; David Ginsburg, secretary, national board; James Loeb, Jr., national executive secretary; Mrs. Frances Adams, study trip director; Fritz Mondale, executive secretary, Students for Democratic Action; David Williams, director, London Office.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, again I wish to apologize. I did not intend to take more than a moment of the time of the Senate. But when this matter came to my attention this morning, I thought it sufficiently important to be presented to the Senate so that every Member of the Senate could know what is going on.

Mr. President, when we take all these proposals and add them together, the total is staggering. So I come back to my original proposition. I do not think it is possible to separate the Marshall plan from the North Atlantic Pact, from the other proposed pacts, from our great domestic problems, from the projected Fair Deal, from our already-existing cost of government. In other words, regardless of how beneficial or how good all these proposals may be, we come back to the one question which we must ask ourselves, namely, Can America afford it?

It is my belief that when we connect the programs of the ADA with the forthcoming agricultural program and the other proposals, we shall be staggered by the total. Apropos of the forthcoming agricultural program, Mr. President, let me say that I understand from a news article in regard to Secretary of Agriculture Brannan that today or perhaps tomorrow the story is to break about the forthcoming agricultural program. At the present time we do not know what it will be; it is very "hush-hush." But I am sure that when it comes to us there will be a great deal of favorable propaganda about it, both in the columns of the press and over the airwaves, and America will be "sold" overnight on the proposition that "This is it."

However, Mr. President, I venture to hazard the guess that, in line with the ideas of Socialist-minded persons who now are connected with our Government, the new agricultural program, as it is to be proposed, will tell the American farmer, "We will give you perhaps 100 percent of parity; but in exchange for that you are going to let the planners and the bureaucrats in Washington tell you how much you will plant, where you will plant, how much you will sell your crops for, and what you can grow on your own farm."

I say again that all such proposals cannot be separated from the consideration of the measure now before us, because the quicker we drag down our

economy the easier it will be for the Socialists and Communists, if we wish to say so, to fish in our troubled waters.

Mr. President, we have had troubled waters before, and we shall have them again. Dr. Nourse has told us now that there is a limit to the aid we can give. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has told us that there is a limit to what we can do. The time I have taken on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President, I have taken knowing that I would be laughed at and ridiculed and knowing that I was in a hopeless minority, but I have taken it because I know in the bottom of my heart that the future hope and future peace of the world are based only on the possibility of the preservation of a solid, strong, free America, not on any British labor socialism or any socialism anywhere or fascism or nazism or communism or anything else.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish to say that the newspapers reported that at the signing of the North Atlantic Pact—this item strikes me as rather humorous—the Marine Band played I Got Plenty of Nothing, and that the great Marine Band also selected for another one of its numbers a piece entitled "It Ain't Necessarily So." Mr. President, I should like to know whether the playing of those numbers had some subtle connection with the bill now pending before us—the bill for the extension of European aid. Is the significance of those selections by the Marine Band on that occasion clear? It is not clear to me. Does the playing of the number I Got Plenty of Nothing mean that we are getting nothing in return for our aid to Europe, or does the playing of It Ain't Necessarily So refer to the jumbled information and double-talk we have received from the administration when we have asked for clarification and enlightenment?

In regard to the particular piece of legislation now before the Senate, Mr. President, if anyone could give us the assurance that at the end of its projected period it would have accomplished the things which it has been intended to accomplish; namely, the feeding of hungry people, the stopping of the spread of Communism, and the aiding of world peace, and if we could be assured that at the end of the 4-year projected period we would not have to continue to finance the deficit budgets of the countries of Europe and to finance socialistic experiments in England, we might feel differently about the requests which are being made of us. But after all, Mr. President, we have many people in our own country who need free hearing aids and free false teeth and free babies, and who would like to have free hospitalization; and some of them who happen to be unfortunate enough to have bald heads, no doubt, would like to have good toupees to keep them warm. Certainly the American people would like to have those things. We also have a school problem which we must face. We have the problem of the depletion of our own natural resources, which we must face. Secretary Krug says we are now a have-not Nation in respect to zinc, lead, copper, and oil; and he recommends the immediate expenditure of \$12,000,000,000 to bring our na-

tural resources up, in order to preserve our position in regard to national defense.

Mr. President, I honestly do not think we can do all these things all over the world and do all the things which are required here at home and not destroy the freedoms of liberties of our great Nation and not black out for 100 years to come the peace and the hope of the world, which must be maintained if we are to live in peace and be a prosperous and happy people.

THE FARM PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this morning Secretary of Agriculture Brannan appeared before a joint meeting of the Senate and House Agricultural Committees and set forth the Department of Agriculture's recommendations for a farm price-support program.

Mr. President, before I go further, I wish to say that I regard Secretary Brannan as a sincere, conscientious public servant. I do not in any way regard him as socialistic, and I would resent any implication that he falls within that category, any more than a good many persons who sometimes disagree with the great corporate interests of America should be classified as such. But this morning I find that I have to be critical of some of the recommendations which he made before the joint meeting of the Committees on Agriculture; and in doing so I am critical not only of a public servant who performs his duty as he thinks it should be performed, but of a personal friend, as well.

The recommendations of the Secretary merit the careful study of the Congress. With the objectives outlined in the recommended program there can be little dissent. We all want to prevent depression. We all want to maintain a farm production that will build markets and maintain employment. We all want stable high-level farm prices and reasonable prices to consumers. We all want to maintain our agricultural resources. We all want to maintain adequate reserves of goods which will protect the national security in event of crop failure; and we all want to safeguard our rural economic strength and stabilize the rural community.

No, it is not the objectives announced by the Secretary, with which we may dissent. It is the means which the Secretary proposes for attaining these objectives that should be carefully studied.

Most of the recommendations of the Secretary appear to be simply the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948 in a new dress. Stated briefly, the Secretary's proposals contain four radical departures from the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948.

One is the requirement that each farmer adopt minimum and sound soil-conservation practices in order to qualify for supports.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I would rather yield when I get through. I shall take only about 10 minutes in the presentation of my speech.

The second radical departure from the 1948 act is that supports are limited to the production of approximately \$20,000

worth of commodities on each farm, and will not apply to commodities produced in excess of that amount.

The third departure is that the new recommendations provide for what amounts to 100 percent of parity support for 10 major commodities. The fourth is that the income support standard formula veers somewhat from the parity concept as we have known it, but comes out with about the same commodity price figures as under the parity formula in the 1948 act. Therefore it may or may not prove to be a considerable departure from the standards which have already been approved by the Congress.

The direct effect of these four recommendations, if they are adopted, would be far-reaching Government control over the Nation's agriculture.

The recommendation for making payments to farmers as an alternative for purchasing or loaning on the crop is already contained in the 1948 act. This method of supporting prices, if used carefully, will permit consumers to benefit from bountiful crops and low prices without unduly penalizing the producer or the taxpayer.

The encouragement which the Secretary gives to an increased animal industry as a means of raising dietary levels and disposing of surplus grain meets with my full approval. This, too, simply accords with the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948.

The proposal to put supports on an income rather than a commodity pricing basis also is set forth in the 1948 act.

This means for determining what parity of income for farmers should be was not available at the time the 1948 law was written. There was incorporated in the 1948 law a definition of parity income.

Although this definition had no substantive value at the time, it was intended as a directive to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to seek a method by which parity of farm income might be determined.

The Secretary has now recommended such a formula to the Congress.

I have had time to give this proposed formula only cursory study. Certainly, we need to get away completely from the old type parity formula which gave definite advantages to the producers of certain commodities while keeping others at a disadvantage.

While I believe that the modernized parity formula provided in the 1948 act goes a long way in overcoming that difficulty, yet it is possible that the formula now proposed by the Secretary will not only provide a means for arriving at an equitable determination of parity income but also a fair determination of commodity prices as well.

I want to point out, however, that the income-support standard embodied in the formula proposed by the Secretary varies but little from the parity prices as figured under the modernized parity formula in the Agricultural Act of 1948. I shall give a few examples: The "income support standard," as the Secretary calls it, for corn, is \$1.46 a bushel; under the Agricultural Act of 1948, the parity price would be \$1.45 a bushel. The income-support standard for cotton would be 27.99 cents a pound; the parity price

under the 1948 act would be 27.3 cents a pound. And so on. There is almost no difference at all. Barley comes out the same, \$1.22 a bushel, no matter how it is figured. So it may be that this new proposal of the Secretary will be found to be an improvement, or it may be that it will not be found to be an improvement.

But the basic difference of opinion between those who believe in high rigid support prices coupled with Government controls, and those who believe in more moderate support prices and freedom of action for the farmer has not been cleared away by the Secretary's recommendations.

In spite of all the camouflage and avoidance of customary phrases and wording, the fact is that the recommendations of Secretary Brannan in the final analysis follow closely the high rigid support levels for the more important agricultural commodities and provide for far more rigid Federal controls over our farms than we have ever had up to this time.

The Secretary proposes 100 percent support for wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, milk, hogs, eggs, chickens, beef cattle, and lambs.

I agree with this regrouping of commodities in accordance with their importance, but I cannot agree with the recommendation that the Government guarantee what amounts to a fully satisfactory income to the producers of these commodities.

The proposal incorporated in the 1948 act that a support price guarantee should be such as to insure the farmer against disastrous price declines, while leaving him as free as possible to exercise his own initiative, would be done away with if the Secretary's recommendations are approved and put into effect.

Under the proposals of the Secretary, the farmer is required to comply with certain stringent conditions in order to receive the guaranteed income support.

These conditions would convey to the Federal Government much more complete control over the Nation's 6,000,000 farms than there has ever been before.

The Agricultural Act of 1948 permits the Secretary to require farmers to comply with acreage allotments and marketing methods and even marketing quotas as a last resort when voted by the farmers themselves.

The new proposals, made this morning, go much further than this and require the farmer to comply with the observance of—and I quote from the Secretary's statement—"minimum and sound soil-conservation practices." This means not only compliance with marketing regulations, but also requires him to use all his land in such a manner as may be approved by Federal officials.

This is a very high price to pay for a guaranteed income.

Furthermore, the requirement that the farmer must observe minimum and sound soil-conservation practices, as defined by Federal officials, might mean that while government undertakes to guarantee a farm income, it also assumes authority for directing how part of such income shall be spent.

The immediate effect of the approval of the Secretary's support-price program would be to put wheat, cotton, tobacco, corn, and small grains under complete and continuing controls; also the land which is taken out of production of such commodities.

After the program has been in effect a short time, controls would have to be extended to hogs, chickens, beef, lamb, pork, and dairy products. It would be a controlled economy with a vengeance.

We may have to come to it some day, but the fact remains that America today is far and away the greatest food-producing nation on earth and this enviable position has been reached through freedom to think and act on the part of the American farmer.

One weakness of the Secretary's recommendations is also found in the Agricultural Act of 1948.

Comprehensive means of supporting perishable and most of the nonbasic commodities are lacking in the new proposals.

The Secretary's recommendations, like the 1948 act, leave it optional to the Secretary, with such means as may be provided him by the Congress to support the price of these nonbasic commodities, from nothing at all up to 90 percent of parity or 100 percent of the income-support level—whichever you choose to call it.

Finally, we are confronted with the stark reality that the level at which support prices of agricultural commodities or farm income is fixed is a fundamental issue not only of economics, but of philosophy of government as well.

The level of support is a powerful force which can be used either to weaken or encourage farm initiative and individual resourcefulness.

A program to assure a high fixed standard of income could not stop on the farm.

If government undertakes to guarantee a satisfactory income to the producers of farm commodities, can we, with a clear conscience, deny the same guarantee of satisfactory income to other groups of our population? Where can we stop?

Admitting a definite and serious trend toward state controls throughout the world, it is, nevertheless, unmistakably clear that those nations which have resisted centralized government control are the most prosperous and happiest nations.

As I have stated, I agree with the major objectives for American agriculture as set forth by the Secretary, but I cannot agree that such objectives should be obtained at the price of a governmental guardianship over the 6,000,000 farm families of America.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAIN. Is it true that the Secretary's recommendations cannot become effective unless they are approved by legislation of the Congress?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true; they cannot.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of an address which I delivered at a

farm forum in Minneapolis on March 10, 1949, which develops considerably further my reason for being critical of certain points in the recommendations made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

Although I will discuss primarily the farm support price program today I do not want you to get the idea that I think a support-price program in itself constitutes a complete or well-rounded farm program for America.

Our aim should be to work out such a program that will minimize the need for price supports. Continuous research particularly in the field of distribution and marketing is needed. The development of marketing agreements and cooperative management, coordination of soil-conservation and soil-building programs, promotion of congenial surroundings for the farm home, a high level of diet among consumers, and fitting American agriculture into the world picture are all factors that enter into the programming of a healthy agricultural economy.

Rather than look upon price supports as a means of providing a Government market for farm commodities and the return of perfectly satisfactory prices to the producer I prefer to consider the support program as a means of providing consumers and industrial processors of an adequate supply of food and fiber, while insuring the farmer that he will not be courting disaster if he meets the needs of his country and a little bit more.

Our goal should be a fair price in the market place with a maximum degree of independence for the farmer in achieving this goal.

During the war and the years that have elapsed since the surrender of Japan in August 1945 our farmers have literally performed miracles of production. Under well-nigh perfect growing conditions farm prices and incomes have reached an all-time high. Industrial profits and the earnings of labor have also set new records. So has our national debt.

It was with the realization that wartime prices and incomes could not go on forever that in July 1947 both Houses of Congress authorized their Committees on Agriculture to make a study of the trends and needs of agriculture. The result of this study was the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1948.

Frankly the House and Senate committees did not see eye to eye and it was only in the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress that a compromise agreement was reached which permitted a permanent price-support program to be placed on the statutes.

The House part of the act provides for a 90 percent of parity support for the six basic and a few selected nonbasic commodities for the year 1949. The Senate bill is to go into effect on January 1, 1950, and is based on the major provisions of a new parity formula and a flexible range of price supports for all commodities. The Senate bill was supported by the three major farm organizations and the United States Department of Agriculture. Since the enactment of the law the Farmers Union has officially shifted its position in favor of higher levels of support.

Since at the present time a strong effort is being made to discredit the long-range provisions of the act, I welcome the opportunity to speak here and hope I may clear up some of the misunderstanding in regard to it.

There are some people who are opposed to any farm support program at all.

Those who believe in support prices are divided into two schools of thought. One group wants high, rigid supports. This group is making its principal appeal to the producers of cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and wheat. They express a willingness to accept

controls if necessary in order to get these high prices.

The other group endorses a flexible support-price program and is generally opposed to Government controls.

I am willing to assume whatever responsibility goes with identifying myself with the flexible-support school of thought. I am unalterably opposed to Government production controls, except in emergencies, for reasons which I will soon make clear.

I have no quarrel with those who advocate a 100-percent Government-guaranteed income for farmers, but personally I do not want to obtain such income at the price which their proposal would require us to pay. Allotments, quotas, controls, and penalties should be exercised only as a last resort and not be permitted to become the regular order.

If 100-percent-of-parity income guaranteed by the Government is the objective, then those who want this signed, sealed, and delivered guaranty should no longer beat around the bush, but should come right out in the open for a Government-controlled agricultural economy. In no other way can a 100-percent guaranty of price to farmers be made to work.

I, for one, do not want to see a controlled agricultural economy in which our responsibilities and our destiny as farmers are surrendered to the Federal Government. I want our people—and particularly our farmers—to have the fullest opportunity to exercise their initiative, manage their farms, and think and plan for themselves.

That is the reason I am opposed to a fixed, rigid guaranty of price for agricultural commodities in peacetime.

Above all else, I cannot believe it wise nor democratic to put the farmer in the position where his work is laid out for him and his efforts are directed by agents of the Federal Government, except on an emergency basis.

To presume that equality of income can be satisfactorily achieved by a federally controlled economy is to presume that all men holding positions in Government are capable, fair, and honest. Unfortunately, men in Government are subject to the same weaknesses as men out of Government.

The power to direct American agriculture also carries the power to dominate, and, in spite of the esteem in which I hold most of the officials of the Department of Agriculture today, I would rather trust the future to the combined judgment and cooperative effort of the 6,000,000 farm families of America than to a few men who might some day yield to the desire for more power or personal glory.

We are confronted with the stark reality that the level at which support prices of agricultural commodities is fixed is a fundamental issue today not only of economics but of philosophy of government. The level of price support is a powerful force which can be used either to weaken or encourage farm initiative and individual resourcefulness.

From this fulcrum of price support, the lever of control can operate to sway the destiny of our farm people.

It has been my belief, and it still is, that the support level for farm commodities should be just below a fair market price, thereby providing incentives for the development of new uses and markets, and for the conversion of crop production which will prevent the accumulation of burdensome surpluses or undesirable shortages. That is the reason I insisted upon giving to the Secretary of Agriculture a flexible range within which he can fix support levels.

One of the major provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948 is a new parity formula. This formula is intended to correct inequalities in the price relationship between agricultural commodities.

The original formula has become so badly outmoded that it is used for only about 40 out of 150 farm commodities today.

For instance, wheat growers know that there is a nice profit in producing wheat at 90 percent of parity, while dairymen know that 90 percent as computed under the old formula scarcely represents the break-even point in the production of dairy products.

By using a new formula which reflects conditions which have prevailed during the latest 10 years, each commodity is put more nearly in the proper relationship to all others.

The parity value of all agricultural commodities combined remains the same under the new formula as it was under the old formula which will go out of use on January 1, 1950. It is only the relationship between commodities that changes.

As a result of using this modernized formula which was endorsed by the major farm organizations and the United States Department of Agriculture, there will be a drop in the parity price of grain and an increase in the parity prices of dairy products, meat products, wool, poultry products, flax, soybeans, and others.

The end result of this change in the parity formula should be to encourage the marketing of a greater part of our grain crop in the form of animal products.

The effect of this will be to place the American consumer on a higher dietary level, to provide greater employment both on and off the farm, to encourage a greater production of soil-building commodities and to provide a far wider market for grain than would be the case if it were marketed in the form of cereal rather than animal products.

The time has come when the grain producer must look to expanding his market in the United States rather than to foreign countries as an outlet for his surplus production.

The framers of the Agricultural Act of 1948 believed that an increased animal industry in America would definitely improve not only our entire national and agricultural economy but would expand the grain market faster than any other means except, of course, the delivery of our surplus to foreign countries at our own expense.

I now wish to discuss the reports that the new law will reduce price support to 60 percent of parity.

The Agricultural Act of 1948 provides minimum levels at which the six basic crops—corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco must be supported. These minimums are based on the total supply of the commodity according to a formula incorporated in the act. Theoretically, supports might have a 60- to 90-percent range. Actually, this could not happen.

Although the act puts full emphasis on the avoidance of controls it does require that quotas must be voted upon whenever the total supply of a basic commodity reaches a certain percentage above a normal supply. In the case of wheat this is 120 percent. Whenever quotas are in effect a 20-percent premium is added to the support price.

If the producers of wheat vote for quotas when the supply reaches 120 percent of normal, the minimum support level would be 78 percent. The Secretary must then fix the actual support level somewhere between 78 and 90 percent unless the national security needs make a higher level necessary to get production.

In no case could the minimum support price of a basic commodity drop below 72 percent when quotas are in effect.

This is quite different from the 60-percent figure which has been so freely reported as the support level which would prevail. To assume even a 72-percent support is to assume that the Secretary would give the farmer the worst possible deal under the act.

The Secretary at all times has full authority to maintain a support level of 90 percent if in his opinion circumstances warrant it.

I have a great deal of confidence in our present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan. I feel that he will use the discretionary powers of this act wisely, nor can I conceive any future Secretary using this act to give farmers the lowest permissible income.

The law does not fix a minimum support level for the 150 nonbasic commodities, but it was made clear on the floor of the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture is expected to support the price of those nonbasic commodities which correspond closely to the so-called Steagall commodities such as dairy products, poultry, hogs, beef, and soybeans, at approximately the same level as the basic commodities are supported. For other more perishable crops the Secretary is authorized to support the price from nothing up to 90 percent.

After all, why should we put all emphasis on supporting the prices of a few basic crops when several nonbasic commodities are even more important in terms of farm and national income?

An amendment adopted on the floor of the Senate provides that potatoes shall be supported at from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

Another amendment provides that wool shall be supported at a level that will induce the production of 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool annually. This will doubtless mean 50 percent support for a few years at least.

Let us look now at the theory that high price supports and controls mean high incomes. This theory is untenable. High support levels involving reduced acreage do not necessarily increase or even maintain farm income. In fact, the result of quotas and controls will more likely be reduced incomes.

As acreage is reduced, the cost of producing a bushel of wheat or corn or other grains increases in proportion to the acreage taken out of production.

In this age of mechanized farming, with its high investment in tractors, harvesters, combines, storage bins, and other equipment and facilities, a large part of the cost of production is represented by fixed costs such as interest, taxes, repairs, depreciation, etc. These costs remain about the same regardless of the acreage planted.

The United States Department of Agriculture has worked out some very significant cost and income figures showing that on a farm of 605 acres, of which 276 is normally planted to wheat, that when acreage is cut 25 percent, the operating costs of the farm are reduced only 10 percent.

These Department figures show that a normal planting of wheat, selling for \$1.55 per bushel, will return a greater farm income than if the acreage planted is reduced 25 percent and the crop sold at \$2 per bushel.

This year's experience with high, rigid price supports is going to be costly.

There are heavy overplantings this year of certain commodities purely because of the 90 percent of parity guarantee for such commodities.

I make the prediction that should 1949 prove to be a good crop year, the total borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is fixed by Congress at \$4,750,000,000, will be pretty well exhausted by January 1, 1950. This situation will not make the farm-support programs more popular with either consumers, taxpayers, or the Congress.

Less than 20 percent of the people in the United States live on farms today.

Over 80 percent are employed in other occupations.

There is already increasing unemployment. Too high guarantees to farmers will result in increasing dissatisfaction in the cities.

The public will stand for a fairly high level of farm supports, but it will not tolerate cost-plus guarantees for farmers when other

people are down and out. It is not the small percentage of industrialists that always seem to make good profits that we have to think about, it is the great bulk of our population that will rebel.

Should the advocates of 100-percent support for farm commodities prevail with their views, I predict that the entire farm-support price program will collapse within a few years. I do not anticipate that their views will prevail, however.

I anticipate that the major provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948 will remain largely undisturbed in spite of political and group pressures which would overthrow them. I further predict that the Secretary of Agriculture will use the power vested in him by this bill to prevent agriculture from leading the way to another depression.

The support levels provided for in this act guarantee the producers against precipitous declines in prices.

Fearing major calamities, such as drought, the act will serve to keep the farmer from losing his shirt or undergoing losses such as prevailed during the depression of the thirties. This, of course, is quite different from guaranteeing him what he considers to be a perfectly satisfactory price and income.

I have heard many comments to the effect that we ought to have a law which provides for forward-pricing of farm commodities so that farmers can plan ahead.

The fact is, the Agricultural Act of 1948 does permit forward-pricing and the Department of Agriculture has so interpreted it.

The Secretary of Agriculture may announce in advance of planting the minimum level at which commodities will be supported. He has only recently used this provision of the long-range Farm Act to guarantee a 90-percent support price for hogs until April 1, 1950.

In return for support of nonbasic commodities, the Secretary of Agriculture may require compliance with production and marketing goals or even conformity to marketing agreements.

It would seem unreasonable to expect the Secretary to deal with thousands of widely scattered, unorganized producers of a perishable or semipermanent commodity.

When the bill was under consideration the question arose as to how the Secretary could bring about compliance with production goals.

This prompted the committee which sponsored the bill to write into it a provision that the Secretary could support prices through loans, purchases, or payments.

The provision for supporting prices through payments is new. It means that if producers fail to comply with the Secretary's request for reduced production or reduced marketing, he may direct all or part of the commodity concerned to be put upon the open market and reimburse those who do cooperate for the difference between the price received in the market and the support price.

Those who fail to cooperate would receive only the open-market price for what they produce. Cooperation in a support program is not compulsory. It will be up to each producer to decide whether to cooperate or not, but if he does not, he cannot be assured of the support price.

Had this provision of the law been in effect this year, the Secretary could have directed all or part of the huge potato crop to be put upon the market so that the consumer could have received the benefit of lower prices and better potatoes.

As it is, potatoes have been priced off the table in so many instances that we are actually consuming a smaller quantity than we did in prewar days, in spite of the large increase in population.

Government has in many instances bought No. 1 potatoes for use as cattle feed, while the low grades have been put upon the open market for human consumption. The costly debacle of the potato program brought on

purely by a 90-percent price guaranty would be multiplied many times over by a flat guaranty of 90 percent or more for all important farm crops.

In determining the amount of assistance which government should give to any class or group, let us remember this—government is not an institution possessing unlimited resources to be expended for our benefit.

When we get from government we must first put into government or else go in debt for it, as we have already done to some extent.

Government is an agency set up by the wise founders of our Nation which we as individuals or groups can use for the mutual welfare and protection of us all.

Government is no better than the men who hold positions in it. Therefore, let us think long and wisely before turning our personal destinies over to them.

There are good men and poor men in government.

There are men who make rash promises to get into government and thus put themselves in a position to exercise power.

There are men who today are advocating a largess for farmers far beyond our power to permanently sustain and, while they promise farmers high prices and high incomes, some of them also weep for the plight of the consumer whom they say pays too much for food and other living costs.

We must not be deceived by these protestations of concern—protestations of high prices for farmers and low costs for consumers.

Farmers cannot get high prices for what they produce unless city people pay well for what they buy. Unless farmers receive good prices for what they sell, city people will find themselves without a market for the industrial goods which they produce.

Very few of us in this world get something for nothing. Let us not be deluded now by the promises of those who offer high inducements to farmers to part with the most precious of all assets, their independence.

I reiterate—a rigid 90 to 100 percent price-support program must be accompanied by strict controls.

Once we start to apply controls and penalties in the Grain Belt, for example, there will be no end.

The acreage taken out of production will also have to be controlled or it will be used to produce other crops which in turn will create excess production of other commodities.

We may expect that such a process would go on and on until a fully controlled agriculture results.

The question is whether, for the sake of illusory increased incomes for a short time, American farmers are willing to surrender those rights for which their forefathers endured hardships—that we might know the meaning of freedom.

I do not mean to imply that government should remain aloof or indifferent to the needs of the people.

We need an efficient, democratically run government in this day of big business and a world made small by modern methods of communication and travel.

We need a government that lays down the rules of the game and enforces fair play; we need a government that protects the welfare of the needy and afflicted; we need a government that sees to it that our natural resources are developed and used wisely in the interest of the people, and a government that safeguards and maintains the Nation's security.

The thirty-odd-million persons who live on the farms of America constitute the very backbone of our democracy and of our free-enterprise system.

They are rooted in the traditions of self-reliance, honest work, and democratic processes. They are inheritors of the pioneer, progressive spirit of our forefathers.

The challenge now is to keep alive that spirit, and not let it be broken or weakened by false prophets or short-sighted promises, born of expediency and nurtured by illusionary gains. Our Nation was not built on paternalism; and it cannot endure on paternalism.

An agriculture under governmental guardianship cannot be a strong agriculture. A nation whose people are not free cannot be a happy nation.

I want to see agriculture and the Nation prosper on a sound and secure basis.

I want to see farm people and city people remain free—free from economic and political domination.

I want to see our country go forward in such a way that Americans can be masters of their own destiny.

We have shown to the world what a freedom-loving nation can accomplish.

We must demonstrate to ourselves and to the world that the torch of freedom is still alive and that we can keep our economic system of free enterprise in balance without jeopardizing our liberty.

To do this is the responsibility of all of us—farm and city people alike.

I have confidence that we will meet that responsibility through farsighted, united action.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in order that the remarks which I have just made may be more clearly understood by those who read them, I ask unanimous consent that the recommendations of the Secretary of Agriculture be printed in the RECORD in full at the close of my remarks.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I intended to make the same request.

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

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE CHARLES F. BRANNAN AT A JOINT HEARING OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1949

This hearing deals with the heart of our farm policy.

The proposition with which I begin is that we are mutually devoted to the task of making our farm program the soundest, strongest and best that we can design.

We have already been dealing this year with a number of important items of legislation relating to agriculture: The Commodity Credit Corporation charter, some acreage allotment and marketing quota legislation, and the international wheat agreement, among others. And now we come to one which touches directly or indirectly upon all the rest.

It concerns our effort to assist farmers to maintain a reasonably stable income at a fair level—a level which is equitable to farmers and in the best interest of the other economic groups within our population.

The principal device authorized by the Congress for this purpose is commonly referred to as agricultural price support. It is, in my opinion, the most effective method yet suggested and must remain an integral part of our national economy until and unless a better method is suggested.

Some differences of opinion have developed about the exact formula and manner under which agricultural price supports should be made available. This is healthy and can only result in improvement if we all apply ourselves forthrightly to a solution of the issues.

One issue has been popularized as a simple clash over rigid support of prices at 90

percent of parity versus flexible supports ranging from 60 to 90 percent. That is an oversimplification.

The issue was not simple in the first place, and recent events have not made it simpler. In the last several months we have seen some of the effects of the bumper crops of 1948, and witnessed the planting of another gigantic winter wheat acreage. We have put into effect a new and lower support level for potatoes, yet find the Government still buying considerable quantities of surplus potatoes. We have come closer to the point where we seriously need some shifts in farm production if we are to avoid surpluses. We can now see some important economic trends that were not evident last summer.

Specifically, prices received by farmers have been coming down much faster than the prices they pay. In March of this year farm prices were 15 percent lower than they were at the beginning of last year, while prices paid by farmers were down only 2 percent from the peak reached last summer. In this period some industrial prices continued to rise. Farm purchasing power turned downward in 1948 and is now at the lowest level since 1942.

In short, some additional problems have come out of the realm of theory into the here and now. Hence the preparation of my first recommendations to the Congress on the important matter of price supports has required me to make a rather complete review of objectives, legislation, and alternative programs. In addition to considering simple revisions in present legislation we have taken a new look at various ways of measuring parity and just about all of the program suggestions that have been seriously considered in the past—two-price and multiple-price systems, forward pricing, automatic pricing formulas, compensatory payments, cost-reduction programs, and combinations of these alternatives.

The result of all this study is not likely to startle anyone. I have no revolutionary ideas to present to you. But I do have some definite recommendations for your consideration.

These recommendations are not advanced as the final and exclusive answers to our farm problems. I would much rather have a program that will work well in the immediate future than one which will partly do the job for 20 years. And frankly, I doubt our ability to provide so well for the future that future Congresses and administrations will have no changes to offer. We need to be clear about policy objectives, which apply to the long-time future as well as the present. At the very least our program must cope with problems now in sight. We proceed from where we are, not from a theoretical time and place. And the present economic situation is somewhat less favorable to farmers than at any time in recent years.

In view of the problems we face I am thankful that we have had a great deal of excellent legislation and much good experience on which to base an effective farm program. We can learn much of great value from the farm legislation and experience of the past two decades.

The programs we have had are the firm foundation on which we can build. We have learned in depression, in a defense period, in war, and in the initial phase of a new postwar period. Throughout this experience we have seen that the measures dealing with the selling prices of farm products and the incomes of producers are the keys to a successful program.

WHAT IS REQUIRED OF A PROGRAM

From our experience we can set up realistic criteria by which to judge and by which to guide our program. Prominent among the

criteria and requirements will be the following:

First, the program must effectively serve the farmer and his family. As an isolated individual the farmer has no control over the prices he will receive and no adequate way of adjusting the total market volume of his commodities to changing demand. After he has planted a crop he is at the mercy of weather, price, and many other forces with which he is powerless to cope. On many occasions in the past he has labored all season and produced a good crop only to find that, because of circumstances beyond his control, his labor would go uncompensated and sometimes his cash investment in seed, fertilizer, and other operating costs would be only partially recovered. A program to help him meet those basic difficulties is the very minimum for which we should strive.

Second, in serving the farmer the program must not discriminate unfairly against any group. It should be fair to consumers and to processors, shippers, wholesalers, retailers, and others in the distribution system. There is no real conflict between farmers and either consumers or business people. The customers of agriculture want plentiful and steady supplies, and they have a right to expect that a program supported by the public will help meet this need. Farmers want to furnish plentiful supplies regularly.

Third, the program must be efficiently operated and the cost must be commensurate with the benefits to the Nation.

Fourth, it must serve general policy objectives, including national security, the maintenance of high-level employment, and cooperation with other nations in the interests of peace and prosperity. It can do this by conserving and strengthening our basic productive resources, providing reserves against national emergencies, and encouraging free-flowing world trade by reasonably assuring sufficient products for export.

In short, the farm program must serve the best interests of all our people, and, in my opinion, that is the only kind of program the farm people want or expect.

Unfortunately, too many people still think of a farm program as some kind of class legislation. There is too little appreciation of the direct and definite ways in which it can benefit all the people and can help make this the kind of a country they want it to be.

Therefore, I want to list several ways in which we can expect an effective farm-production and price-stabilization program to serve the interests of all the people.

1. It can help prevent depression: Most depressions have been farm-led and farm-fed. Farm prices traditionally go down before, faster, and farther than other prices. On the downswing of the business cycle, farm people are the major early victims of a squeeze. As their income and, therefore, purchasing power is cut by low prices or production failure, industrial producers find a contracting market for their production. This throws workers out of jobs. They in turn spend less for farm products, which in turn further forces down farm prices, and farm purchasing power is further cut.

I don't mean to say that declines in farm prices are the sole cause of depressions, but they certainly contribute greatly and would do so more now than in the past because agriculture has become a bigger customer of industry.

Farm price supports cannot substitute for good markets that come with full employment and foreign demand, and, I believe, almost every farmer now understands the importance and relationship to farm prosperity of good wages for city and industrial workers. Supports are no substitute for city markets, but they can at least slow down declines in farm prices and provide stopping points so as to keep our fluid farm

prices from going rapidly into a worse and worse relationship with nonfarm prices.

2. A farm-production and price-adjustment program can help build markets for industrial goods and help maintain employment for labor: Industry today is dependent on the farm market to a far greater degree than it has ever been.

Let me illustrate this fact by listing some of the manufactured equipment that is in use on one particular farm today and which has been purchased since the last depression. This happens to be a Michigan farm—not fancy—just a good family farm. Here's the list: A combine, a corn picker, a portable elevator, one additional tractor with equipment to go with it (including a disk, drill, and corn planter), a feed grinder, a pick-up truck, motor and pump assembly for pumping stock water, an electric pump and pressure tank for running water in the house, electric refrigerator, electric stove, and electric hot-water heater. Think of almost any good farm, and you can make a similar list.

Back in 1929 there were only 827,000 tractors on American farms. At this time last year there were 3,250,000. In 1929 we had about 37,000 combines. Last year we had 540,000. The number of corn pickers has jumped from less than 9,000 to more than 800,000. These are only a few examples.

In 1929 less than 600,000 farms were electrified. Today the figure is more than 4,000,000.

Altogether the American farmer has lately been a \$30,000,000,000 customer of American business.

Even so, rural people represent a vast, untapped market for all sorts of goods. For example, half of the commercial family farms in this country are small, and in this group only 22 out of 100 homes have running water. For most of the other family farms, the comparable rate is 38 per 100, and in the top group, 58 per 100 have running water.

Farm people want to buy industrial goods, but when their prices go down in relation to the prices they have to pay, they have to cut their buying. Again let me illustrate.

A farmer on route 2, Defiance, Ohio, ordered a tractor last year priced at \$1,550. When it arrived at his dealer's, the price was \$1,950. His soybeans went down from \$3.47 in September to \$2.18 in March, and his corn went down in the same months from \$2 to \$1.23. He canceled his tractor order.

A farmer who lives on route 1, Crane Hill, Ala., ordered a tractor in 1945 at a price of \$1,500. It arrived last summer, priced at \$2,450. He felt uncertain at that time about the future of cotton prices and so, for the combination of reasons, turned down the tractor.

A farmer on route 1, Gettysburg, Pa., fed 40 steers for 157 days and lost \$3,000. He gave up buying a hay baler worth \$2,150 and building a machine shed on which he had planned to spend \$1,000.

It is important to all of us to maintain balance between farm and industrial prices. A program that helps to stabilize farm prices and incomes will help to stabilize markets for factory goods and will keep thousands and thousands of main streets busy.

3. Stable farm prices and incomes encourage high-level production with the greatest assurance of reasonable prices to consumers. This is one of the most significant lessons from our wartime experience. Without the cost-plus contracts and guarantees enjoyed by many industries, and with only reasonable price protection, farmers quickly made great shifts in the use of their productive resources to meet war needs. They supplied civilians with a fourth to a third more milk and a fifth more meat than prewar while they were meeting the needs of the armed forces and also sending large amounts of food to our allies. Farmers, like manufacturers, want to produce what their customers want. But usually it is only with advance knowledge

of minimum price that small individual producers, planning separately, can unify their efforts efficiently to increase the total supply of a particular commodity.

Furthermore, we know that American business depends on agriculture for raw materials, and business is starved if farm production goes down. About half of all the business done with United States consumers last year was based in one way or another on American farm commodities.

Price supports should be available at all times to assure the maintenance of this supply. If prices are allowed to remain too low too long farmers are unable to buy the machinery, fertilizer, and other materials which they must have to maintain high-level production.

4. A program that helps maintain farm incomes helps to maintain agricultural resources: City people, just as much as farm people, are concerned with the problem of conservation. Our soil, water, and forest resources must support a population that is still growing, and our objective is a higher standard of living for the people as a whole. Yet we are still losing productivity on hundreds of thousands of acres every year. Half of all our cropland is still subject to erosion. Obviously, conservation depends on something more than good farm prices. On the other hand, resources can be conserved and improved only if they are used profitably.

The depression taught us that hard times make poor farmers and poor land. Low prices force farmers to abandon their land-conservation practices in an attempt to make up for lower price by increasing acreage to get a greater volume. For the short pull, they will be able to pile up bigger production with less outlay. But only a few seasons need pass before even production will be decreased. The low wheat prices of the depression brought increased plantings, at great cost in resources. The dust storms in the Great Plains, as well as gullies and floods elsewhere, gave dramatic evidence that surpluses and low prices can lead a nation to ruin.

Price supports can aid conservation in at least two ways: (a) By bringing additional stability into the farm business so that farm people can enjoy a good standard of living without mining their resources and (b) by directly encouraging types of farming which naturally conserve resources.

It is generally believed that for the sake of keeping our resources permanently productive as well as to meet consumer needs, livestock production should be made a more important part of our agriculture. I agree with this. I also think the shift is not likely to take place as promptly and fully as necessary without the assistance of a well-adapted production and price-adjustment program.

5. An effective farm program is essential to our national security, will provide a reservoir of goods which protects the Nation against crop failure, and will assure supplies for an even flow of world trade: Reserve supplies above ground and their counterpart—reserve strength in the soil—are essentials of national defense. A large livestock population is also reserve strength. Before the last war, when we had to convert our Nation quickly into an arsenal of democracy, we were extremely fortunate in having large reserves of grain and cotton. Without having to wait for another harvest, we were able to start converting grain into the high-protein foods that were sorely needed by our friends abroad. Plenty of cotton was available for war uses. Several years of intensive soil-conservation effort had improved many acres of land which had suffered abuse.

Agriculture justly takes pride in the speed with which it converted to defense and war production. But agriculture is glad to share the credit with the people as a whole, for the storage and soil-conservation programs

were made possible by the general public—by a sharing of responsibility by farmers and the whole people. In terms of dollars alone, our prewar stocks proved to be a great investment.

Reserves also provide security against dangers other than those of war. Although we have never had a drought or other disaster that threatened us with famine or anything close to it, we have had shortages which severely disrupted our economy and caused a great deal of personal hardship. The results of the droughts of 1934 and 1936 are examples. Forced liquidation of livestock temporarily increased meat production and reduced prices, but in 1935 beef and veal production dropped 20 percent and pork production dropped 30 percent. There were further reductions in 1937. It was not until 1942 that cattle numbers came back to the 1934 level.

A more recent example was the short corn crop of 1947. Farmers had already been selling meat animals faster than they were replacing them. The short crop speeded up the trend, resulting in shorter supplies and higher prices of meat. We are still feeling the effects. Reserves will help us maintain livestock production from year to year and help prevent extreme fluctuations in price.

Adequate reserves are essential for still other reasons. We believe that free-flowing world trade is necessary to world peace. To the extent that we can, we want to discourage the tendency of some of our sister nations and traditional customers to return to nationalistic self-sufficiency with its artificial trade barriers and economic welfare. One means of doing so is to assure importing nations that they will have access to supplies they need year after year. That assurance on one commodity can be given through the pending international wheat agreement, and at the same time we and other exporters assure ourselves of regular markets. Wheat reserves will enable us to guarantee our commitments under the wheat agreement. Steady supplies of other export commodities can also be assured to importing nations by means of reserves.

It should also be remembered that a democracy with reserves and great productive power is a great comfort to nations fearing either famine or foreign aggression. Our practical ability to serve as a friend in need will determine how well we can meet our responsibilities of leadership—how well we can serve the cause of world peace and democracy.

Reserves of storable commodities are a natural adjunct of price supports. They are an aim as well as a result of the farm program. They represent an important part of the insurance which the public buys with the funds it invests in maintaining a healthy agriculture.

6. A price-support program which safeguards our rural economic strength can help stabilize the rural community and help maintain individual opportunity in our free-enterprise system: One bulwark of democracy may be found in the prosperous rural community mainly composed of economically strong families farming in the traditional American pattern. It is an ever present answer to communism.

We should be aware that for many years there has been a steady increase in the number of large-scale, industrialized type of farming unit. Many of these are absentee and corporate-owned. According to the 1945 census about 100,000 of the largest units—fewer than 2 percent of all farms—are selling products valued at nearly one-fourth of all the farm products marketed in this country. This is more than is sold in total by two-thirds of all our farms, including half of our family farms.

If we are to have stable and prosperous rural communities with schools, churches, health, and other facilities, it is plain that

many farm people need greater economic security and opportunity.

Price supports are the farmer's equivalent of the laboring man's minimum-wage, social-security, and collective-bargaining arrangements.

Of course, the price support does not meet the fundamental problem of the operator who cannot produce a large enough volume to make a good return at any price. But it does help on the price side of the farm-income equation. There are a great many farmers on the economic border line—they can make a fairly good living when prices are in reasonable balance, but a small drop cuts sharply into the income they have available for living expense and leaves only operating expenses or less. These people are a very considerable percentage of all the independent producers in our entire free-enterprise system. While price supports alone will not solve their problem, I see no reason to think it can be solved without some kind of a sound and effective program for maintaining stable and reasonable prices for the goods they produce.

MEASURING RESULTS

I have listed six ways in which a good farm income and price-support program can serve the interests of all the people. It can help do these things: Prevent depression, build bigger industrial markets and employment, maintain high-level production of farm commodities, conserve natural resources, maintain reserves for national security, and strengthen the rural community.

A program that will meet the test I have outlined will cost money, and the returns will have to justify the cost. We may not be able to set up a balance sheet in terms of dollars and balance it every year. But then, that is not the way we have measured the public cost and the returns from the tariffs with which we have protected various industries, the value of less-than-cost postal rates, the public investment and returns from the railroads, merchant marine and air lines, and the public cost and returns from the minimum-wage law and social security.

We do know that agriculture is a basic segment of the economy. It must be highly productive, and permanently so. It must contribute to the prosperity of the Nation, and in turn those engaged in agriculture must be able to share equitably in that prosperity.

I believe we can have that kind of an agriculture if we really want it. We won't get it easily or automatically. We won't get it all of a sudden. But we have already made great progress toward it, and if we will work together we can make more progress.

In my opinion, production and price adjustment with a definite income objective must be the core of our united effort, and although I will mention other measures I am concentrating at this time on the core.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Condensed into the fewest possible words, here are the proposals, each of which will be explained afterwards in detail.

Objective: The recommended program is intended to assure a volume of farm income and purchasing power which it is in the public interest to maintain for the reasons which have just been discussed.

The standard of support has been established with reference to income criteria rather than price criteria. A recent 10-year period has been selected as the base. Simplicity of computation and application has been a constant aim.

The recommended price support standard for any specific commodity does not represent a parity price nor does the composite average represent parity income as those terms are now statutorily defined or commonly understood. This income standard simply represents a realistic minimum below which it is not in the interest of farmers or consumers to allow farm prices to fall and

above which I would hope to find most farm prices most of the time. It is the minimum level from which we would be working toward narrowing, and eventually closing, the historical gap between farm and nonfarm income.

Formulas: As the start for our moving base, we have taken the average annual purchasing power of cash receipts from farm marketings for the years 1939 through 1948. From that, with the aid of the old parity index, we have moved first to an income support standard and then to a specific price support standard for the individual commodities.

Application of support: Loans, purchase agreements, production payments, and direct purchases should be available for use. These several methods would be used singly or in combination as experience and prevailing circumstances warrant.

Commodity loans and purchase agreements are probably the most effective and efficient methods for the commodities which do not appreciably deteriorate in storage and for those which should be held in reserve in appreciable quantities for production stability or against national emergencies.

Production payments, on the other hand, seem more adaptable as a method for supporting highly perishable commodities and those for which storage is too costly.

In the case of both perishables and storables, it may sometimes be desirable to remove surpluses or to obtain supplies for storage or collateral programs by purchasing directly from producers or intermediate processors.

Conditions of support: The availability of price support cannot be separated from the acceptance by farmers of reasonable undertakings to advance or accomplish the overall objectives of a sound farm program in the interests of the public and of their fellow farmers, such as—

(a) The observance of minimum and sound soil-conservation practices.

(b) Compliance with or adoption of whatever programs are found necessary to curtail wasteful production or disorderly marketing (such measures as acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and marketing agreements which may be adopted from time to time through referendums or by the authority of the Secretary under terms of specific legislation such as is now on the statute books).

(c) The limitation of eligibility for price support to a defined volume of production on each farm—a volume high enough to benefit most farms but one which will not encourage the development of extremely large, industrialized farming.

Those are my recommendations in brief. I have left out many significant details and comparisons which we can go back to, now that you have the over-all picture.

The income and price-support standards: If there is anything new in what is here proposed, it is the recommendation that we actually start our computations with an income criterion as the base on which price supports are determined. We have had income criteria in our laws—so-called parity income definitions—but, so far, we have not used them. Since income is what finally counts, I think it is time to start relating support prices to an income standard.

The factor which has discouraged real use of the parity income definition in the past has been the gap between farm and nonfarm income. This is so wide that a program based on real dollar equality looks unrealistic as an immediate objective. Under the old definition, for example, farmers last year received 160 percent of the theoretical parity income. But, actually, the average net income of farm people from all sources was only \$909 per capita, including the value of home-produced food and income from nonfarm sources, compared with the nonfarm

average of \$1,569. This puts the average farmer's income at less than 60 percent of his urban brother's income. Such a definition of parity seems to me indefensible.

The new definition in the Agricultural Act of 1948 defines parity income as that income which will provide farm people with standards of living afforded persons in other gainful occupation. This is undoubtedly valid as a concept and as a long-range objective which we accept as such.

In developing an income-support standard which can be translated into a price schedule, I start from the firm conviction that the particular formula or formulas should be based on recent experience and not related or chained back to some distant base period. Any such formula should reflect as far as possible the advancements in agricultural knowledge, facilities, and skills.

It is recommended that the income support standard for any year be defined as that level of cash returns from farm products which is equivalent in purchasing power to the average annual purchasing power of cash receipts from farm marketings during the 10 calendar years, 1939 through 1948.

As formulas go, this is quite simple. As the starting base, it takes the average annual purchasing power of cash receipts for the years 1939 through 1948, which figures we already have. This purchasing power is determined by dividing cash receipts for each year by the same year's index of prices paid by farmers for goods and services, including allowances for interest and taxes—that is, the "parity index" as we now know it. In terms of average 1939-48 farm-purchasing-power dollars, this base is \$18,218,000,000.

To calculate the income support standard, this base is multiplied by the current parity index. For example, parity as of March 15 was equal to an index of 144 (base 1939-48=100). Such an index would indicate an income support standard of \$26,234,000,000 (18,218,000,000 times 1.44).

Before going on to a discussion of the corresponding price-support standard, let me say a word about this income measure. It is not a parity income figure, but rather what I believe to be a minimum level which we should do our best to hold with the expectation that actual income would usually run higher. It is a level of income which I believe we can all agree should be maintained not only in the interest of farm people, but equally in the interest of all our people. It is calculated from a recent and fair base. True, 1939-48 does include some high-income years, but it also includes some low-income years starting with the very low year 1939. Furthermore, farm purchasing power has been above this suggested support level for six successive years.

Some people may object on the grounds that this formula relates to cash receipts rather than to net farm income. However, this has two advantages. The first is simplicity. As you will soon see, it is a very simple step from cash farm receipts to the support-price standard. Secondly, both the farmer and the American businessman are interested in the farmer's total purchasing power. Farm marketings must return enough to cover not only the farm family items but production expenses as well.

I am aware that this standard does not close the gap between average per-capita farm and nonfarm incomes. However, as I indicated earlier, one of our problems is to get something which will work here and now.

We contemplate that the base used for determining the income standard should move forward. I am proposing that this 1939-48 income base be used for 1950 and that thereafter the base should be the first 10 out of the last 12 years. In other words, there should be a 2-year lag between the base period and the year of actual operation so as to allow administrative preparation well in advance of operations and so that the

Congress may become aware of the effects of the moving standard before new calculations are put to use.

After determining the aggregate income standard for a year, the next step is the determination of a corresponding schedule of commodity prices. In doing this, average farm prices for the 10 immediately preceding years (or marketing seasons) would be multiplied by the ratio of (a) the current income support standard to (b) the actual average level of cash receipts from farm marketings during the 10 immediately preceding years. This formula will keep price relationships among commodities on a moving, up-to-date basis.

For example, the average cash receipts for the 10 years 1940-49 (using an estimate for 1949 in this illustration) is \$20,980,000,000, while the estimated minimum income standard for 1950 is \$26,234,000,000, assuming the parity index remains at its current level.

Since the support standard is 1.25 times the average cash receipts, the support price schedule would be determined by simply multiplying the 1940-49 average farm price for each of the several commodities by 1.25.

Now let us see how these formulas compare with the familiar parity price formula. So far as income and prices are concerned, the standards are about equal to what current marketings would bring if farm prices were to average the present parity level for 1949, but with the prices for the three great staples—corn, cotton, and wheat—averaging only about 90 percent of the old parity level. At the same time it follows that prices for a number of the other commodities, especially livestock and livestock products, would average above the current parity level. The method of calculating the income and price standards, as well as a number of price comparisons, are shown in detail in the accompanying tables (exhibits A, B, and C.)

Application to specific commodities: Our ultimate ability to assure these minimum income and price-support standards is of course dependent upon the availability of funds and specific authorization.

I recommend that the Congress designate those commodities which should have first priority on the funds available for price-support purposes. This list should include the agricultural commodities of prime importance, both from the standpoint of their contribution to farm income and their importance to the American consumer family.

This list should include, at least, the following commodities: Corn, cotton, wheat, tobacco, whole milk, eggs, farm chickens, and the meat animals—hogs, beef cattle, and lambs.

I recommend that the prices or returns of these first priority, group 1, commodities be maintained at not less than the full support price standard. It should be clearly understood that the support price standard is not a ceiling.

Those commodities not included in the group 1 or priority list should be supported in line with or in relation to group 1 commodities, taking into account the available funds and authorities, the ability of producers to keep supplies in line with demand and other relevant factors. There will also need to be discretionary authority available for adjusting supports for these commodities in order to maintain desirable commodity relationships, especially in order to maintain normal feeding ratios or feed value relationships.

It may also on occasion, be necessary to recommend to the Congress certain adjustments in support prices for one or more of the group 1 commodities in order to maintain feed ratios or feed-value relationships.

The authority should be available to support any commodity at whatever level is required to increase supplies or meet national emergencies.

Price support methods: Commodity loans and purchase agreements are methods well adapted to the support of storable commodities which can be carried over without processing for a number of marketing years if necessary. Storables account for roughly 25 percent of our annual cash receipts from farm marketings and include cotton, corn, wheat, and other grains, tobacco, the oilseed crops, dry beans and peas, wool, and peanuts. These are not all equally storable, but experience has shown that loans and purchase agreements are effective for all the commodities on this list. Nevertheless, it would be desirable to have available, as a supplementary method, the authority to make production payments under certain circumstances.

The nonstorables—products which are either highly perishable or which can be stored only at heavy expense—include fruits, vegetables, meat animals, milk, butterfat, poultry and eggs, and account for roughly 75 percent of cash farm receipts. Production of these commodities is geared largely to domestic demand, and this demand fluctuates with employment, wages and other factors which change mass purchasing power. We can hope to increase per capita consumption of all or most of these products in a healthy economic climate.

When it is necessary to apply supports to any of these nonstorable commodities, I recommend that we rely mainly upon production payments.

The term "production payment" means exactly what it says—a payment to the farmer to go on producing to meet genuine consumer need, rather than restricting output short of that need.

Under this system the farmer would be paid in cash the difference between the support standard for commodities which he produced and the average selling price for those commodities in the market place. Because the payment would go directly to the farmer it would be an efficient support operation.

Another big advantage is that the system would induce efficient production and marketing, because any farmer who could exceed the average market price by quality of product or good bargaining would benefit to the extent that his selling price exceeded the average market price.

A third advantage of this system is that it would allow farm income to remain at a high enough level to sustain abundant production while retail prices sought their supply-and-demand level in the market place. This level is bound to be reasonable for consumers because of the larger supplies brought out.

It is obvious, of course, that the use of production payments must be qualified in such a manner as to avoid extremely depressed prices in the market place or a wasteful use of soil resources.

The payment method is not new. It has been used for various purposes before and during the war and we know it is administratively feasible. We know it is a method which not only protects farmers but gives consumers a real break.

I want to make it clear that I believe production payments should be used to encourage increased consumption as well as to support farm returns. Let me illustrate. In some of our larger cities, milk consumption per capita was much higher in 1947 than in 1940. The increases ranged from 15 percent to nearly 50 percent. Since 1947, in some of these same cities, the average person has been using less and less milk. Consumers have not simply decided they want or need less milk. The decision to buy less was forced upon them for the most part by the rising cost of the commodity. The result is bad for both consumer and producer.

Through production payments, we can keep the market price within reach of more people and maintain returns to the dairy farmers at

a level which will bring forth the necessary production. As we indicated in our long-range testimony in 1947, we should be producing and consuming 150,000,000,000 pounds of milk by now instead of something less than 120,000,000,000. If it is necessary to get milk down to the area of 15 cents a quart at retail in order to have maximum consumption, and use production payments to assure farmers of fair returns, I think both farmers and consumers will want to do it.

I believe the production payment authority should be so written as to allow it to be used as a supplement to our milk marketing agreements and orders.

The same principle should apply to other commodities to which marketing agreements and orders are adapted.

Parenthetically, I believe authority to support hog and milk prices through direct payments should be available before January 1, 1950. If it becomes necessary to support prices of hogs and milk this year as now required by law, authority to make payments will facilitate the job.

Another price-support method which should be available for use on perishable commodities is the direct Government purchase program. One of the biggest obstacles that fruit and vegetable producers encounter is a seasonal glut in markets. It may be local and temporary. Or it may be general and prolonged. There are times when marketing agreements and merchandising programs will not wholly meet the situation. On those occasions, it is necessary for the Government to make direct purchases and divert supplies from normal trade channels.

In preparing for this testimony, I gave considerable study to the possibility of using a "food stamp" or "food allotment" program as a price-support method. The attractiveness of such a program lies in the fact that it encourages increased food consumption and aids those consumers who are most in need. On the other hand, as we now see it, such a program would be administratively expensive, difficult, and would provide only an indirect aid to agriculture.

The use of an equal amount of funds in production payments or the other price-support methods would give farmers far more aid and at the same time benefit a wider group of consumers—in fact, all consumers of the commodity involved.

Conditions and limits: Now let us consider the practical conditions and limits for price supports.

Farmers consider themselves to be partners with each other and with other people in operating a program for the benefit of all. I believe they expect to and should accept responsibility. I do not believe that full benefits, if any, should be extended to producers who operate without regard to the welfare of the general public or of their fellow farmers.

As a result of increased yields, American farmers in 1948 produced the largest corn crop in history on the second smallest number of acres in 50 years. They produced the second largest crop of potatoes in history on the smallest number of acres in the past 70 years. Cotton, tobacco, wheat, and oats are among other major crops for which yields have been increasing.

There is good reason to believe that high-level production will tend to continue and that yields may continue to increase.

Even though economic activity in the United States continues at near-record levels and foreign demand for the products of our soil may remain large for some time to come, production of most agricultural commodities may easily out-run current high-level demand. Our experience in this country shows that full employment and high-level economic activity do not automatically provide a good market for everything our farms may produce. For example, with substantially full employment in 1923, our wheat prices were abnormally low because of for-

eign surplus production. In 1926, we had substantially full employment and a domestic surplus of cotton. In 1929, we had substantially full employment and were struggling to get rid of our large 1928 wheat crop.

Thus farmers have to prepare to moderate production of some items to less than maximum capacity.

Failure to provide for adjustments in production may result in burdensome surpluses as well as continued unwise use of much of our soil resources.

In view of the significant changes that have taken place in the total volume and in the pattern of agricultural production, there is a need to reexamine our adjustment policies and programs in order to insure that they realistically meet the problems that lie ahead. In making this reexamination, careful consideration must be given to providing a combination of production and marketing adjustment measures to balance supplies with demand, give producers an opportunity to contribute to farm income stabilization, and provide reasonable limits to the Government's financial assistance. My suggestions regarding these, by commodity groups, are outlined below:

Marketing quotas and acreage allotments should continue to be available or be provided for commodities such as tobacco, cotton, wheat, rice, corn, and peanuts, with improvements based on experience.

Whenever acreage allotments or marketing quotas are in effect on corn, acreage allotments and marketing quotas should be available for use on other feed grains and possibly rye. Such authorities are needed for additional commodities, such as soybeans, flaxseed, and dry edible beans.

The legislation should provide for acreage allotments, marketing quotas and marketing agreements, and orders for fruits, vegetables, and tree nuts. Producers of any one of these commodities should be provided with adequate tools to develop a program which would maintain or establish balance between supplies and demand, thereby providing a basis for price and income stabilization.

The time may come when marketing quotas or similar feasible devices may be desirable for meat animals, dairy products, poultry and eggs, although the need for improving the diets of consumers and for encouraging conservation farming would not so dictate at this time. For fluid milk, marketing agreements and orders should be continued.

Eligibility of a producer for participation in the benefits of any price-support program should be conditioned upon compliance with or adoption of applicable programs of production adjustment, marketing quotas or agreements, and the carrying out of reasonable conservation practice requirements.

Present legislation provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may invoke acreage allotments and marketing quotas in most instances on the basis of supply in relation to demand, and that producers determine in a referendum whether they will regulate themselves by approving the use of these devices. With respect to such storable agricultural commodities as soybeans, flaxseed, dry edible beans, and dry field peas, as well as the nonstorable crops, it is recommended that acreage allotments or marketing quotas should not be declared necessary until producers have been given an opportunity by the Secretary to vote on the question of invoking such measures in order to bring supplies in line with demand and to qualify for the price support requested.

A further limit on the extent of support is necessary if the public is not to provide financial encouragement for the continued development of extremely large-scale, industrialized farming.

The program I have presented is designed to raise the efficiency with which resources

are used in agriculture. But our emphasis upon efficiency must not be followed in disregard of maintaining a strong and self-reliant rural population in America. In my opinion, we would be wrong to allow our programs to operate in such a way as to encourage the concentration of our farm land into fewer and fewer hands.

As one means of implementing this conclusion, I suggest that the production of a farm in excess of a predetermined amount be not eligible for price support.

To determine the amount of commodities per farm eligible for support, it is suggested that we establish a common unit of measurement applicable to all agricultural commodities on which price supports may reasonably be expected at some time. I am suggesting a comparative unit, which would be equal to 10 bushels of corn, almost 8 bushels of wheat, or a little more than 50 pounds of cotton. The equivalent in other crops or commodities may be quickly computed by relating their value to the value of corn according to prices used in the price-support standard. This is elaborated upon in the attached table, exhibit D.

It is then suggested that not more than 1,800 comparative units per farm be eligible for support. The effect would be about as follows: The operators of all farms, no matter how large, would receive benefits of the price-support program to the extent of 1,800 units of the commodities grown on that farm. Farms which produce in excess of 1,800 units would not enjoy support on the excess. This would exclude part of the production on approximately 2 percent of the farms of the Nation.

I have arrived at this recommendation with considerable caution. If we are to encourage the initiative of individual farm enterprisers we must not set the eligibility point too low. As a matter of fact, we need to place it as high as possible and still preserve the essential rural values I have mentioned. The dividing point I am recommending has been determined on the basis of Census material relating to farms. This dividing point will provide support for just about the amount of production available for sale from our largest family farms. Such a large family farm would be a modern, mechanized, efficiently operated farm with some hired labor, particularly during peak work periods, but still a farm on which the farmer accepted full responsibility for the management and on which the farmer and his family did a great deal, if not the bulk, of the farm work.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Summarizing the suggested program methods, I would like to call your particular attention to these points:

1. We would base price supports on a realistic income standard, which is a more fundamental base than price alone, and yet we would continue operations in the price field. The economy would continue to have the same price-stabilizing benefits which have been important contributions of past programs.

2. This would not be just a support-and-control program. It would directly encourage the movement of greater volume of commodities for which demand is elastic in relation to price, as well as hold down the production of surpluses. This will enable the public to realize more direct benefits.

3. The recommended program makes definite provisions for support of nonstorable commodities, which represent about three-fourths of cash farm receipts and which have not been adequately covered before. Some of these nonstorables would be eligible for the same preferential treatment that storable basics have received. This enables the program to work more directly toward the development of a production pattern in line with people's needs and market demands.

4. The recommended program permits plenty of leeway for enlarging farms in the

interest of efficiency and better living standards, but it does not encourage the concentration of production on extremely large farms.

5. This program provides a closer tie between price supports and other parts of the farm program and increases the responsibility of farmers for carrying out the objectives of national farm policy.

6. The suggested methods of operation are not new in principle, and few are new in practice.

So much for the program methods.

In the final analysis, a program cannot be judged by its aims and methods alone, but by actual results. I believe the recommended program will measure up to the standards I mentioned in the beginning. It provides farm people with price and income supports and the general economy with a large measure of stability. It provides for ample reserves of storable commodities needed for national security and for carrying out our foreign policy. It is reasonably simple and thereby subject to efficient administration. It seeks not only in general but in certain specific ways to assure the general public with abundant food at reasonable prices and thereby offers them direct and tangible returns for money spent.

Having pointed out certain advantages of the program, I also want to call attention to some of its shortcomings.

In the first place, this program does not close the gap between farm and nonfarm income. It offers a realistic beginning.

In the second place, the price and income supports I have suggested, in common with all other price-support systems, falls short of meeting the needs of those operators who lack enough good land and enough capital to produce the necessary volume with the necessary efficiency for a good standard of living. For those operators and their families, an expanded Farmers Home Administration program is a basic need. We should also remember that opportunities in agriculture are becoming more limited in number, both for operators and labor.

We need a program of job training and placement and some definite means of encouraging the development of industries in underdeveloped areas if we are to avoid a long-time problem of relief for those who are crowded out or only partially employed.

I also call your attention to the fact that neither a price-support system nor prosperity itself will assure the conservation of agricultural resources on which we as a people depend for our very lives. With the best possible price-support system, we still need an expanded soil-conservation program.

Price supports, of course, do not take care of the problems of community services such as electrical and telephone services and health and education facilities. They do not affect our need for research and education in agriculture and home economics, for cooperative credit, or for various regulatory and service functions.

The school-lunch program is also a continuing need. This program is somewhat related to the price-support program. As long as it appears necessary to make direct purchases of commodities for the purpose of maintaining farm returns, we should plan to dispose of what we acquire in constructive ways, which certainly include school lunches. Only about 6,900,000 children—approximately a fourth of those now in school—are now benefiting from the program, and on a fourth of the lunches the program provides for milk only.

These are the facts we should keep in mind when we are considering outlets for farm production, as well as when we consider the primary purpose of the lunch program—the welfare of the children.

Another program very important to maintaining farm income and a continuity of

production is crop insurance. Price supports are of no immediate importance to a farmer who, because of natural hazards, is unable to produce anything to sell. The crop-insurance program is designed to help the farmer get back his seed, at least, enabling him to get by until his next crop can be harvested and sold. Without protection of his investment the farmer who suffers a crop disaster loses not only the benefit of the current price support, but also a part of his previous profits.

I am glad to note a few days ago that the House Committee on Agriculture reported favorably on the Department's recommendation to expand this program. I also share the committee's enthusiasm for extension of the multiple-crop-insurance system by which a producer of diversified crops can buy a simple policy to cover at least part of his investment. The multiple-crop system fits right into our aims for price support and other programs. I hope that the sound operating experience of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation in recent years will allow it to grow until crop insurance is available to every farmer.

In general, I would reemphasize the recommendations made by the Department of Agriculture in 1947 with regard to the programs needed in addition to price supports.

All of these matters have their individual places in our total agricultural policy of abundance. Price support is not the only matter that requires our attention. However, it is the most immediate, pressing problem. And I would say, further, that it must be the heart of our policy, for it will determine to quite an extent how successful the rest of our programs can be. One thing is certain: It would do little good to have a power line to the farmstead or a hospital in the community if the crop produced will not return enough money to enable the farmer to use the available services.

In the final analysis, of course, the best basic economic aid for agriculture is a fully employed labor force at good wages. But labor is not likely to be fully employed and industry is not likely to be expanding production when agriculture is in economic trouble.

Agriculture is not merely a recipient of good fortune but a partner in the making of prosperity.

I am confident that by working together we can develop a production and price-adjustment program that will actively and positively serve the best interests of all the people.

EXHIBIT A

PROVISIONAL DEFINITION OF INCOME-SUPPORT STANDARD

The income-support standard in any year shall be that level of total cash returns from farm marketings which is equivalent in purchasing power to the average purchasing power of cash receipts from farm marketings during the 10 calendar years 1939 through 1948. Purchasing power in any year shall be measured in terms of an index of prices paid by farmers for goods and services, including interest and taxes.

The following table and calculations show how 1939-48 average purchasing power would be calculated and adjusted to give an income figure for 1950:

TABLE 1.—Cash receipts from farm marketings: Calculations of average purchasing power, 1939-48, and of income-support level for 1950

Year	Cash receipts from farm marketings ¹	Parity index (1939-48 average=100)	Purchasing power of cash receipts in millions of 1939-48 dollars (column (1) × column (2))
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Millions of dollars		
1939.....	7,877	73	10,790
1940.....	8,364	73	11,458
1941.....	11,181	77	14,521
1942.....	15,372	88	17,468
1943.....	19,434	95	20,457

¹ Excluding Government payments. Cash receipts for 1949 were estimated at \$27,500,000,000.

EXHIBIT B

(Work table: Illustrative calculations only; shows probable relative differences for 1950)

Specified commodities: Illustration of calculation of price-support standards for 1950 based on parity index for Mar. 15, 1949, and estimated average prices received by farmers, 1940-49

Commodity (grouped according to present legislation)	Unit	Income support standard 1950 ¹	Average cash receipts from farm marketings 1940-49 ²	Adjustment factor, column (1) ÷ (2)	Average prices received by farmers 1940-49 ³	Price support standard, column (4) × (3)
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Basic commodities:						
Wheat.....	Bushel	26,234	20,980	1.25	1.50	1.88
Corn.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	1.17	1.46
Cotton.....	Pound	26,234	20,980	1.25	.2239	.2799
Rice.....	Bushel	26,234	20,980	1.25	1.81	2.26
Peanuts.....	Pound	26,234	20,980	1.25	.0756	.0945
Tobacco:						
Flue-cured.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	.394	.492
Burley.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	.397	.496
Specified Steagall commodities:⁴						
Butterfat.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	.535	.669
Milk, wholesale.....	Hundredweight	26,234	20,980	1.25	3.38	4.22
Hogs.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	15.20	19.00
Eggs.....	Dozen	26,234	20,980	1.25	.366	.458
Chickens.....	Pound	26,234	20,980	1.25	.232	.290
Flaxseed.....	Bushel	26,234	20,980	1.25	3.44	4.30
Soybeans.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	2.03	2.54
Beans, dry edible.....	Hundredweight	26,234	20,980	1.25	6.76	8.45
Potatoes.....	Bushel	26,234	20,980	1.25	1.27	1.59
Other commodities:						
Cattle, beef.....	Hundredweight	26,234	20,980	1.25	13.50	16.90
Lambs.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	14.70	18.40
Oats.....	Bushel	26,234	20,980	1.25	.69	.85
Barley.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	.975	1.22
Apples.....	do.	26,234	20,980	1.25	2.09	2.61
Wool.....	Pound	26,234	20,980	1.25	.398	.493
Oranges.....	Box	26,234	20,980	1.25	1.57	1.96

¹ Estimated.

² Cash receipts from farm marketings for 1949 estimated at \$27,500,000,000.

³ Prices for 1949 estimated basis current prices and announced or mandatory support levels for 1949.

⁴ Sweetpotatoes, dry field peas, American-Egyptian cotton, and turkeys are also Steagall commodities.

TABLE 1.—Cash receipts from farm marketings: Calculations of average purchasing power, 1939-48, and of income support level for 1950—Continued

Year	Cash receipts from farm marketings ¹	Parity index (1939-48 average=100)	Purchasing power of cash receipts in millions of 1939-48 dollars (column (1) × column (2))
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Millions of dollars		
1944.....	20,360	99	20,566
1945.....	21,520	101	21,507
1946.....	24,864	113	22,004
1947.....	30,186	135	22,360
1948.....	31,019	146	21,246
1939-48 average.....	19,018	100	18,218

1. 1939-48 average purchasing power, in millions of 1939-48 dollars..... 18,218

2. Prices paid by farmers including interest and taxes, basis parity index for March 15, 1949 (1939-48=100)..... 144

3. Equivalent 1939-48 purchasing power at March 15, 1949 prices..... 26,234

The support-price standard, or prices corresponding to the income-support standard, would be calculated by multiplying average farm prices for the 10 immediately preceding years by the ratio of the income standard to the average level of cash receipts from farm marketings during the 10 immediately preceding years, as follows:

4. Income-support level (at March 15, 1949, prices)..... 26,234

5. Estimated average cash receipts from farm marketings, 1940-49..... 20,980

6. Ratio of income-support level to 1940-49 average cash receipts..... 1.25

At the March 15, 1949, level of prices paid by farmers, the adjustment factor to be applied to 1940-49 average prices would be \$1.25.

EXHIBIT C

(Work table: Illustrative calculations only; shows probable relative differences for 1950)

Specified commodities: Estimated alternative support standards for 1950 based on parity index for Mar. 15, 1949, and estimated average prices received by farmers, 1940-49

Commodity (grouped according to present legislation)	Unit	Income-support standard ¹	90 percent current parity	Support range, title II, Agricultural Act of 1948 ²		
				60 percent	72 percent	90 percent
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Basic commodities:						
Wheat.....	Bushel.....	Dollars 1.88	Dollars 1.95	Dollars 1.24	Dollars 1.48	Dollars 1.85
Corn.....	do.....	1.46	1.42	.90	1.08	1.35
Cotton.....	Pound.....	.2799	.2745	.1739	.2087	.2603
Rice.....	Bushel.....	2.26	1.80	1.31	1.58	1.97
Peanuts.....	Pound.....	.0945	.106	.0672	.0806	.101
Tobacco:						
Flue-cured.....	do.....	.492	.405			.422
Burley.....	do.....	.496	.393			.434
Specified Steagall commodities:³						
Butterfat.....	do.....	.669	.582			.584
Milk, wholesale.....	Hundredweight.....	4.22	3.55			3.70
Hogs.....	do.....	19.00	16.10			16.60
Eggs.....	Dozen.....	.458	.476			.453
Chickens.....	Pound.....	.290	.252			.252
Flaxseed.....	Bushel.....	4.30	3.74			3.74
Soybeans.....	do.....	2.54	2.12			2.21
Beans, dry edible.....	Hundredweight.....	8.45	7.46			7.37
Potatoes.....	Bushel.....	1.59	1.62	1.16		1.74
Other commodities:						
Beef cattle.....	Hundredweight.....	16.90	12.00			14.80
Lambs.....	do.....	18.40	13.00			16.00
Oats.....	Bushel.....	.825	.884			.840
Barley.....	do.....	1.22	1.37			1.30
Apples.....	do.....	2.61	2.12			2.28
Wool.....	Pound.....	.498	.405	.289		.434
Oranges.....	Box.....	1.96	3.32			3.16

¹ 1940-49 average prices times 1.25. Prices for 1949 estimated basis current prices and announced or mandatory support levels for 1949.² Based on parity revisions title II, Agricultural Act of 1948, including transitional parity prices which are 95 percent of present parity. Transitional parity prices are for wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, eggs, oats, barley, and oranges.³ Sweetpotatoes, dry field peas, American-Egyptian cotton, and turkeys are also Steagall commodities.⁴ Not more than.

EXHIBIT D

Selected list of commodities showing quantity equivalent to 1 unit (10 bushels corn) valued at income-support standard prices

Commodity:	Quantity equivalent to 1 unit
Wheat (bushels).....	7.77
Corn (bushels).....	10.00
Cotton (pounds).....	52.16
Rice (bushels).....	6.46
Peanuts (pounds).....	154.97
Tobacco:	
Flue-cured (pounds).....	29.68
Burley (pounds).....	29.44
Butterfat (pounds).....	21.82
Milk, whole (hundredweight).....	3.46
Hogs (hundredweight).....	.76
Eggs (dozen).....	31.88
Chickens (pounds).....	50.34
Flaxseed (bushels).....	3.40
Soybeans (bushels).....	5.75
Beans, dry edible (hundredweight).....	1.73
Potatoes (bushels).....	9.18
Beef cattle (hundredweight).....	0.86
Lambs (hundredweight).....	.79
Oats (bushels).....	17.70
Barley (bushels).....	11.97
Apples (bushels).....	5.59
Wool (pounds).....	29.32
Oranges (boxes).....	7.45

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I wish to say a word regarding the importance of our present price-support program. It has laid a good foundation for a fuller and a more modern support program. A modern price-support program, which provides for adequate reserves, is as essential to our defense as are modern airplanes, tanks, guns, bombs, and a stock pile of strategic materials.

The income-support standard, as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture, is a compromise between supporters of prices at 90 percent of parity

versus supporters of the flexible supports ranging from 60 to 90 percent.

I have reviewed the recommendations of Secretary Brannan during the past 2 days and am in full accord with his objective. I agree with Secretary Brannan that—

We need a realistic minimum below which it is not in the interest of farmers or consumers to allow farm prices to fall and above which I would hope to find most farm prices most of the time. It is the minimum level from which we would be working toward narrowing, and eventually closing, the historic gap between farm and nonfarm income.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of such an objective.

The Secretary proposes a more modern and simplified formula than is the parity formula heretofore used. The application and administration of supports can be effected more easily and promptly. The farmer will know the minimum support level and will not have to guess whether his crop is supported at 60 percent, 72 percent, or 90 percent of parity.

As soon as a bill is presented, incorporating the recommendations of Secretary Brannan, I shall ask the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to hold hearings, giving all interested parties full opportunity to present their views. We do not want this bill rushed through the Congress in the heat of an election or just before adjournment, as happened last year. I shall do everything in my power to see that it receives careful and deliberate consideration and passage through the Senate during this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I understand that the full report to the Secretary of Agriculture has now been made a part of the Record.

CONFIRMATION OF ARMED SERVICES NOMINATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now consider various nominations for promotion in the armed services, which I have today reported. I ask that the nominations be confirmed and the President immediately notified. These are all routine nominations, and there is no objection to any of them from any source whatsoever. They come from the committee with a unanimous report.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Reserving the right to object, I take it that the Senator does not intend that these names be included on the roll call of this morning. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. These gentlemen will take their places in that illustrious roll call which includes the names of men who wear the uniform of our country and on occasion defend it from enemies who attack.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified at once.

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to have an opportunity to make a few remarks in reply to the comments of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] in his reference to the organization known as the Americans for Democratic Action and his reference to the affiliation of the junior Senator from Minnesota with that organization, as well as his reference to a project which the

organization has undertaken for the encouragement of travel on the part of young Americans to Great Britain.

Just so that we may have it clear in the RECORD, I wish to read from the program of the Americans for Democratic Action as adopted on March 29 and 30, 1947, in the first organizational conference in the city of Washington, D. C. I read:

GENERAL PURPOSES

As Americans for Democratic Action, we hold with the Declaration of Independence that the purpose of government is to secure to men the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We fight today in the spirit of those who, through the course of American history, have fought to enlarge and vindicate these rights. Our objective is to raise again the banner of progressivism in America, the only banner under which the free peoples of the world can be rallied against totalitarianism.

It is our conviction that bread and freedom are ultimately interdependent. Our program is directed toward this one goal: a society in which each individual enjoys the highest degree of liberty compatible with justice and economic security for his fellows.

By liberty we mean the fullest assurance of those traditional rights which are based on a profound belief in the dignity of the individual: equality before the law and freedom for all persons to speak, to write, to worship, to vote, and to assemble as they choose, without regard to race, creed, color, national origin, or economic status.

By economic security we mean freedom from want and a fair distribution of the fruits of labor. More concretely, we mean the guaranty of full and steady production and employment; the protection of labor's right to organize democratically and bargain collectively; fair levels of income and security for the farmer; assurance to genuinely competitive business of fair opportunities for efficient production and expansion; protection of the people's inheritance in natural resources against waste and monopolistic exploitation; and a system of minimum wages and social insurance broad enough to maintain adequate standards of nutrition, education, medical care, and housing.

Mr. President, I put this into the RECORD because I do not hesitate to say that the Americans for Democratic Action represent some of the finest traditions, the hopes and aspirations for political freedom and economic security, by the American people.

There may be Senators, there may be those in the House of Representatives, and others throughout the country, who are in disagreement with many of the programs and objectives of Americans for Democratic Action. We in this country always reserve for ourselves the right to disagree, to have honest differences of opinion. But I want no one to feel, because of the remarks which have been made on this floor, that this organization is anything but a deeply sincere, patriotic, liberal, American, freedom-loving organization of people who are by their own talents and their own achievements fine representatives of this Nation. I will exclude from that group the acting national chairman [Mr. HUMPHREY].

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. This is not in any sense designed as a reflection, but merely as a matter of identification. Will the Senator be kind enough to tell us, if he will, whether David Williams, director of the London office, is the same David Williams who is listed in the British Who's Who as David James Williams, member of Parliament, Liberal Neath division of Glamorgan, since May 1945?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know, but I shall be more than happy to afford the Senator the information, and it shall be presented to him in his office.

Mr. DONNELL. Would the Senator be kind enough, as I read the names, if he can, to tell us who these gentlemen are?

Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., chairman of the executive committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall go into the matter of the personnel, without being too extensive in my remarks, in order to give some idea of the leadership and the affiliation of the individuals connected with the Americans for Democratic Action. I should like to continue my remarks, and I am sure that in what I say I shall be able to answer the penetrating and sincere questions of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

The first national chairman was Wilson W. Wyatt, the distinguished ex-mayor of the city of Louisville, Ky., who was a distinguished servant of his Government as the National Housing Expediter.

The chairman of the executive committee in the early days of this organization was a well-known and eminent economist, one who performed distinguished service for his Government during the period of the war, Leon Henderson.

The secretary of the national board, about whom the Senator from Missouri has inquired, is a young attorney in the city of Washington, D. C., who at one time I believe worked in the Office of Price Administration, and also with one of the housing programs of the National Government.

The gentleman who is known as the national executive secretary has for many years been affiliated with liberal and progressive organizations, such as the Union for Democratic Action, which preceded this organization. His name is Mr. James Loeb, Jr.

I should like to call to the attention of Senators some of the distinguished members of this body and of the House of Representatives who are proud to affiliate with the Americans for Democratic Action.

I first refer to the new Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the former president of the great University of North Carolina, the man who was so eloquently, and, let me say, so righteously defended on the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from the State of North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], is a vice chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JENNER. Is not the gentleman the Senator just referred to also a member of 18 Communist-front organizations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall reply to the question from the Senator from Indiana by saying that I know of no man in the United States of America who has a more distinguished, a more honored, and a more desirable and worthy record for public service and for devotion to democratic principles and to the highest ideals of this Republic and of this Nation than the junior Senator from the State of North Carolina. I am honored to serve in the same body with him.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator think it is highly desirable and patriotic to lend one's name to organizations that are known in this country and classified by the FBI and the Department of Justice as Communist-front organizations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would reply to the Senator's question that I am not going to involve myself in connection with a further attack, such as has been conducted on the floor of the Senate, upon the splendid reputation, the noble character, the fine mind, and the excellent person known as the junior Senator from North Carolina. I think it is beneath the dignity of this honorable body to engage in such debate. His service to his country is so outstanding that we should stand here and give thanks to Divine Providence that the distinguished Governor of that State saw fit to appoint him to this body to fill the vacancy which occurred because of the passing of our late lamented friend, Senator Broughton, of that fine State.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I continue with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask if the Senator will yield for a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to my friend from Missouri, yes.

Mr. DONNELL. My inquiry is this: I understood the Senator to say that the first president of the organization was Mr. Wilson Wyatt?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. And that Mr. Leon Henderson was connected with this organization.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. Leon Henderson was the OPA Administrator?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, he was.

Mr. DONNELL. And I believe the Senator said that Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, the chairman of the executive committee, has also been connected with the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not certain of that.

Mr. DONNELL. I thought the Senator so stated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is a capable attorney in the city of Washington, and it is my understanding that he had at one time an affiliation with that Administration.

I will now proceed, Mr. President.

Mr. DONNELL. I am sure the Senator would not object for another inquiry if he knew the object of the inquiry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I also ask if Mr. Paul Porter was not connected with the Office of Price Administration?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He was, as I understand, appointed by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and served with the Office of Price Administration, and, as reported on the floor of the Senate a few moments ago, he did serve as publicity director for the Democratic National Committee, and did serve likewise as Special Ambassador to the Greek Government following the action of the Congress of the United States on the Greek-Turkish loan. He has served in many distinguished capacities, and we feel highly honored to have him as a member of our organization.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. That is the same Paul Porter who served on OPA, and in other governmental organizations, and is now a member of the board of Americans for Democratic Action?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator permit the question as to whether or not Mr. David Ginsburg, the secretary of the National Board of Americans for Democratic Action, is the same Charles David Ginsburg who is listed in Who's Who in America as having been assistant to Commissioner Leon Henderson? Am I correct in that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe he was.

Mr. DONNELL. Are there any other members of the board who are connected with either Mr. Leon Henderson or the OPA, of whom the Senator knows?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know, except I would point out that the distinguished Governor of the State of Connecticut, the Honorable Chester Bowles, is a member of Americans for Democratic Action, and, of course, lest anyone have any doubt that the list of individuals was composed of none but Government officials, I would point out that the very distinguished and honored clergyman, from, I believe, the State of Missouri, if I am not mistaken, Bishop Scarlett—

Mr. DONNELL. Yes; indeed he is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Served with distinction as a member of the board of Americans for Democratic Action. I would point out that the able theologian of world renown, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, serves on the board. I would point out that the able junior Senator from the State of Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is a member of this organization. I would point out that not only—

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not only is the junior Senator from Illinois a member, but let us go to the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. DONNELL. Just a moment. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not yield.

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

Mr. DONNELL. Will not the Senator from Minnesota yield for just one question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not yield. Continuing my remarks—

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will not the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I do not yield, Mr. President.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask if the Senator will not yield for just one question?

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

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator will be kind enough to yield if he understands the object of the question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I shall not yield for questions for the moment. I should like to point out—

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair repeats that the Senator from Minnesota declines to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will not the Senator yield so I may ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has declined to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I am asking the Senator from Minnesota if he will yield for one further question. I do not think he will have any objection to yielding if he knows the purport of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has declined to yield. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to yield at a later moment. I do not want to deny my friend the distinguished Senator from Missouri the opportunity to interrogate me, but I want to continue because there has been some reflection cast upon this organization.

I point out that the distinguished and able Congresswoman from California, HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, is a member of the Americans for Democratic Action. The able Representative from Wisconsin, ANDREW J. BIEMLER, and the able Representative from Kansas City, Mo., Mr. RICHARD BOLLING, are members of this organization. Representative YATES, of Illinois, and Representative HOLFIELD, of California are members of this organization. These are, to mention but a few, individuals who are dedicated to what? Who are dedicated to the principle of political liberty for the American people, with the hope of being able to assist the rest of the world in the securing of political freedom and some semblance of economic security.

Now, without any further remarks as to the nature of the organization, of which I am very proud to be the acting national chairman. It is an organization which includes some of the distinguished labor leaders of this country, men of character and above reproach. It is an organization which includes members of the clergy, of the business community, outstanding educators, professional people. It is an organization which has dedicated itself to one thing—to ally itself with groups of independent people

in this country, progressive liberal-minded people who are unalterably opposed to any kind of totalitarianism, whether from the left or from the right. It is an organization which sees communism and fascism as twin brothers, as equal evils. It is an organization which recognizes that we do not fight communism and fascism just by saying we are against it; an organization that recognizes that communism and fascism are the end products of a decadent, degenerate, and broken-down political and economic society.

The Americans for Democratic Action is determined to do its little part—and I say little part because it is a small organization—to bolster up in this Nation and in other nations those democratic forces which believe in human liberty so that they can withstand the onslaughts of the viciousness and the villainy of totalitarian forces within our own country as well as totalitarian forces outside our country.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I decline to yield at this time, Mr. President.

I listened today to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] in which he said that he was perturbed and disturbed because here was an organization which was suggesting to young people, young Americans, that they take a trip, that they go to England and that when there in England they study the Labor Party, which is the majority party in England; that they study the Workers' Education Association, which has had a long history in Great Britain, an organization which has had a longer history in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark; that these young people when they go to England should view and study and be brought into contact with the Trade Union Congress. This is nothing more or less than the great labor movement of Great Britain. It is suggested that they should be brought into contact with and should have the opportunity to learn about the Fabian Society.

Mr. President, I submit that the best way we can build international good will and the greatest means we can use to build peace and understanding in this world is to know each other.

Not only do I encourage young Americans to go to England; not only do I encourage them to study the Labor Government of England, but I encourage them to study the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party. I encourage them to go to Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, France, western Germany, and Italy. I encourage them to become citizens of the world. They can become citizens of the world only if they have an opportunity to learn about the world in which they live. If it is wrong to encourage young men and women to inform themselves, to open up their minds, to see how other people live, and to form judgments on the basis of their own experience, I stand eternally condemned as being consistently and perpetually wrong.

In my judgment, commerce between the nations promotes peace. Cultural interchange among the nations promotes peace and understanding. I only wish that every young American could come to Washington and study his Government. I wish we could recognize that we are living in one world, and that sooner or later every young American should have the opportunity to study the kind of world in which he lives, the world which will affect the future course of his life.

Why is it considered that there may be danger in the program of sending young men and women to England? Because the Labor Government is in power. Lest anyone misunderstand my remarks, let me make my position clear. I do not believe in socialism. I do not believe in any type of collectivism. I believe in free enterprise. That is the kind of life in which I was brought up. That is the kind of background from whence I came. However, I believe that the purpose of economic institutions is to serve the people. Not long ago I heard the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] state on the floor of the Senate that the reason some countries were turning to socialism was that the old systems were not meeting the needs of the people. I point out that perhaps one of the reasons they are turning to socialism is that the old systems simply do not give the answer to the human needs. In the so-called good old days, the coal miners of England did not have their needs met. The people of England did not have opportunity for health services, educational services, and the other things they needed. They turned to a different economic system.

I remind my distinguished colleagues that we ought to get down on our knees and thank God that Great Britain today is a nation which has dedicated herself to the continuance and preservation of the great traditions for which she is so well known.

What traditions? Free speech, for one. Remember that out of Britain came the Magna Carta. Another tradition is freedom of the press. Others are freedom of religion, freedom to worship, freedom to assemble, freedom to petition, and freedom of political action and participation. In every newspaper we hear about Britain and her new experiment. We read that an election is coming on. The British pioneered democratic processes.

I have been reminded by the junior Senator from Indiana that democracy is apparently something that we do not have; not only is it something we do not have, but that there is danger of democracy degenerating into gang rule. I do not wish to misrepresent the remarks which have been made on the floor of the Senate today, but I ask Senators to look at them in the RECORD.

I admit that democracy is not a form of government. Democracy is a spirit of government. Democracy is the spirit of human personality. It is something which may be classified as intangible. It is a basic, fundamental belief that every human being is worthy of respect and of dignified treatment. It is a basic realization that we are created in the

image of our Maker, and that there is something very precious about human life, the human soul, the human mind, the human body. That is what we mean when we talk about the spirit of democracy. It means the dignity of the individual, and respect for his personality. It means the freedom of conscience to seek the truth, so that the truth may make us free.

We who believe in the democratic spirit also believe that there is a fraternity of mankind, and that all men are equal under the law and in the eyes of their Maker.

In the spirit of democracy we have many forms of government. We have a republic with a federal system, such as exists in the United States. A republic is a structure of government; but I submit that a republic without a democratic philosophy could be tyrannical. It is the spirit of democracy which gives to it the kindly touch, the human element of understanding, and the characteristic of decency. England is living within the democratic tradition, yet her form of government is that of a king and parliament. Norway is a kingdom, as is Sweden; but I ask my colleagues, Would any Member of the Senate rise and say that Norway is not democratic, or that Sweden or Denmark have not aspired to the highest traditions of democracy? Yet they are not republics.

How do they live? They live in the spirit of mutual respect for fellow citizens. They recognize that the only justification of any kind of institution is what it does to promote the welfare of the people, and to enrich the lives and enlighten the mind of every human being. That is what we mean when we talk about democracy.

I submit that Britain stands today just as she stood in 1940 after the terrible disaster at Dunkerque. Britain stood her ground then and now as one of the main bulwarks against the forces of darkness in Europe. Even as we were making up our own minds about our foreign policy she did not turn to communism. She did not turn to fascism. She turned back into the richness of her own experience and her own understanding of her own problems. Out of that decision came a Labor government. I am proud to say that it is one of the greatest tributes to working men and women that they could provide for Britain a government of their own—a free government for a free people.

The Labor Party includes professors, doctors, lawyers, bankers, and businessmen. The Labor Party of Great Britain is not made up solely of members of labor unions.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I decline to yield at this time.

The Labor Party of Britain is made up of a broad cross section of its people, as is the Labor Party of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden. Even kings have learned to work with and to admire, respect, and pay tribute to the great leadership which comes from the Labor Party ranks. Since when did we become so fearful of free labor? When did we

become such highbrows? This country is made up of descendants of the embattled farmers who stood at Lexington and Concord, and of the workers. Practically every Member of the Senate points with pride to the days when he worked for a living. We still work for a living—lest anyone misunderstands my remarks. We point with justifiable pride to the fact that we came up the hard way. There were no silver spoons in our mouths. But while we talk about the dignity of labor, we are unwilling to recognize it when the name of labor is attached to some political organization which may be successful.

Mr. President, it would be a good thing for thousands of Americans, both young and old, to visit Britain. Perhaps it is not our youth who should take the trip. Possibly the trip should be taken by adults, so that we may better understand what is happening in that great country.

Mr. President, I did not intend to say a word in this debate over the continuance of the authorization for the Economic Cooperation Administration. I recognize that possibly I am a little out of line in even rising at this point; but I felt that there was involved a question of personal privilege. I cannot sit silently in my seat and hear an organization with which I am closely affiliated brought under attack. I must rise to its defense.

I do not say that it has all the answers. It is attempting, in the democratic American way, to find the answers through political education and understanding.

I stated that I did not intend to interject any of my personal opinions with respect to the continuation of ECA, but I shall do so. I believe in it. I believed in the Marshall plan when it was first enunciated by General Marshall. I believed in it when the Eightieth Congress passed an authorization and passed an appropriation. The debate in this Chamber has indicated, without the shadow of a doubt, its success. Those who attack Britain for her weaknesses and her failures when young Americans plan to go there and learn about the British Labor Government are the same ones who a short time ago were showing how Britain had increased her production under the Labor Government. They are the same Senators who said no longer do the great British people need any American help, because, as has been said, the British economy had recovered. They say coal production has increased, they point out that steel production has increased. These same gentlemen say the British are doing very well.

I should think that young Americans would like to see such genius at work and see such great ability pouring out the treasures of the earth in the form of the finest products of the British factories.

Oh, no, Mr. President; ECA is working, but it is now at its critical point. Just as war appropriations were made, so it is that peace appropriations need to be made. This great body appropriated \$450,000,000 in 5 years for the prosecution of the world's greatest war—and for its successful prosecution. I submit to you, Mr. President, that when victory was within our grasp in 1944,

when the enemy was on the retreat, when the Nazis had been stopped on the cold plains before Stalingrad and when the Japanese were being pushed out of their strongholds in the South Pacific, when victory seemed in our grasp, did the Congress of the United States say, "Let us cut down the appropriations now; it looks as if we will win the war, let us take it easy and go slow on the spending of money"? No, Mr. President, not at all, not on your life, because that was a fight to the death; it was the battle of the century. I submit to you that at that time the Congress continued to appropriate vast sums of money to win the war. The action of the Congress was wise then—it will be equally wise to authorize the peace program of ECA.

Mr. President, we have a war on our hands, and it will not be won by false economy. It is a cold war, and it can be won only by the warmth of democratic ideas and performance coming from this Nation—the ideas of democratic living, backed up by the substance for which this Nation is so well known—backed up by its money, its diplomatic pledges, its political genius, its industry and scientific accomplishment. I submit that we would be making a tragic mistake if in any way we were seriously to amend the proposal of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate which provides that we should go ahead. Yes, Mr. President, go ahead with the renewal of authorization for ECA. We must understand the kind of world we live in as we expend this money. We must understand that the hope for freedom in the world does not lie in the debunked, bankrupt, morally degenerate leadership of the past in Europe or in Asia. Nor does it lie in any type of streamlined brutality such as communism. The hope for freedom and peace in the future lies in people such as those in the British Labor Party. It rests with people in the Social Democratic forces of western Germany, not in the cartelists or the monopolists or the old aristocrats of privilege who were the "big shots" of the pre-Hitler or Hitler days. The hope for freedom rests with the untapped resources of young men and women rising above the miseries of World War II. It rests with the labor and cooperative organizations of Europe and Asia. It is to be found in the natives in colonial areas who are aspiring for the freedom which I heard the distinguished Senators from Oregon and Maine [Mr. Morse and Mr. Brewster] speak for so eloquently.

Yes, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota holds those same beliefs. He does not believe there can be nobility of democratic purpose in Europe and at the same time an underwriting of the most miserable type of imperialism and colonialism in Asia. It is about time that we made our position clear, Mr. President. We cannot be for freedom in Europe and colonialism and enslavement in Asia. This is one world. It requires one foreign policy.

Yes, we may be winning the war for recovery in Europe, but we are losing the minds and souls and hearts of millions and millions of backward peoples who are aspiring to be free men and women, on

the continent of Asia and in many other areas of the world.

So I wish to have the ECA authorization provided; yes, indeed, I do, Mr. President; but I also want full appropriations made for it; and then I want the kind of humanitarian administration and policy not only from ECA, but from our State Department and from this Congress, so that the people of the world will understand, as they may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if they do, or as their leaders may read it, that here there is no spirit of denial of opportunity. Here in America we believe that the little people should have an opportunity to become big people, that we would like to see opportunity provided for every person in the world to make something out of his life. I want our policy to carry forward the democratic hopes and aims of our people.

A utopian dream, you say? I agree, Mr. President; but it is about time that we realized the crucial situation that faces us. It is about time that we realized how important a man Pandit Nehru is, in India—a great believer in freedom; and we cannot afford to wait until we have another conflagration on our hands, before we come to the rescue. Mr. President, we have had fire-department tactics for far too long—tactics by which we wait until there is a conflagration, and then send for the foreign-policy fire department.

I think it is time that we move on the offensive—the moral, political, and economic offensive. The Marshall plan was an important step on that offensive. It was a step in the right direction; and it has worked. Now we need, not less of it, but more of it. Every dollar we spend will come back to us a hundredfold—back to us in good will, in security, in peace and freedom.

Mr. President, there are still some truths that need to be enunciated; there are still some things that need to be said. It is still better to give than to receive. It is more noble to serve than to be served. Those are basic truths that every one of us was taught, and I think it is about time that we applied them in our politics, in particular, international politics. It is in the field of our foreign policy that it will count most. Whether we have peace or war, freedom or enslavement, does not depend just on what we do in our domestic policy, although that has its effect. It depends in a great part upon what we do in our foreign policy.

Mr. President, I commend the Members of this body and of the House of Representatives who in the past voted in the affirmative, and will do it in the future, for the continuance and extension and broadening of the purposes and objectives of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. First of all, I wish to ask the Senator's pardon for my persistence a few minutes ago in asking him to yield. I thought the question I wished to ask him then was appropriate at that time, although of course it was entirely

proper for the Senator to ask me to postpone my inquiry.

I wish to say now that in addition to Mr. Leon Henderson, who was OPA Administrator and is connected with Americans for Democratic Action; and in addition to Mr. Joseph L. Rauh, whom the Senator from Minnesota thinks probably was with Mr. Henderson in OPA; and in addition to Mr. Paul Porter, who was connected with the OPA, I wish to ask the Senator whether Mr. Chester Bowles, whom I also mentioned as having been connected with Americans for Democratic Action, was also connected with the OPA?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed; he was.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask further whether the David Ginsburg who is listed in the pamphlet as secretary of the national board of Americans for Democratic Action is not only the same Charles David Ginsburg who was, as I said a moment ago, assistant to Leon Henderson—who was then, I may add, on the Securities and Exchange Commission—but is also the same Charles David Ginsburg who was general counsel of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is his very distinguished record, but only in part, let me say. His record is quite distinguished.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question in reference to the personnel listed in this document?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator know who George Edwards is?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do, and I am very happy to reply to the question of the able Senator from Missouri. George Edwards is president of the city council of the great city of Detroit, Mich. He is without doubt, in my opinion, one of the ablest young men in America, and I am sure he will be heard from in the not-too-distant future; in fact, if I may be permitted to say so, he may well aspire to a higher office in that great and beloved State.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator from Minnesota know who Hugo Ernst is?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do. I shall reply by saying that Hugo Ernst is one of the members and officers of the American Federation of Labor, a vital part of the greatest free labor movement in the world, and one of which we can justifiably be proud. Hugo Ernst is at the present time president of the International Hotel and Restaurant Workers, and he has an enviable reputation for sincere and constructive labor relations.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I further note in the list of officers of Americans for Democratic Action, the name of Mr. Emil Rieve. I ask the Senator whether he is the same Emil Rieve who has been president, and perhaps still is, of the Textile Workers of America, and vice president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was going to save the time of the Senator from Missouri by giving him a thumbnail character sketch of Mr. Emil Rieve, who is International President of the Textile Workers of America, CIO, and is well known in some of the New England States and some of the Southern States. I am quite sure that many of our colleagues hold him in the highest respect. He is, to my mind, one of the outstanding labor leaders in the free labor movement in America.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not think I asked the Senator about Louis H. Harris, who is listed on this publication as treasurer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is an outstanding businessman in the city of New York who, I understand, has done very well in this free economy of ours. He has continued on in the liberal tradition and with his liberal spirit has served very capably for more than 2 years as treasurer of Americans for Democratic Action.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me say that inadvertently I overlooked in the list the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., whom all of us know, and whose reputation stands without any comment of my own.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to make a comment. Mr. President, I think his reputation is of the very highest. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as all of us know, is the son of a very distinguished father. I think he will equally distinguish himself, and I am looking forward to the day in the not-too-distant future when he will serve as a Member of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I believe the Senator said that he does not know whether David Williams, the director of the London office is the same David Williams who is a member of the British Parliament, and whose name I gave a few moments ago from the British list.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must reply to the Senator from Missouri that I do not know, but I may say I shall be more than happy to provide the Senator with that information. I hope that he is a member of Parliament because if he is a member, it would add greater stature to our organization.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the names of two other individuals listed on this document?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator be kind enough to tell us who they are, if he knows? One is Mrs. Frances Adams, State trip director, and Mr. Fritz Mondale, executive secretary?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mrs. Frances Adams, as I understand is a resident of the city of Washington, D. C., and her title is exactly as it is stated on the bulletin. She has worked with the local

chapter of the Washington, D. C., committee of the Americans for Democratic Action. In reference to Mr. Fritz Mondale, I may speak with a certain amount of State pride. Mr. Mondale comes from a very distinguished family residing in the southern part of Minnesota, a family residing on one of our fine Minnesota farms, in the richest farmland in the world. He was a student at Macalester College in St. Paul, one of the finest institutions of the arts and sciences in the Nation. He was a student at the time the junior Senator from Minnesota was professor of political science at Macalester College. I am happy to know I was sufficiently able to inspire him to enter into such political activity as that which he is now engaged. He is a field representative of the Students for Democratic Action—an affiliate of the Americans for Democratic Action.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the Senator's courtesy in answering the question. I hope the Senator again will pardon me for the interruption.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, I should like to ask him a question. But I will wait.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be more than happy to receive the Senator's question.

Mr. KEM. I merely wanted to say I have listened to the interesting and intelligent remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, and I should like to ask him, in order to keep the RECORD clear, whether during the period in which he held the attention of the Senate, he was disturbed by any calls for a vote, or other manifestations of impatience on the part of any of those who happen to hold views contrary to his, on some of the features of the pending legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to reply to the Senator's question by saying I have always been treated with the utmost courtesy by Members of the United States Senate. But I feel that the Senators who serve as members of the Foreign Relations Committee and those who are anxious to have this legislation voted upon could well have chastised the junior Senator from Minnesota for taking up this time, and I have noticed that some of them have become a bit restless, and well they may. I may say to them that the only reason the junior Senator from Minnesota rose to his feet today was to defend the reputation and the character of a splendid organization. I urge, and then I shall take my seat, that we carry on with the debate, come to a vote, and finally authorize the full amount for the Economic Cooperation Administration.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield further to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HUMPHREY. On the Senator's time, yes. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether he feels that the Senator from Texas or any other of the senior Members of this body are exempt from

either the rules of the Senate or the ordinary considerations of courtesy between gentlemen?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do not, Mr. President. I believe that every Member of the Senate is worthy of the utmost courtesy and fullest opportunity of extended debate.

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. LODGE addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator made two or three statements which particularly interested me. In a general sort of way, with respect to his general objective, I, of course, agree. But the Senator made the statement that the Marshall plan so-called, or ECA, was the first move and contribution this country had made toward world freedom and democracy. I wonder whether the Senator wants that statement to stand. Had we not taken other steps, prior to that, such as aid to Greece and Turkey, our action with respect to Bretton Woods, the United Nations, and many other things which were milestones in their day?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate, Mr. President, the opportunity which has been afforded me by the distinguished Senator to correct my statement. I should like to say that this Nation, since the time of World War II, has been in the forefront for the promotion of world understanding and world cooperation. I thoroughly concur in the leadership this Nation gave to the establishment of the United Nations, the World Bank, and the Bretton Woods Agreement. I believe we have done great things in the good-neighbor policy, and I believe we have done wonderful work in the establishment and promotion of world understanding through aiding in the establishment of many United Nations organizations. We made great progress in the case of the British loan. But I say the Marshall plan, the program for economic cooperation, has been the most successful and most brilliant chapter in American aid for world recovery and for the maintenance of the hope of freedom and security in the world. I think it has been our most brilliant chapter.

Mr. BRIDGES. The impression the Senator wanted to leave was that it is the most successful, rather than the only one, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do, and I appreciate the correction.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to suggest two other questions, if I may. The Senator referred to totalitarian forces in our country who were trying to destroy it. The Senator did not identify them. Would the Senator identify them?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am more than happy to identify totalitarian forces, because I think the only way we can do away with them is by way of accurate identification, by the kind of identification whereby we really put the label on people who deserve the label, and not promiscuously use a general plastering of labels which are so easily kicked

around. The Communist Party and its membership constitutes a subversive force in the United States of America, and the best way to thwart their activities or to demonstrate their ineffectiveness is by strengthening the American economy. The Communist part is but one of the subversive forces.

I should like to point out that I think there have been other forces that have been subversive, such as the Silver Shirts, the Ku Klux Klan, the Christian Fronters—Fascist organizations—and to me it makes no difference whether it be a dictatorship of the proletariat or a dictatorship of the elite, it is still a dictatorship. Whether elite or proletarian, they soon acquire the same beast-like habits once they obtain omnipotent power.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In that case, what does the Senator say about some of the people who are affiliated with his organization, if they are, who are members of Communist-front organizations, and so designated by the Department of Justice? The Senator just said the Communist Party is the greatest totalitarian threat to this country. What does the Senator say about some of the people who are associated with his movement if they are affiliated with Communistic forces? I am not charging they are, but I say, if they are.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I imagine that every American has made some political mistakes in his life. I imagine that every citizen and every man, woman, and child has not always lived a life without sin, and as is repeated so often, "There is more rejoicing in heaven over one sinner that repents," than there is sometimes over the 99 who have remained true and faithful. There have been people, innocent people, who have been sucked into Communist-front organizations by clever front operators, but I am happy to say that the Americans for Democratic Action more than any other single political group in this country has exposed the them for what they are. When a man front organizations and has exposed has at some time or another found himself affiliated with an organization which he later found to be unworthy of his support, and to be undemocratic and un-American and thereupon disassociated himself, he has exemplified great courage. He has admitted that it is possible to make mistakes. But he has braved the storm of rebuke and criticism and admitted his errors. He should be welcomed back. I should hesitate to go through the political, economic, social, and personal record of every person who belongs to the Republican Party or to the Democratic Party or is a Member of the House of Representatives, the Senate, or any other honorable body. I am sure all of us would find a few skeletons in our closet. What is important is, Where do people stand now? What are they thinking and doing today? Have they made up their minds that there is an irreconcilable ideological conflict in the world? Do they know their position? I know of no man who is a member of the board of the Americans

for Democratic Action who does not know what his position is, and I may say to the Senator that I surmise the members of that organization could detect a "commie" so much faster than some of the people who do all the talking about "commies" that it would be almost ridiculous.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. I noticed in the Senator's speech he did not refer to communism as being a threat. I am glad to have him identify it now as such.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, Mr. President, I think I should correct the RECORD. The junior Senator from Minnesota not only referred to communism as a threat, but he referred to all forms of totalitarianism as a threat to freedom, to peace, and to security. Let there be no doubt about that.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator will yield further, he has just now stated it, but I did not notice that in the main body of his speech he mentioned them specifically.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota mentioned them specifically. He has done so not only by speech, but as one person in the great ferment of American politics, he has urged that all of us make our contribution—and I have made mine—toward the exposure and the defeat of those who would ensnare people into the front organizations, and other organizations which would try to discourage and deceive the liberal democratic movement in this country. We have had some success, and if we can receive the cooperation of those who so willingly use the label and the brush of communism, and make sure they understand the identification, so they know of whom they are talking, I do not think we will have much trouble. The real problem is that communism can hide behind a great smoke screen, because too many unthinking people call other persons Communists without any appreciation or understanding of the term or the philosophy.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator said, in effect, that persons who have been sinners may dissociate themselves from a Communist organization, and he sees no harm in it, because it is better to have those persons back in the fold and to go along with those who are living a pure life. But if such persons do not dissociate themselves from Communist organizations, what does the Senator say about that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. What he has always said. It is time for the American people to make their choice; it is time to come clean. We cannot have half-baked ideas about being able to cooperate and work with those who do not believe in democratic principles. I mean the democratic way of life. I believe that people should stand up and be counted. I have said that a number of times. I believe that persons who are challenged as Communists should say one thing or the other, "I am not" or

"I am." That is all that is necessary. But I caution those who make the accusation, that when we steal a man's character we steal something which is very important; and before we start to defile character we should be extremely certain of our facts. We must recognize that while there may be an organization which has a taint about it, it does not mean that everyone within the organization is tainted. It may mean that someone has been led into a false path. It is our job to lead them out. I would solicit support for the organization of which I speak, Americans for Democratic Action. Let me point out that the only way we can deal with Fascists and Communists is realize their objectives and their tactics. The best way to answer them is to build a dynamic healthy society, which does not leave any potential converts for them.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. If a man becomes associated with or a member of a Communist-front organization, who has the burden to dissociate himself? Is the burden not on the individual, and if the individual fails to dissociate himself, is it not reasonable to assume that there may be some tendencies in the man's character which would bear watching?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not care to read into anyone's character what may not be in it. I know the position I would take, and I think I am right. I believe the promiscuous calling of names and the use of labels in America has done more to foster the growth of communism in this country than has any other one single factor. I think the willingness to put the tag of Communist or Fascist on anyone with whom we do not agree has been a protective screen behind which the real Fascists and Communists can hide.

It is not very fashionable to talk about Fascists any more, but I should like to remind the Senate that there are Fascists who are just as dangerous as are Communists. It was the Fascists who precipitated the war and almost destroyed the world. Out of their folly and misery arose the threat of communism which we face today. I want people to dissociate themselves from any antidemocratic group, but I cannot tell a man that he has to dissociate himself from an organization to which he belongs. He has to live with his own soul and with his own conscience. I believe that every person in America has a right to live according to his own conscience. He has a right to join any church or any political party he may want to join. All I want him to do is to stand up and proclaim his affiliation.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Can the Senator condemn communism, the Communist Party, and Communist-front organizations, and then attempt to close his eyes to a man's not dissociating himself from such an organization when the character of the organization becomes known to him?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that what may be known to the Senator sometimes is not known to others. I do not wish to use the personal reference. What may be known to one person may not be so clearly known to someone else. Sometimes it takes some persons a good deal longer to know. It takes some children a longer time to get out of the fourth or fifth grade than it takes others. It takes some persons a little longer to accumulate sufficient information to make them believe that a certain thing is true. I think we should weigh it on the side of toleration and give every man the opportunity to uphold his own dignity. I am sure the Senator and I both agree that we do not like Communists and Fascists, but I am wondering if we agree on what kind of society it is that can do away with the menace of totalitarianism. It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Minnesota that it is in unemployment, in lack of opportunity, in discrimination, in prejudice, in an economic society that is disintegrating and degenerating, that the Communist threat is really found.

I do not want America to try to reestablish in Europe some kind of a nineteenth century democracy saying all that is needed is free speech. No; we must have freedom of trade also. We must have economic security. That is why we not only have to carry our political message to the world but we should extend our technical know-how, our economical aid, to help them to raise themselves by their own boot straps. That is part of the answer to communism and fascism.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield. I do not want to continue to take the time of the Senate, but I do not want to deny others the opportunity to ask a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is proposing, through his organization, to send a group of young people from this country to England. He has said he admires the Labor Party of Great Britain and its accomplishments. Does not the Senator agree that the thing for which the Labor Party of Great Britain is most noted is the fact that its outstanding accomplishment, that which they brag about, is the socialization of the industries of Great Britain?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say to the distinguished Senator that what the members of the Labor Party most brag about, as the Senator puts it, is that they have begun to meet human needs; and it is on the floor of the United States Senate that we hear about socialism. It is in Great Britain that we hear about meeting human needs. I said I have admiration for the Labor Party, although I do not always agree with all its program, philosophy, and methods. Apparently, according to the adversaries of the ECA authorization, ECA has worked very well. It has worked so well that they want to cut down the authorization.

I point out that the immediate accomplishment of the Labor Party of England is the preservation of those basic, fundamental freedoms which are vital

to the democratic philosophy—free speech, free press, freedom of assembly, freedom of political participation. Get those things, and there is a chance for free men and a free world.

Mr. BRIDGES. We have all those freedoms in this country, have we not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, we have.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. We are sending young people from this country over there, and we have in this country all those things of which the Senator speaks. What do they have in Great Britain that we do not have here?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Westminster Abbey. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is perfectly correct, but there is also a socialistic program which has taken over one by one the industries of Great Britain. That is one of the fundamental distinctions, if not the great distinction, between this country and Great Britain. I am trying to find for what purpose the organization of which the Senator is the head is sending these young men to England. Is it to make them experts so that eventually they may come back and help socialize our own country?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I point out to the Senator that the junior Senator from Minnesota is not sending anyone to Great Britain. As a matter of fact, the junior Senator from Minnesota was even having a difficult time arranging for a short vacation for members of his own family. Americans for Democratic Action are arranging for a tour for young people, to study the economic, the political, and the cultural institutions of Great Britain.

The only fear I have, I must say, is a fear that has been brought about because of what I have heard from the opponents of the full authorization for ECA. I fear that these young people will find out of the great accomplishments of the British Labor Government. I was uncertain as to this achievement until I heard the senior Senator from Indiana and the junior Senator from Indiana, the junior Senator from Missouri and the senior Senator from Missouri, state the British had greatly increased production and they were doing very well. Yes, doing so well that it is now proposed that we should curtail the aid. Yes, according to the critics of ECA, the British socialistic ideas have increased production so much, that it might be something that would arouse the imagination of the young people, and they might come back with some ideas with which the Senators and I would not agree.

These young men and women study economics in the colleges and high schools, they study different philosophies of politics. The best way to be able to resist something is to know about it. The best way to be able to resist a disease is to know the full impact of it, and the best way to understand something that is good and wholesome is to witness it in operation.

I do not intend to make any prejudgment as to what these young men and

women may find. I know they will find Westminster Abbey, as I said a moment ago. They will find the city of London, and will see the shambles and the wreckage caused by war. I know they will find a Britain that is struggling hard to rehabilitate itself. I know they will find a proud people. I know that if they look through the London Museum they will find some of the great symbols of political liberty. I know that if they stay in England 2 or 3 weeks they will come back with a greater appreciation of the need for international cooperation and what should be the bonds of fellowship.

I have heard it said on the floor of the Senate that the free peoples should get closer together. I have heard those who attack the Atlantic Pact say that what we need is more United Nations cooperation, more interchange. I have heard criticism of the ECA because it did not promote unity. Yet, I think it was Aristotle who said that the way to bring about infiltration of ideas from one country to another was by commerce, the free flow of trade.

The first argument of those who are against ECA is that it is working. They are unhappy because Britain is producing. They say that if Britain is producing we should not give it any ECA aid. The fact is that ECA aid is why Britain is producing. ECA is working. So these gentlemen are not sure what program we should have.

The final blow comes in finding that things are so good, that ECA is working so well, that the Labor Government in Britain is doing so well, that we never should have our imaginative young Americans go over there and see what is happening.

I predict that they will come back and say, "God bless America." They will look at the Declaration of Independence, and look at our private enterprise, and say, "Give us America. It is still the best Nation in the world." And that is how I feel. But I want them to see what the people of the rest of the world are doing, and I want them to become acquainted with the British.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether he understood the junior Senator from Missouri to say that he was unhappy because England was producing goods in large quantities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understood the junior Senator from Missouri to say that we could well afford to reduce the authorization for ECA because Great Britain was doing so well—that the production was even above prewar levels.

Mr. KEM. Did not the Senator understand the junior Senator from Missouri to say that he was very much concerned about foreign competition because it was unequal competition; that when the American producer and the American workman were in competition with foreign industry subsidized by Marshall-plan money, and operated by the governments of these foreign countries themselves, it was an unequal competition, in

which the American workingman was very apt to lose in the end?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, why is it that on the floor of the Senate, where, on the one hand, we brag and beat our chests about Americans and American industry, which we have every right to do, and talk about the genius of our people, the skill of our labor, and the administrative ability of our management, all at once we become so frightened because we are going to have a little competition somewhere?

I submit that competition has never been able to destroy our markets. The only harm we have suffered in terms of our trade has been when the flow of commerce and the interchange of goods was diminished, not when it was accelerated.

I would point out also that we should not for a single moment think that the amount of production which may take place in any one of the numerous countries which are being aided under the ECA is nearly equivalent to what we can produce in this country. I stand forthrightly on the premise that American industry is capable of outproducing and outmatching, in terms of quality or quantity, any country or industry in the world, and we should not be fearful of competition.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator recall anywhere, at any time, in the long history of American industry, that American workingmen have been in competition with foreign-owned, foreign-operated, state-controlled industries subsidized with the money of American taxpayers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely have made no such observation. I should like to make a further comment now. The American workingman was led to believe for years that a high protective tariff was his friend. He learned, however, that it was in the interest of big business in this country.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me make one further observation. For every single American worker who has suffered, because of unfair competition from foreign industry, and has been exploited by foreign industry, I can find a much larger number of American workers who have suffered from exploitation in the past days of this Republic from manufacturers and industry within America. It was not the American worker in the forest who was paid 50 cents a day who suffered from foreign imports. He suffered because the barons of the lumber industry were unwilling to pay him a living wage. It was not the American workers in the coal mines of this country who in 1927 were receiving less than \$5 a day, and whose wages went down to as low as \$3.25 a day who were suffering from the importation of coal from abroad. They were suffering by reason of lack of organization in the mines, by reason of the exploitation of the mine owners.

Mr. President, we will not be fooled by any kind of economic argument that a little competition from Great Britain, from France, from Belgium, from Holland, is going to exploit the widows and orphans and the American workers. The

only ones troubled by any such competition are the monopolies which, as a result of such competition, will be obliged to produce with more efficiency and sell at reasonable prices.

Mr. President, I believe in competition. I do not believe in monopoly. I believe in competition for this country and I believe in competition between the countries. And I shall stand for that which is so American—the competitive enterprise system. I am amazed to hear people talk so much about competition who never want it when it really happens. I want to see it.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the question I asked him, which was whether he knows of any time in the history of American industry in which the American workingman has been in competition with foreign state-owned industry financed or subsidized with the money furnished by the American taxpayers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know of such fact.

Mr. KEM. I should now like to ask the Senator a further question. Does he think that such competition is the kind of equal competition which is in keeping with the American tradition?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do believe that the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the money it expends for recovery in the free nations of the world, are 100 percent in the American tradition. I think nothing can be worse for American industry than to have a monopoly in the world markets. I think nothing could be worse for the American people than to find ourselves without any competition.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator look with equanimity and satisfaction to a period in which the American workingmen will be competing with industries employing low-cost labor, built with Marshall-plan money, and equipped through the Marshall plan with American technique and technology?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to submit to the Senator from Missouri that since he has such deep concern over low-cost labor, I want him to join with me and the British Trade and Labor Congress to promote better wages in Great Britain. I want him to join with me to help raise the wages of the unorganized people in America. American workers in this country are up against unfair competition from their own underpaid unorganized brothers. There are areas in this country that could give adequate testimony to that effect. I say to the Senator that if we are going to argue about the ECA because it is going to hurt America, then we have surely arrived at an argument that is without one basis in fact. One can argue that it does not work, that it is a foolish expenditure of money because it will not work in the long run. That is a matter of judgment. But to argue that it is working so well that it ought to be limited and checked is an

argument that the purposes of ECA have been and will be fulfilled. Recovery is being accomplished.

I yield the floor because the debate has continued too long, and I look forward to the opportunity of voting.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has yielded the floor.

COMMITTEE MEETING AND TEMPORARY LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit at 2 o'clock. The subcommittee is composed of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attending the session of the Senate at 3 o'clock, in order that I may attend the International Joint Commission Conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

Mr. BRIDGES. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. What committees now have permission from the Senate to meet? I want to know how many Senators may be absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Appropriations Committee and any subcommittee thereof.

Mr. BRIDGES. Any others?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. None others except as permission was just granted the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

EXTENSION OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May we have the pending question stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

Mr. MYERS. My reason for suggesting the absence of a quorum is that I believe it is fair to Senators who are absent to be given an opportunity to come to the floor of the Senate for the vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to know whether the yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. 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:

Alken	Hendrickson	Miller
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Brewster	Hoey	Mundt
Bricker	Holland	Murray
Butler	Humphrey	Myers
Cain	Ives	Neely
Capehart	Jenner	O'Connor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Connally	Kem	Russell
Cordon	Kerr	Schoeppel
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Eaton	Lodge	Taft
Ellender	McCarthy	Taylor
Ferguson	McClellan	Thayer
Flanders	McFarland	Tobey
Frear	McGrath	Tydings
Fulbright	McKellar	Vandenberg
George	McMahon	Wherry
Green	Magnuson	Williams
Gurney	Malone	Withers

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to make one or two observations in connection with the statement made this morning by my friend the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] in connection with a newspaper story purporting to attribute to Dr. Nourse a statement to the general effect that the program of military aid to Europe would necessitate alterations in the Marshall plan. I think that fairly sums up what Dr. Nourse said. I do not know what the motive was for making that statement, nor do I grasp entirely what Dr. Nourse's qualifications are for passing on a matter which is as complex and as fast-changing as this subject is.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Is the Senator aware that the report which appeared in the Post was incorrect, and that Dr. Nourse's remarks were correctly reported in the Times-Herald? He did not bring the Marshall plan into the discussion.

Mr. LODGE. I was not aware of that. I am grateful to the Senator from Vermont for calling my attention to it. The story which I read did not make sense in terms of what I believe to be the prospect with regard to military aid.

It is my understanding that it is not planned for the first year to encourage the development of armed forces in Europe which will take any more manpower away from industry and agriculture in Europe than is being taken away at the present time. Of course, we do not begin fundamentally to change the economic situation in a country until the national defense establishment gets to

the point where it does take manpower away from peacetime pursuits. When that time comes, if it does come 2 or 3 or 4 years from now, then unquestionably it will be necessary to make an adjustment so far as the Marshall plan is concerned. But I cannot see any justification for making an adjustment now based on assumption of change in occupation. I merely wished to make that observation in the light of what the Senator from Missouri said.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he believes that the appropriation for the Marshall plan proposed in the authorization, together with the other necessary and reasonable items in the current budget, can be made without an increase in the present taxes on the American people.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes. I am opposed, I say to the Senator, to levying any more taxes on the American people. In fact, I think one of the most effective steps we can take toward getting some real economy is to refuse to levy any more taxes until some economies have been put into effect.

I note in the report of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch, commonly known as the Hoover Commission, an estimate that \$3,000,000,000 can be saved. I also believe that if we get real unification of the armed services we can save a great deal of money. Certainly I am opposed to voting for the imposition of more taxes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, is the Senator equally opposed to deficit financing?

Mr. LODGE. I am, in the sense that I think we should begin to cut down on the national debt. But if it were possible to eliminate the whole national debt tomorrow, I do not know that I would favor doing that, because, if my recollection of history is correct, I believe I remember that the British piled up a large national debt after the Napoleonic Wars, and kept it all the way through, and the belief was expressed at that time that if the British had suddenly abolished their entire national debt, it would have created a severe national and international financial panic. But I am not at all an expert on that matter; the Senator from Vermont is an expert on it.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Massachusetts wish to increase the national debt?

Mr. LODGE. No. I have just said that I think it should be reduced. How far it should be reduced or what the rate of reduction should be, are matters on which I am not an expert.

Mr. KEM. Very well. The Senator from Massachusetts will agree, will he not, that the item now proposed—a billion and a half dollars—to arm the nations of western Europe who become signatories to the North Atlantic Pact, is not contained in the President's budget and is not allowed for by the anticipated revenues of the United States for the present fiscal year?

Mr. LODGE. No; I would not agree to that, because I do not know how much

of that figure represents existing stocks of materials which we have already bought and paid for, and I do not know how much of that figure represents rather arbitrary estimates which may be made on the value of a tank destroyer, for instance, which was bought and paid for 4 or 5 years ago. So I cannot tell about that.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator from Massachusetts agree that whatever may be the figure of the expenditure that is necessary for arming the nations of western Europe under the provisions of the North Atlantic Pact, it is not contained in the President's budget.

Mr. LODGE. I do not want the Senator to think that I am doing any petty-foggery or quibbling, but I point out that we do not arm the nations of western Europe under the North Atlantic Pact. We can arm them without the North Atlantic Pact if we wish to do so. But so far as I know, the estimate is not contained in the President's budget.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator from Massachusetts tell us where he proposes to find this billion and a half dollars, if we neither increase the national debt nor increase the present tax burden on the American people?

Mr. LODGE. I have tried to indicate that. First of all, I think there are a great many very large economies which can be effected in the operations of our Government, and which should be effected. Then I think we should ascertain whether the figure of a billion and a half dollars is the correct figure. At the present time we do not have any definite figure before us. I think we should ascertain to what extent that figure represents items which have been bought and paid for already, and to what extent it indicates or would require new orders.

I think we must make up our minds about how much we can afford to spend on Government in general without ruining our economy. Certainly I think nothing would be more disastrous, not only to the United States, but also to the nations of western Europe, if you please, who are so dependent on us, than to have the American economy break down; and I hope while the foreign ministers are here in Washington this week, that some one will tell them that, and will point out to them that they have just as great a stake in the American economy as we have.

The National Security Resources Board, as I understand, passes on the effect of all these programs on the American economy, so far as scarcities are concerned, and also passes on the question of whether these programs will require and consume too much of our supplies of aluminum, steel, and so forth, and whether they will involve or require priorities or rationing. But I do not know of anyone, either in the executive branch or in the Congress, who has arrived at a definite formula or a definite set of principles in regard to how far we can go in Government spending before we run the risk of bankrupting our country. Certainly I do not think we should do that.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me say that I think that formula is very simple.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can yield only for a question, without losing the floor.

Mr. LODGE. I am willing to yield the floor, so far as that is concerned.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Is it not possible that if we declare certain war equipment which we now have, surplus, and send it to Europe on the basis of a valuation of 10 cents on the dollar, the replacement cost to us, in our own defense program, will be much more than the anticipated billion and a half or billion eight hundred million dollars which we propose to spend in the next year on armaments?

Mr. LODGE. That is one of the possibilities which must be worked out. Another is the extent to which the nations of Europe can manufacture their own weapons. All those are things which, so far as I know, have not been settled.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator know that at the conclusion of World War II, we left with Great Britain approximately \$6,400,000,000 worth of tanks, jeeps, trucks, antiaircraft guns, and other war equipment, and that we settled with Great Britain for that \$6,400,000,000 worth of strategic war materials for an I O U of \$640,000,000?

Mr. LODGE. I did not know those particular figures; but let me say that I do not doubt that the general tenor of the question of the Senator from Indiana can be answered emphatically in the affirmative, because, as I have said many times before on this floor, and I repeat it now, I think the civilian branch of our Government was totally unprepared for the end of hostilities, when that time came; and that is one of the tragic episodes in our history. Due to that, we had the total demobilization of all branches of our armed services, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, as fast as demobilization could be had, and we got rid of all that equipment as carelessly as we did. I think that is just too bad; and when we have made a mistake of that sort, I think we should learn from experience, and not repeat the mistake.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator from Massachusetts believe that the addition of a proposed plan of sending arms to Europe is inextricably confused or involved with the ECA plan; and does not the Senator from Massachusetts believe that when the other plan comes to us, it must be coordinated and worked out together with the ECA plan and program?

Mr. LODGE. I said, perhaps before the Senator from Ohio appeared in his seat, that when the military establishments of Europe reach a size where they are taking manpower from the normal peacetime pursuits of Europe, in both industry and agriculture—something which is not anticipated or planned, as

I understand it, for the next year—then of course the military-aid plan will have a very direct impact on the whole plan for the economic recovery of Europe, and the Marshall-plan figures will have to be readjusted.

But for the coming year I think it is not planned to increase the size of the manpower complement of the European military establishment, so I do not think what the Senator from Ohio has suggested will be true as of this year.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. If we are going to try to build up in the western European countries the military units which now exist, building them up with money and arms from the United States, does it not follow that Europe also will have to do a part of that job and will have to turn a part of its productive enterprises into the task of completely rearming its military units? Is not that inevitable? Therefore, are we to put up 100 percent of the materials and funds needed for that purpose?

Mr. LODGE. Let us talk about the first period, to June 1950. For that period of time I do not envisage any increased demands on the civilian population of military age in Europe at all. Nor do I think the production of weapons or the manufacture of weapons by the nations of Europe will that first year attain proportions which will be significant in terms of the economy of those countries. I think for the year after that the military program would have a very definite impact on the Marshall plan, because I think undoubtedly it will be thought generally desirable to have them manufacture part of this equipment. But there is yet another decision which we have got to make, let me say to the Senator from Ohio. We can take the view that we want to preserve our own resources, we want to keep our own manufacturing potentials here for civilian goods, for radios and ice boxes and so forth, or if we have a depression in this country, and we have unemployment, we may decide we want to fabricate the whole arms program here. Those are decisions we have not made yet, that we have to think over. On the basis of military efficiency, it is certainly desirable for the nations of Europe to make many of the things that they can make themselves, subject, of course, to as great a production of standard types as possible.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator will permit me to read briefly from the statement made by the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Nourse, as it appears in the New York Times, and see whether the Senator agrees with the conclusion there stated.

Dr. Nourse is quoted as saying:

In line with what I said earlier about the intermeshing of the military machine and the industrial plant and labor force, it is evident that ECA (the Economic Cooperation Administration) funds and administration must be regarded as an integral part of the plan of American security and sustained prosperity within the setting of the world economy—that is, the international economy of the free nations.

The relative parts to be played by military and by industrial preparedness in each of the participating countries, and the relative roles to be played by each arm of the military service at the most effective points must be reexamined in the light of the new strategic concept and with no dangerous backward look at traditional positions of prestige, historic roles, or impressive trappings.

We cannot afford to make the costs of its implementation a simple addition to other military plans as they stood before the new alignment. Rather must we rework the whole operation and financial plan so as to gain maximum security with minimum strain on our economy.

That I think is the essence of Dr. Nourse's speech. I wonder whether the Senator from Massachusetts agrees with that?

Mr. LODGE. On the whole, yes. I think the whole program will have to be reexamined. We must not shrink from reexamining the whole program. I think the whole program ought to be subject to continuous reexamination and analysis. I agree with Dr. Nourse that it is not a question of making a simple addition, and I think we must be prepared to rework the whole operation when it becomes necessary to do so. I was simply expressing my guess, just as one humble student of the problem, and I am not on the inside, and I have no secrets at all, that the program will not drastically affect the operation of the Marshall plan for this first year.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to inquire, in the form of a question, whether the Senator from Massachusetts would like to have me read another section of Dr. Nourse's address.

Mr. LODGE. I always like to hear the Senator from Vermont, whether he is using his own words or those of somebody else.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wanted to make sure that I was asking a question. Earlier in Dr. Nourse's remarks occurs a passage which I think throws light on the last passage read by the senior Senator from Ohio. Dr. Nourse said:

Legislation now being readied for Congress is reported to total \$1,800,000,000 for arms shipments—including continuation of Greek-Turkey aid and the value of supplies sent to western Europe from current American stocks.

"It would be wrong to conclude," Dr. Nourse said in alluding to this plan, "that we can, without concern, add these expenditures, whatever they are, to the present budget items for national security."

His plea as I read this statement, and as I am informed from his office, particularly related to the two items of military expenditure, and throughout his talk he was making the plea that the Atlantic Pact should in net result make it less expensive for America to maintain its defense than if we were doing the whole thing alone, and he supplements that conclusion by suggesting that the military appropriations should be made inclusive of European aid instead of having European aid added to it.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say in response to the Senator from Vermont that I think

of course this military-aid program is going to save us a great deal in the long run. I think it ought to cost us much less to do it this way than to try to do the equivalent all by ourselves. When I make that statement, I not only include weapons and munitions, which I do include, but of course I also include something that is even more precious and more fundamental to the welfare of the country, and that is our young manhood. I yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, will he yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. There has been some question about who Dr. Nourse is, and what authority he had. As I read the report—and I wonder whether the Senator read it—the observations of Dr. Nourse were made, were they not, with the full approval of the President?

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator from Nebraska asks me whether the President approves Dr. Nourse's statement—

Mr. WHERRY. I merely inquire, does the Senator know?

Mr. LODGE. I do not have the President's confidence, and he has not told me whether he approves it or not.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought the Senator was giving his interpretation of what Dr. Nourse said. I read the same article. I think it was placed in the Record, and I suppose it is the statement other Senators have read. I understood it was stated somewhere in the newspaper article that his remarks and observations were made with the full approval of the President of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. I do not know.

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

Mr. LODGE. I think I still have the floor. I want to respond first to the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor, and has been asked a question by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to respond to the Senator from Nebraska in my own way. I do not know whether Dr. Nourse's statement was approved by the President or not. I was drawing merely my own personal conclusions on the subject, which I reached by myself, without talking to anybody, I may say.

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

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Dr. Nourse made the express statement that the President had seen the speech, but that the President had neither approved nor disapproved any of the features of the speech.

Mr. LODGE. I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN and Mr. WILEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I believe that especially under the present turn of our economy, and at all times, we have two overriding objectives to which all our programs must defer. One is to keep this country safe; the other is to keep it solvent. The two are interdependent. I agree entirely with the warning given us the other day by the

distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, that an increase in taxes at this time, or going into deficit financing at this time, might very well deliver a blow to the economy of this country that would be catastrophic. Either of these courses might very well plunge us out of our present recession or deflation or whatever we care to call our present economic condition into ruinous depression.

I supported the original full authorization for ECA, and I shall support this one in full. But from the very beginning it has been understood that the operation of ECA and the cost of it would not be allowed to jeopardize the economy of this Nation. Therefore I earnestly hope that the Appropriations Committee, if we are to have a North Atlantic Pact—and I suppose we shall have it—and if we are to implement it, and we may implement it, will offset against the appropriations under this authorization the amount of the implementation. I go further, Mr. President, and say that I hope it will make such further adjustments under this authorization and others before it that may be necessary to prevent increasing taxes or putting this country into deficit financing.

Mr. WILEY and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on the 30th day of March I had a few words to say on this subject, and I shall be very brief at this time.

One of the significant things with which I am impressed is the silent voice of the American citizen in this constitutional Republic on the issues which we are debating in the Senate. To me, it is a good omen. When I say that there has been silence, I mean that there has been scarcely a murmur of American opposition to the Marshall plan; and one can say that is substantially true in relation to the discussion of the Atlantic Pact; so far as it has been discussed. I am judging from my own mail, and I am trying to find the answer, because I still receive approximately 700 letters a day.

Why is the voice of the American people silent? I diagnose the situation to be as follows: There runs through the mixed strain of blood, which has made America, a strong ingredient of common sense. Lincoln thanked God for the common man, the man who had to work for his living, not the man who is the creature of synthetic education, or the beneficiary of mental and physical idleness, but the ordinary man who possesses common sense. So I think, contrary to the condition before we got into the Second World War when we received thousands of letters, the common sense of the American citizen has cut through all the maze, the haze, and the confusion; and what does he see? He sees that the world has turned a corner and that every nation is in every other nation's backyard, speaking literally and not figuratively. American invention and ingenuity have brought about that situation.

Readers of history realize that it was the small nations, such as Israel, Athens, Florence, Elizabethan England, which placed their stamp upon history

and put mankind in their debt. The big nations could not stand bigness. The big nations of the past were like Russia is today. They became autocratic. They stifled freedom and individual initiative; they rubbed out the advances of the race which the small nations had wrought; they crushed out the principles of justice and freedom. The American Nation has grown big, but it is not crushing out freedom. It is not asking; it is giving. Freedom and justice obtain in this Nation, and we are endeavoring to give them to others. Of course we are not trying to get for other nations anything but what we ourselves have. We are trying to extend freedom and peace to all peoples.

As I analyze the situation, Mr. President, we are living in a great time in the history of the world. It is worth while to be a part of this great adventure. The common man is not forgetting that we got into two world wars without any arrangements, without any treaties or pacts. We got into them after we had outlawed war in the Kellogg Pact and after placing an embargo on arms. We got into the Second World War after we had talked about peace and great principles. Somehow or other, the common man realizes that talk is not sufficient. I believe he realizes that talk is very cheap. He realizes, much more than do some leaders, that men must create circumstances. The common man realizes that, while circumstances alter cases, our job is to see that we make circumstances that do not alter our case so that we lose our freedom. I believe the common man realizes that the Atlantic Pact and the American commitments constitute a deterrent to Communist aggression.

I desire to speak a few words on a question which has been discussed freely and the economic principles which are involved. I refer to the obligation of the Appropriations Committee. We have the President's budget. That is not sacrosanct. There is not an item in it that should be so held. We have commitments under the Marshall plan. They are not sacrosanct, either. I want to repeat, in substance, what I said when I spoke on the 30th of March. I think this kind of repetition is wholesome, or I should not take the time of the Senate with it.

Mr. President, I want to say that authorization should never be the equivalent of appropriation. Under the circumstances in which America finds itself today, in which some persons say unemployment is steadily increasing and may mount into the millions, we are about to enter into a pact which will operate as a deterrent. This fact, together with the other circumstances I have mentioned, must be considered by the Appropriations Committee. I am not saying that going into the "red" will mean disaster. We have had to go into the "red" before. I am saying that the Appropriations Committee cannot "pass the buck" in this case, because every Member of the Senate who has spoken has been emphatic to the effect that that is his conviction. Personally, if given an opportunity when the time comes, not to consider the matter piecemeal, but to consider the over-all economic implications

of this vast program upon which we are entering, I shall be very happy to appear before the committee and give my own judgment. I realize it is not very significant, and yet, Mr. President, I represent 3,300,000 persons who know how to build a State, men and women who have made out of forests and prairies a State, which is 50 percent industrial and 50 percent agricultural, men who have never discounted the fundamental principle of Franklin that they should save, that a stitch in time saves nine. Yet those people, many of whom have Germanic background, according to the FBI, provided the cleanest State in the Union from the standpoint of saboteurs, and so forth. That is my State.

Representing those people, Mr. President, I repeat that I think the Appropriations Committee must consider a number of things:

First, fluctuations in cost and the value of the dollar. I am talking now about the time that has elapsed between last November, and June and July, when we will get the final figure as to what we are going to spend.

Second, the possibility or likelihood of fluctuations in respect to the needs of the recipient countries. It is strange, Mr. President, but I happened to open today one of the reports from Washington which just came in, and I ask Senators to listen to this:

Top financial men of the American ECA missions abroad are being ordered to Paris to discuss the proposed revision of the European payments plan and other fiscal matters. It has already been publicly announced that Tasca, who is alternate American Executive Director of the monetary fund, will also be in attendance.

Mr. President, I believe the discussion here, if it shall accomplish else, will have impressed upon all of us the seriousness of the economic situation as it appears now, and as it will continue to appear.

Another proposition I suggest is the fluctuation in American revenues. A man with a big balance can afford to be liberal. A man without a balance in the bank has to think about himself and his obligations to his own. I say this is a tremendously important item.

Another item is fluctuations in the revenues within the recipient countries. We do not know what those countries are going to do within 6 months. We do not know what their revenues will be. We note that in the sterling area they are doing a good business, and that England particularly has a balance in her favor in dealing in the sterling area.

Another item which we must consider, and which was so graphically pictured this morning by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], is America's need. That is an element in determining how much we can spend. We have a multitude of needs which must be considered. I shall not delineate them. Senators will remember that he who does not look after his own is unworthy.

Another item which must be considered in the whole economic problem is the world picture. What do I mean by that? Suppose conditions in Europe become worse; are we going to say that we cannot afford to aid her economically? Of course not. We never did

that; but we know that the political situation in the world tomorrow will be one of the great imponderables in determining the course we shall take, not only politically but economically.

Another factor is the North Atlantic Pact, which has been discussed in the Senate. As I entered the Chamber today I heard some comment in relation to Mr. Nourse's statement. How much can we afford to appropriate in view of the political situations as they exist when we appropriate the money? We might ask, Will the signing of the pact, the continuing of ECA, operate as a deterrent? If it does, that is an element to consider when we are asking how much we shall appropriate in June or July, considering our own economic needs and our own wants.

Mr. President, I shall not go into another problem which I think we should ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to discuss at some time when we are considering the pact, namely, the currency problem in Europe. The exchange of currency is one of the basic factors.

Much is being said as to devaluation. In reading one of the reports today I found that it was stated that our own businessmen, who were trying to do business in Europe, were very much concerned about devaluation. Washington is flooded with protests from American businessmen to the effect that currency valuations in Europe, with their various restrictions, are operating as a discrimination against them. So long as there is a world sellers' market, this does not matter much, but the discriminations become a factor of vital importance in a buyers' market.

Mr. President, all those factors must be considered in determining what we are to do in respect to the amount of money we are going to spend. I repeat, we are the masters of what we spend, not the President in his budget, and we must not get into the habit of passing the buck to the President, and especially now, if we are going into a little tailspin economically, we must consider how much of the money that is going to Europe, whether it be in preparation for defense or in relation to contributions under the Marshall plan, is to be spent to create jobs and to promote production in America.

I covered that subject in my previous remarks, and I shall not repeat, except to say that last year, in November, that was not so significant as it is now. Therefore I only say to the Administrator, "This imposes an additional burden on you and your associates, Mr. Hoffman, because now the call is coming from America." Yet we do not want to enter upon another WPA program, creating useless jobs. If we are going further into a tailspin, we want to build constructively, we want to build values, we want to construct things like the St. Lawrence waterway, in connection with which we are asked to make a loan, and not spend money which we will not get back, but which will produce wealth, jobs, and income, and increase and strengthen the economy of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). The question is on agree-

ing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like very briefly to discuss something which occurred on the Senate floor yesterday. I particularly call the attention of the Senator from Texas to this.

I might say, first, that last year we developed a very healthy habit of depending to a great extent upon the Committee on Foreign Relations. We knew that when we submitted an amendment to any legislation which was before that committee, the then chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], would carefully scrutinize the amendment, that he would submit it to the very able staff which he had, and we knew that if he then opposed the amendment his opposition was based strictly on the merits, and on nothing else.

Unfortunately, this year we cannot indulge in the same assumption. Yesterday, for example, we were discussing an amendment designed to prevent discriminations against American nationals in French Morocco, discriminations not in favor of the natives of French Morocco, but in favor of European nationals, and the able Senator from Texas said:

Mr. President, I should like to take about two minutes of the Senator's time. I have a list of the old companies that have been in Morocco doing business for years, who are not complaining about this matter at all. The list is as follows.

Of course, all of us who were listening to the Senator from Texas, knowing that he has been working on this matter for months, assumed that he was referring to American companies. We had no reason to assume that he would list for our benefit a group of French companies. He read this list. I have in my hand a statement handed to me by Mr. Robert E. Rodes, who was commander of the American Legion in French Morocco. Mr. Rodes is also a reserve officer in the Corps of Army Engineers. He is a man who did a great deal of work, as the Senate knows, in preparing for the American landings in French North Africa. This is what Mr. Rodes has to say:

The undersigned heard a list read of American firms who were engaged in business in Morocco and who had not complained of treatment there. Most of the names read are well known to the undersigned. They are not American firms but French firms or Moroccan corporations of French ownership who represent American products. Several of them have strong French political backing. Even if they wished to complain the reprisals to which they would be exposed would render this unwise.

To the best of the undersigned's knowledge only two companies in the list would be eligible for membership in the American Trade Association. These are the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. and the Texas Co.

I may say that I do not think the Senator from Texas was attempting deliberately to deceive the Senate. I am sure he was not. I am sure that it was not an attempt to deceive the Senate, but was the result of a bad memory, because these letters have all been brought to his attention previously. I have the letters before me, letters which were written to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I continue to read from the letter:

While these companies are too dependent on their relationship with the petroleum control authorities to make strong official protests, the undersigned knows that when he left Casablanca paint badly needed for maintenance by the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. was being illegally held by custom authorities in Casablanca and that the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. lodged a complaint about this. The Socony-Vacuum Co. has paid under protest taxes which their legal advisers and United States diplomatic authorities consider illegal.

This is referring to one of the companies which the Senator from Texas told us was perfectly satisfied and had no complaint.

To the best of the undersigned's knowledge and belief, with the exception of these two oil companies, there is only one other eligible concern in Casablanca that is not a member of the American Trade Association. It is repeated that American firms represented or managed by foreigners are not eligible.

The inclusion of Coca-Cola in the list is particularly ironical. Coca-Cola is produced and distributed by a Moroccan corporation, largely financed with French capital and with strong political backing from Paris. Arrangements are being made even to furnish the sirup from France. This company was able to receive official exchange for many articles that were merely incidental to its operation and large rations of dollar value sugar while the undersigned was denied exchange for rock bits needed for mining. When an American veteran wanted to start a Coca-Cola plant in the city of Fez he was told that he would have to have 75-percent French ownership.

I call this to the attention of the Senator from Texas with the hope that he may tell the Senate that he was mistaken yesterday when he gave us a long list of French companies and mistakenly represented to the Senate that they were American companies.

I should also like to refer briefly to a statement made by the Senator from Texas as it appears on page 4054 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We were speaking of the discrimination against American veterans of World War II in French Morocco. We were referring to the practice of the local Vichy officials to try and put Americans out of business with American dollars. I quote the Senator from Texas:

But let us not interrupt the work of the ECA simply because some individual may find a single complaint involving one little incident. The chief difficulty complained of is in connection with the sale of automobile tires. I do not know the details, but apparently the complaint is that the agents for some of the automobile manufacturers cannot sell as many tires as they would like to sell.

I shall repeat that, in view of the letter which the Senator from Texas had in his possession at that time. I repeat the statement he made:

I do not know the details, but apparently the complaint is that the agents for some of the automobile manufacturers cannot sell as many tires as they would like to sell.

At the time the Senator from Texas made that statement he had in his possession, or at least had received—and again I say I am sure he was not deliberately trying to deceive the Senate; I am sure it was merely the result of a

bad memory—he had in his possession a letter setting forth in detail the situation in regard to the sale of tires in French Morocco, a situation which had been brought to the attention of the State Department, a situation which the State Department recognized was very, very bad, a situation set forth in the letter of January 5, 1949, in which the Senator was notified that the French customs officials—and I again call that fact to the attention of the Senators—the French customs officials, the port-control authorities, are in many cases the identical Vichy authorities who were in charge at the time we made our landings at Casablanca.

For the benefit of Senators who were not present yesterday, I will say that in that particular case one of the officers of our American Legion post in French Morocco, a World War II veteran, had been jailed by a French official at the time we were making our landings, jailed because he was active in the preparation of those landings. Of course, he would have been shot had we been unsuccessful. Our landings were successful and he was released. This young veteran now must go to that Vichy official who had him jailed while we were making our landings, and try to get some satisfaction from him.

As I told Senators the other day, when our consul goes down and says to this man, "Release this material which you are holding illegally; you cannot charge a 'take' of 150 percent," he will say, "Well, try and do something about it. Your Army is not here now and your Navy is not here now."

I call attention to the fact that this was all brought to the attention of the Senator from Texas in a letter written on the 5th of January 1949, in connection with the statement he made on the floor. Senators will understand that what I say is not intended to be a criticism of the Senator from Texas, but I think it is highly important for the reason that the Senate must be able to depend upon the word of the chairman of the committee. When the chairman of the committee rises on the floor of the Senate and tells the Senate that a certain fact is true, even though the Senator does not intend to deceive the Senate, and if it is the result of bad memory, the end result is that it is just as bad as though he were deliberately trying to deceive us.

I am going to read another letter in connection with the Senator's statement that he knew of only one minor incident resulting in complaint. I read a letter, a copy of which was sent to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, on February 17, 1949.

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I will not yield until I finish reading the letter.

Further to my letter of today concerning the new and illegal sanctions which are being applied to Americans in the empire of Morocco by the French protectorate government, I wish to bring to your attention my personal difficulties that are a result of this situation, and which are very typical of the difficulties experienced by all the Americans in business in Morocco today.

I am a resident of the city of Rochester, N. Y., a veteran of 5 years in the United States Air Forces during the war, 2 years of which were spent overseas, and after my discharge I came here to Casablanca, Morocco, to build my own business. For the last 2 years I have worked hard to create something for myself that I could call my own and be justified in the normal pride that I feel in the results of these efforts.

During this period I have succeeded in setting up an excellent bus line between the cities of Casablanca and Agadir which runs approximately the full length of Morocco in the French zone along the coastline. These busses are GMC coaches, which are exactly the same models used by the Greyhound Lines in the United States. Obviously, with material and equipment of this sort, my bus line is the very finest that can be seen anywhere in Europe, and especially north Africa. It is not possible to exaggerate the service that these busses render the Moroccan public, and certainly so, when any kind of comparison is made between my own line, Les Pullman du Sud, and the ancient, creaking firetraps of the French government-owned vehicles of the CTM (Compagnie des Transports au Maroc), of which there is an absolute government monopoly (as everything is nationalized and government-owned), which has set out to sweep any other existing lines off the Moroccan highways.

Now that this bus line is running smoothly and with every trip in itself meaning excellent publicity for American technique and know-how, and with the complete approval and appreciation that the Moroccan public has granted it, this new French coup d'état has fallen on my own and other American businesses, setting off confusion and chaos.

My busses are American built; therefore, this means that I must maintain spare-parts supplies from the factories in the United States. Recently I ordered certain spare parts that I needed most urgently, requesting that they be forwarded to me by air. This was done, but in the meantime, upon arrival at the airport in Casablanca, the French customs officials refused to deliver me these goods on the grounds that the protectorate government has stopped all importations, especially from the United States, and that all I need do is to "send them back to the United States." Upon this flat refusal and definitely unfriendly and belligerent attitude of the protectorate government, I sent the following cable to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington requesting their aid and investigation in this matter:

"Spare parts for bus line operated by undersigned veteran arrived by air being held illegally by French. Please have State Department cable instructions and please answer American Legion's reply paid cable of January 29.

"CARL HUMPHREY,
"Usamo Casablanca."

Obviously, if this illegal blockade of American goods and capital continues, my large and long-term financial investment in this country and my bus line are doomed to crumble into dust, just as the rest of the American interests which are caught in the same impossible straits as my own.

I cite my own case; however, this is representative of the same situation for every American in business in Morocco, and our Government must not ignore our appeals for their help in this time when the French are throwing all agreements and treaty rights that we have enjoyed for over a century in this country right out of the window.

The letter continues, citing other instances.

Mr. President, while I am not at this time asking for reconsideration of the vote yesterday on the amendment re-

lating to this subject, I strongly feel that had the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee taken the time to study this amendment, had he refreshed his memory on the situation, had he, instead of telling us yesterday that a list of French companies which he read were American companies, that they had not objected, and therefore we should not adopt the amendment, gone into the subject in detail and found that the French Vichy officials are using American dollars to put Americans out of business in Morocco, I do not believe he would have made the mistake he made yesterday. Had he not made that mistake, I feel that the amendment would have passed.

Mr. President, I feel that it is extremely unfortunate that we must write legislation on the floor of the Senate. When we attempt to do so without being able to depend on the chairman of the committee, we get bad legislation. I know that last year we went along with the idea that we had a very competent Foreign Relations Committee. I know from personal experience during the Eightieth Congress that we could submit any amendment to the chairman of the committee, and the amendments were accepted or rejected solely upon their merits. Much as I dislike to bring up this question today, I think it should be brought to the attention of the Senate. Because of the bad memory of the Senator from Texas, or for some other reason—and I wish to emphasize that I am sure that he did not try deliberately to deceive us—we have an end result which is the same as though he were trying deliberately to deceive us.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to reply in kind to the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin. He accuses the Senator from Texas either of ignorance or misrepresentation, neither of which happens to be the fact in this case.

The Committee on Foreign Relations went out of its way to give attention to the complaints about which the Senator from Wisconsin is talking. I talked with Mr. Rodes, to whom reference has been made, and who has been haunting the galleries and the committee rooms for a long time. We took him into the committee room after the hearings were concluded and introduced him to the Secretary of State and the Assistant Secretary of State. He told them about this complaint. They took him to the State Department, and he talked with a number of persons in the State Department.

The facts which I stated are taken from a printed House committee report. The companies which I mentioned are American companies. Of course they have some French employees, just as other concerns have French employees.

Mr. President, I do not care to pursue the subject further. The Senator from Wisconsin has had his day in court. He had the opportunity to debate this question endlessly, and the Senate rejected his two amendments overwhelmingly.

With that I rest the case.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I will not yield. The Senator would not yield to me. I decline to yield.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Texas would not yield to me, I claim the floor in my own right.

I suggest to the Senator from Texas that in fairness to the Senate, if he is not convinced at this time that the list of companies which he gave us yesterday, allegedly as American companies, are operated with French capital by French boards of directors and presidents, he should at least check into the situation and come back and tell the Senate what the situation is.

Yesterday the Senator from Texas told the Senate that he knew of only one complaint from French Morocco. Those of us who have been checking into this question know that there is a whole series of complaints, extending over a year or a year and a half. As of today, the French in French Morocco are putting Americans out of business with American dollars. If they want to wreck American businessmen by using their own money to do it, that is all right; but I believe that when they are using American ECA funds to wreck American businessmen, especially World War II veterans, and when we have a chain of documented cases, it is unfair to the Senate for the Senator from Texas to say that he knows of only one minor case. If as of this time he does not know of the chain of circumstances, in view of the important position which he holds in the Senate, I urge that he go into the subject and tell the Senate exactly what the situation is. If he will do that, then I shall move for reconsideration of the vote on my amendment, and I am sure that it will be adopted unanimously once the Senate knows the extent to which we are going in French Morocco, using roughly \$3,200,000 a month to wreck American business.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas will undertake to guide his conduct by what he thinks is right. The Senator from Texas has no commission from the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, not only have we referred this question to the State Department, but the facts which we have cited are based upon a committee report from the House of Representatives and upon information which we obtained from the State Department. If any additional information comes to my attention, I have no disposition to withhold it from the committee.

Mr. President, this question has been disposed of. We had a day's debate on it. Two amendments were offered, and the Senate overwhelmingly rejected them both.

I do not care to give any more of my time or attention to the subject at this time.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to state that I have been informed by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] that he, in turn, has today been informed by some London newspaperman or representative of a London newspaper that the Mr. David Williams mentioned on the document from which the junior Senator from Indiana read earlier in the day is not the Labor Member of Parliament to whom I referred. The Who's Who applicable to Great Britain indicated a David Williams, with an initial which did not appear on the document. The question which I asked, both of the Senator from Indiana and of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as to whether the two names represented the same person was based upon the similarity of names.

I wanted that information to go into the RECORD as soon as I learned it from the Senator from Indiana, which was only a few minutes ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we have already had a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What was the decision of the Chair on the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I inquire if any business has been transacted since the previous quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No business has intervened since the previous quorum call.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EASTLAND (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is absent on public business. If the Senator from South Carolina were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is necessarily absent and is paired on this vote with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], who is detained on official business at one of the Government departments. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business at Government departments.

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

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay" on this amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 72, as follows:

YEAS—10

Bricker	Jenner	Wherry
Butler	Kem	Williams
Capehart	Langer	
Eaton	Malone	

NAYS—72

Alken	Holland	Murray
Anderson	Humphrey	Myers
Brewster	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	O'Connor
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Pepper
Connally	Kefauver	Reed
Cordon	Kerr	Robertson
Donnell	Kilgore	Russell
Douglas	Knowland	Saltonstall
Downey	Lodge	Schoeppel
Ellender	Long	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	McCarran	Sparkman
Flanders	McCarthy	Stennis
Frear	McClellan	Taft
Fulbright	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
George	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Green	McKellar	Thye
Gurney	McMahon	Tobey
Hayden	Maybank	Vandenberg
Hendrickson	Miller	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Wiley
Hill	Morse	Withers
Hoey	Mundt	Young

NOT VOTING—14

Baldwin	Graham	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Taylor
Byrd	Lucas	Tydings
Eastland	Magnuson	Wagner
Gillette	Martin	

So Mr. MALONE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEM, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the senior Senator from Missouri, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may yield the floor.

Mr. KEM. I do not want to yield the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may without prejudice yield to the senior Senator from Missouri for the purpose of making a short statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONNELL. I merely desire to make a correction.

Mr. KEM. I yield to the senior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire, with reference to the David Williams to whom I referred a few moments ago on the floor as a member of Parliament, to state that the full name of Mr. Williams, as it appears in the British Who's Who for 1948, is David James Williams. I thank the Senator.

NATIONALIZATION OF INDUSTRY

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I call up my amendment G to the pending measure, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, between lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Section 111 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) No assistance shall be furnished under this act to any participating country, the government of which shall undertake, after the date of enactment of this subsection, to acquire and operate, in whole or in part, the iron and steel industry of such country or any other basic industry thereof."

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to prevent the money of American taxpayers being used to finance and implement the experiments in socialism in Europe. I explained the amendment in some detail last week, but a number of the Senators who are now present were not on the floor at that time. I should like to summarize briefly what I had to say at that time.

INCONSISTENT TO SPEND BILLIONS TO STOP COMMUNISM AND AT THE SAME TIME TO SPEND BILLIONS TO SUBSIDIZE SOCIALISM

It is inconsistent for the United States to be spending billions of dollars in order to stop the spread of communism in Europe, and at the same time to spend billions of dollars to subsidize socialism in Europe. Communism and socialism are the fruit of the same tree, and the tree has its roots in the theories of Karl Marx. Their ideologies are the same with one distinction. The Communist seeks to reach his goal, which is the abolition of private property and the nationalization of the means of production, if necessary, by revolution and violence. The Socialist, or national Socialist, as he is sometimes called, seeks to reach the same goal, the same identical objective, by so-called democratic methods.

The other day I quoted Mr. Churchill in regard to the objective of these Socialist Parties on the continent of Europe and in the British Isles. Mr. Churchill said in effect that the Socialist Parties in Europe, are the handmaids and heralds of communism and prepare the way at every stage and at every step for its further advance. Communism is the form of Marxism developed in Russia. The Government of the U. S. S. R. is controlled by members of the Communist Party. Socialism, or national socialism, is the form of Marxism developed in England, and the Government of England is controlled by members of the Socialist Party in that country. They have made a great deal of headway in England. The other day I set out in my

remarks a list of 10 of the principal industries of England that have already been nationalized, that are already owned and operated by the Socialist government. I also at that time set out in my remarks a list of 23 of the basic industries of France that are now owned and operated by the Government of France. The majority leader referred the other day to France as the weakest link in the Marshall plan chain.

Mr. President, the process of nationalization or socialization has been accelerated by the use of Marshall plan money. The latest project pending in England is the seizure by the Government of the basic iron and steel industry. But that is not the only industry the Socialist Party in England has in mind taking over and operating. The other day one of the leaders of the English Socialist Party was a visitor in Washington, Prof. Harold J. Laski, reputed to be the head of the Brain Trust of the English Socialist Party. Mr. Laski said the Socialist Party had in mind taking over three of the principal industries, adding very significantly, "Nothing but force will make me tell what they are."

So, Mr. President, the American taxpayer is not only buying into a pool of socialism, but, to a large extent, he is buying into a blind pool. He knows not what he does.

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

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Did Mr. Laski indicate why he was so secretive with reference to these particular industries? The statement is so interesting and challenging that I would like to have some amplification of it.

Mr. KEM. He did not say. But he is a very intelligent man, and he undoubtedly knew the present measure was pending in this body at the time of his remarks.

Mr. President, all these industries which have been nationalized or socialized in England, I think, without exception, have been unsuccessful from a financial standpoint in their operations. The British Transport Commission announced that for the first fiscal year there would be a loss of \$112,000,000. That is the dollar shortage which I suppose will be made up by Marshall Plan money, if the pending amendment is rejected.

During the first year after socialization, the coal industry lost \$94,000,000. That is another dollar shortage.

Civil aviation—and I shall have more to say regarding that in a moment—lost \$100,000,000 in the first 14 months of operation.

Electricity, in the first few months after it had been socialized, lost \$28,000,000.

It is interesting to note particularly the experience of the British Government in coal production. During 1938, the last year before the war, the British coal industry, which was not then socialized, produced 227,000,000 tons. The first year after socialization, production dropped down to 208,500,000 tons. So it goes—

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

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator give us the amount of production last year?

Mr. KEM. The actual production, as I understand, was 208,500,000 tons, although 8,000 more men were employed than were employed in 1938 under private operation.

There is an interesting comparison between that record and the record of the steel industry, which has remained under private ownership. During the period in which the coal industry was losing ground the steel industry was gaining ground. The steel industry was called on by the British Government, under their plan, to produce 14,500,000 tons. Under private ownership they actually produced 14,900,000 tons.

What we are being asked to do, Mr. President, is to send to England, to be used in financing these experiments in socialism, money of the American taxpayer, earned under a system of free enterprise and personal initiative.

I quoted a day or two ago an American businessman who is now domiciled in Europe. He had this to say:

We are showing these Europeans that we have a h— of a lot of money and d— little sense to go with it.

PRIVATELY OWNED BUSINESS WILL COMPETE WITH GOVERNMENT-OWNED ENTERPRISE

Mr. President, I want to invite the attention of the Senate to what are some of the most serious aspects of this subject, namely, that we are taking the money of the American taxpayers and building up government-owned industry in Europe which will compete with American industry in the markets of the world and also in many of our own markets in the United States. The American businessman has always prided himself on his ability to compete. Our standard of living is higher; our wages are higher. American industry had some tariff protection in the past, but, generally speaking, the American businessman feels that with an even break he can hold his own with producers anywhere. But, Mr. President, there is no even break when he is called upon to compete with a government cartel, a government operation which enjoys freedom from taxes, a government operation which enjoys innumerable special advantages, and, beyond all, has been financed with money gathered by the tax collector in part from American producers themselves. The plain fact is that the moneys of the American taxpayers are being used for that exact purpose. It will have three serious effects on our economy, in my judgment. In the first place, it will put the American producer at a distinct disadvantage, as I have said. In the second place, it will progressively cut off the flow of raw materials from foreign countries and their colonies into American enterprise. In the third place, as we have already seen this process taking place, it will invite American companies to establish factories in those foreign countries where they can enjoy the relatively cheap labor enjoyed by government-owned enterprises.

I shall not take the time of the Senate in discussing this subject in great detail.

I set it out in some detail in my remarks last week. But I want to invite the attention of the Senators who are present to one situation in connection with civil aviation.

The British Overseas Lines, which is rendering service between the British Isles and America, is owned by the British Government. It recently announced that it was purchasing a considerable number of Boeing Stratospheres at a cost of \$15,000,000. Of course, it is perfectly obvious that the \$15,000,000 for that government enterprise comes from American taxpayers. There is no other place from which the money can be had, if we are to judge from the figures given us here. The American company, which is privately owned, and which is engaged in the same business, flying from New York to London, is required to compete with the government-owned industry. What about the financing of our American competing company? It is called American Overseas. Until recently it was a subsidiary of the American Air Lines, Inc. American Air Lines, Inc., announced recently that it had disposed of its overseas subsidiary, and it gave this very striking reason, which appears in the annual report of the American Airlines recently published. I read from the report the other day, but I shall read it again:

American Airlines has no additional funds for the purpose of investment in Overseas Airlines, and presently has no source from which it can secure such additional capital.

In other words, the experience of the private line in competition with these government-owned lines has been bad. They have shown deficits instead of profits which does not induce private investors to risk their money in competing with these government-owned lines.

To the same effect we see that the Belgian line has announced the purchase of some great Convairs, the very latest ships, which as I understand cost \$450,000 apiece, the kind of ships which the lines operating in my State as a rule cannot afford. The Belgian line is a beneficiary under the Marshall plan.

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

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator realize that the British Government has thought it prudent not only to provide the assistance, as the Senator said, covering an annual deficit of around \$40,000,000, and approximately \$15,000,000 more required to purchase these 10 stratospheres from Boeing, but has also allocated \$600,000,000 to establish the supremacy of British commercial aviation around the world, in direct competition with our own air lines, which are struggling vainly to meet that competition with the limited Government aid which we have found it possible thus far to provide?

Mr. KEM. I did not know that. The situation is worse from the standpoint of an American than I had anticipated.

Mr. BREWSTER. If the Senator will read the British white paper of 2 years ago, he will find the plan and the commitments outlined and a very similar

analogy prevails in the expansion of the British merchant marine to a point considerably in excess of its prewar scope.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I hope those figures will be brought to the attention of the Administrator of ECA. Surely, he does not know of them. It would seem that we have had less sense than I thought.

THE INTERFERING IN THE INTERNAL ECONOMY OF ANOTHER COUNTRY ARGUMENT

I now wish to address myself to the argument which has been used against my amendment by several of the proponents of the ECA program with whom I have discussed it. They have said, "Of course we believe in free enterprise, we believe in private initiative and the American way of life, but we do not feel that we should interfere in the internal economy of another country."

Mr. President, with all due respect to the Senators who have made it, I think that argument is wholly unsound. The whole ECA program is an interference, on a gigantic scale, with the internal economy of 16 countries in western Europe.

(A) THE ECA ACT AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO PLACE CONDITIONS ON THE GRANTS OF AID

The bill itself provides that the Administrator may make bilateral contracts with the countries with which he deals, in which he may lay down certain conditions with which they must comply in order to get funds under the ECA plan.

Mr. President, I wish to ask this question. If it is not interfering with the internal economy of a country for the ECA administrator to lay down a condition, why does it become an interference with the internal economy of that country for the Congress itself to attach a condition as to how our funds are to be used?

A few days ago the senior Senator from Ohio, in a very fine address, in effect said that he thought we could carry through and find out what was being done with our money. He said:

I do not want to cut Great Britain off because she is adopting a Socialist form of government.

Mr. President, I do not want to do that either.

I agree that she can adopt any kind of government she wishes, but it does not follow that American money should be used by the English to finance their experiment in socialism.

It would be one thing if this were a case, as the lawyers say, of first impression, and for us to adopt, from this point on, a program of noninterference in the internal economy of other countries. That is not the case. But from the very inception of the program we have been interfering in the internal economy of other countries.

(B) WE HAVE INTERFERED IN THE ELECTIONS OF ITALY

Let me point out just a few instances. One of the great accomplishments of the Marshall plan is generally considered to be the carrying of the Italian elections last April. In the campaign leading up to the elections the American Ambassador made a number of speeches

in which he urged the Italian people to stand against communism, and urged the ECA program as a reason why they should do that.

The Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Tom C. Clark, a few days before the election addressed the Italian people over the radio, and made very strong representations to them that they should vote as he thought they should vote.

Mr. Zellerbach, in his testimony before the committee, laid particular emphasis on the fact that the use of ECA funds had resulted in what he regarded as a favorable vote in the election.

Mr. President, I do not want to say for a minute that I criticize what Mr. Zellerbach did, what Mr. Clark did, or what Mr. Dunn did, but I do desire to say that it is entirely too late for us to hold up our hands in pious horror and say, "Of course, we will not interfere in the internal affairs of any nation."

(C) OUR AID IS SUPPORTING A SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND

Mr. President, there is just one more case of interference which I wish to point out, namely, that the Marshall-plan money is being used as a great slush fund to influence the next election in the British Isles. We are told that the Socialist government is paying in Great Britain today benefit payments to the old people and the needy considerably in excess of what our Government feels it can afford to pay to the old people of our country. Clothing has been derationed by the use of Marshall-plan money. Sugar has been derationed by the use of Marshall-plan money. And so it goes.

We have Mr. Churchill's word that the Socialist government in England "is living from month to month and from hand to mouth" on the United States. As I have said, Mr. President, there are two ways of life competing in the world today. There is the American way, based on free enterprise and individual initiative. There is the Marxist way, which has as its objective the abolition of private property in the means of production.

What the ECA is doing now is taking money of American taxpayers, earned under the American way, and using it to subsidize the socialist way. I believe that to do so is against the interests of the United States. I believe it is contrary to the interests of Americans to take their hard-earned money to support and maintain a political ideology totally foreign and repugnant to their way of thinking.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have been somewhat confused by what the Senator has just stated. Did I understand him correctly to say that Mr. Churchill said that the money we send over there is being used for the farmer-labor party of England in the election?

Mr. KEM. I believe there were numerous quotations in my remarks a few days ago to that effect. Let me see if I can locate them.

This is what Mr. Churchill said in the debate on the bill to nationalize or socialize iron and steel:

This measure cannot wholly be judged on its merits or demerits, if such there be, except in relation to the general economic life of Britain and our position in the world, and also in relation to the United States on whom the Socialist Government and Socialist policy are living from month to month and from hand to mouth.

Again in the same debate, Mr. Churchill said:

When a measure of first-rate importance is presented to the House of Commons it is always necessary for us to ask the question, Is it going to help the country or is it a partisan maneuver? Is it progress that is sought or is it faction? This is certainly the time to apply that test, because on the morrow of our greatest victory we are living on subsidies by loan or gift provided by taxes on the hard-working and heavily burdened people of the United States. I have always thought that we should need their help after the war, but it should be a point of honor with us, irrespective of party nostrums, to regain our full economic independence at the earliest moment, and to do nothing that would put off that event either by hampering our output or wantonly dividing our people.

Along that same line is an editorial from the London Economist of November 20, 1948, and I read as follows:

Even those who have been most reluctant to believe that ministers of the Crown would so far forget their responsibility as to monkey with a major industry for reasons of mere internal party maneuverings are now compelled to agree with Mr. Churchill when he calls the bill "a feature in party tactics intended to keep the Socialist left wing as far as possible in order, and the Government as long as possible in office."

Again at Blenheim, in a speech on August 4, 1947, Mr. Churchill had this to say:

Therefore I supported the American loan and I will still support, and justify, further appeals to the United States provided that we are doing our best, that we are making the most of our resources, that we are determined to become a self-supporting nation and system at the earliest moment, and will put aside every impediment, and labor long and hard.

It is when we are not trying our best, not making the most of ourselves and our resources, not pursuing a wise or practical policy, not coming forward as a united nation, not trying to deal with the problems on their merits, that there is humiliation in asking and receiving aid from a mighty and friendly ally.

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

Mr. KEM. Yes; I gladly yield.

Mr. LANGER. What puzzled me was that I understood from what the Senator from Missouri said that Mr. Churchill claimed this money was being used for the Labor Party of England, but yet he is in favor of the United States turning over this money. Is that correct?

Mr. KEM. I think Mr. Churchill is first and foremost an Englishman, and if I may interpret what he has said, I think he thought as many of us here did, at the outset that England needed

money, needed help from America. But he stands aghast when he sees that money being used to nationalize and socialize the industries of the British Isles.

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

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Nevertheless the Senator from Missouri knows, does he not, that Mr. Churchill does want the Marshall plan continued, and wants England to get her share under the Marshall plan?

Mr. KEM. I was asked that question in the debate last week by the Senator from Oregon. I do not know that Mr. Churchill has said definitely or specifically that he opposes gifts or grants or so-called loans to Great Britain provided they are put to proper use. As I understand, what Mr. Churchill criticizes is the perversion of these grants and gifts, the misuses to which they are being put.

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

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

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. From one of the quotations the Senator read I gained the impression that Mr. Churchill was in favor of ECA.

Mr. KEM. As I said, I think he believes that, in general, certain aid from America is justified. I may say in passing that many of us who oppose the amount provided in the pending bill have the same thought. I may say that the Senator from Missouri so believes. But what the Senator from Missouri does not believe, what he is opposing here and shall continue to oppose so long as he is a Member of this body is the use of the money of the American taxpayers to nationalize—to socialize—the basic industries of England or in any other European country.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator. Mr. McMAHON rose.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question or yield the floor, as the Senator desires.

Mr. McMAHON. I would prefer to address myself to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY] suggested to me a few moments ago that it might not be amiss to have something said on the amendment by a member of the committee. In accordance with that suggestion I shall very briefly address the Senate concerning the objectives sought in the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

I might begin by saying that I would not favor the nationalization of the steel industry of this country. If I were a citizen of Great Britain I doubt very much whether I would favor it there. However, that is not the question in issue.

When 2 years ago and more Gen. George Marshall delivered his speech at Harvard in which he outlined the conditions of western Europe and of the

world, and when he suggested that he believed this country would be willing to assist Europe if European countries would combine to assist themselves, the Foreign Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Ernest Bevin, lost no time in seizing on the suggestion, and an invitation went to every country in western Europe, including, although we tend to forget it, the Soviet Union, for a meeting to be held in Paris, as I remember, about 3 days later. In this country we waited with a good deal of interest to see whether the Soviet Union was willing at least to start in a cooperative effort to rebuild the war-torn economy of those countries, including her own. We did not approach the question, nor did the countries of Europe approach it from an ideological standpoint. Of course, Senators all remember that after the meeting had progressed for a couple of days, and after Mr. Molotov had showered insults and hurled his imprecations upon General Marshall and upon the United States of America for daring to suggest that we would be willing to try to rebuild western Europe, he, with his train of followers and assistants, departed behind the iron curtain.

It was that event more than any other, I think, which made us realize that there existed an irreconcilable difference of viewpoint, an irreconcilable intention as to the future of the world, and that there was definitely to be pitched a contest of freemen against slave states, a contest which all of us pray and hope shall never result in a conflict of arms.

Immediately the Soviet Union, with all the art of which it is capable—and it is extremely proficient along this line—began to propagandize everywhere to the effect that the United States of America had become a great imperialistic power; that it was bent upon controlling not only nations, but colonies and men everywhere, and was determined to be the master of the earth.

Of course, Mr. President, those of us who have had some part in forming our policy, those of us who know, or believe we know, what the American people are thinking realize that the last thing in the world this country wants or that its people want is to rule other countries of the earth. What we want is cooperation in building a free society of free states so that men and women can work out their destiny under God.

Mr. President, I can conceive of no action this Congress could take which would be more designed to prove the case sought to be made by Molotov and company than the adoption of this amendment. The purpose of the ECA has been to bind together free countries and free men. It has not been to dictate from Washington the nature of the economy under which the people in other countries should live. I think we would defeat the very objective which we are seeking to accomplish if we tried to do so. I hold no particular brief for the Socialist Government of Great Britain. Strangely enough, they seem to be making handsome progress, according to the figures which have been given to us by the Senator from Missouri.

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

Mr. McMAHON. Not at the moment. I shall be glad to yield in a few minutes.

As has been pointed out before, apparently the success which this plan has had has become one of the great arguments against its perpetuation. It seems to me that we have short memories indeed. A year ago many of us stayed up all night in order to get the results of the Italian election, because we knew, if we knew nothing else, that if Italy went Communist in that election, France was bound to follow, and that if France followed, the whole of western Europe would crumble into communism and decay.

The Italian election was won by the forces opposed to communism because, more than anything else, of the fact that this country had announced that we were willing and able to go to their assistance. It is easy to forget now that terrible winter of 1946, when it seemed that the hand of palsy was laid upon all Europe, and when Senators in this Chamber were debating very seriously what we would do when all Europe collapsed into communism. We seem to have been successful in pushing that day back. We have made great progress. We have done it, it seems to me, by realizing sensibly that we cannot dictate to the countries of Europe exactly what kind of governments they shall operate.

We can insist on one thing. We can insist—and I suspect will ever insist—that any government which receives aid from us shall maintain the basic civil liberties and rights which freemen get not from the state, but from God. They are natural rights—the right of freedom of religion, the right of freedom of speech, the right of freedom of press, the right in criminal cases to be charged openly, and then given a fair trial. Does anyone allege that those rights have been impaired or impinged upon in even the slightest degree by the present government of Great Britain?

Let us remember that we did not approach this venture in a spirit of pure idealism. It is not pure charity. We approached it on the basis of intelligent self-interest. We approached it on the basis that we have a great stake in the success of the economy of the countries which we are helping. I doubt if we would have any constitutional right to take money from the taxpayers of the United States and, purely as a matter of largesse, distribute it over the face of the earth. It is because it has the most direct relationship to the peace of the world, in which we have everything at stake, that we have decided to go forward under the present plan and the present policy of the Government.

Mr. President, we cannot amend the tariffs in Great Britain. We cannot suggest to the French that their budget shall be 1,000,000 francs more or 1,000,000 francs less, or that they shall discharge so many civil servants or hire so many others.

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

Mr. McMAHON. In a moment. If we were to do so, we would prove the allegation which is made against us, and we would defeat the very objectives for which we are striving.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is the Senator familiar with the fact that Mr. Bruce—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio for a question.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator realize that that is exactly what we have done?

Mr. Bruce made a speech and served notice on the French Government that unless they balanced their budget we could not proceed with ECA. Does the Senator realize that that is exactly the course we have taken in France? We have told the French that if necessary they should discharge some of their 1,300,000 government employees.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

Mr. McMAHON. I do not yield at the moment.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that we have a right to advise; and I certainly would not be opposed to giving advice. We have that right; but to impose conditions is quite a different thing.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I will not yield at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I have advised the Presiding Officer two or three times that for the moment I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the advice from the Senator from Connecticut. The question is answered. The Senator from Connecticut declines to yield for the moment to the Senator from Missouri. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to quote from Mr. Harriman, our roving Ambassador, who said:

If you refer to conditions, I think you are treading in a very dangerous field. These are mature and sovereign nations with widely different types of organization, economic organizations, and systems, and I do not believe we could accomplish what ought to be accomplished if there are any conditions to our aid in this field. Suggestions, advice; yes. Discussions and arguments, yes; but not conditions. There must be a will on the part of the nations and the people of the nations, and progress must be based on conviction that each step that they take is wise and sound.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Connecticut comes from one of the greatest industrial States in the Union. The industries of Connecticut have long supplied many of the wants of the western area of the country, from which I come. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut if, as a representative of that State, he looks with satisfaction and equanimity upon a condition under which the manufacturers, producers, and working people of Connecticut will be in direct competition with foreign government-owned and government-operated industry financed with Marshall-plan money?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say in answer to the Senator from Missouri that he

rightfully terms the State from which I come one of the great industrial States of the country. Small in area, it has been known, particularly during the war years, as a great and efficient producer. It has been my observation that we in Connecticut can compete with the rest of the world because of the efficiency of our machinery and the intelligence and skill of our working men.

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

Mr. McMAHON. Not at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield for the moment.

Mr. McMAHON. Our State has grown great meeting the competition of the world and overcoming it. I say to the Senator from Missouri that I have greater fears for the people of my State on grounds other than the one which he suggests. I saw what happened in 1930, when we enacted the highest tariffs the world has ever known. A thousand economists addressed a communication to the then President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover, and warned him that the imposition of such tariffs would plunge the economy not only of this country, but of the countries of the world, into despair. That is exactly what happened.

Mr. President, I am also aware—

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I refuse to yield for the moment. I shall tell the Senator from Missouri when I am ready to yield.

Let me say that I am also aware of the fact that a greater danger could come to my people and to all the other people of the United States, namely, the orientation of western Europe, with its 270,000,000 people and its machine-tool plants, into the orbit of the Soviet Union. It was because we knew that Hitler's Germany combined with Tojo's Japan would monopolize practically two-thirds of the skilled manpower and over 60 percent of the machinery of the earth, that the fight we have since finished was won, and it was essential that it be won if we were to continue to exist as a free people. But let such a condition come about again, this time under the domination of an even more ruthless tyranny, equip that tyranny with a stock pile of atomic weapons, equip it with jet airplanes, and equip it—nay, it is already so equipped—with its ruthless will, and then I say, Mr. President, I shall be concerned for the state of the people of Connecticut, yea, for the welfare of all the people of the United States and the people of all the world.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this time?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Connecticut spoke with feeling and assurance about the ability of the producers of Connecticut to compete with the world. I could not help but recall that a few days ago I read in the Washington Post that the New Haven Clock

Co., a long-established industry in the Senator's State, had shut down, putting 600 persons out of work; and that the reason assigned by the president of that industry was the difficulty or inability to meet foreign competition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that Senators can yield only for questions.

Mr. KEM. My question is this: Is the Senator from Connecticut familiar with that incident?

Mr. McMAHON. I say to the Senator from Missouri that I am thoroughly familiar with the incident, and I have made a complete study of it. I do not intend to discuss that company's affairs, in relation to this amendment, on the floor of the Senate at this time. We are to have debate on the reciprocal trade agreements extension bill, and I shall reserve until that time my comment on the example the Senator from Missouri has given. Since I propose to speak when that issue comes to the floor of the Senate, I shall then welcome a further investigation of the attitude of the Senator from Connecticut on that question or on any other question pertaining to reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a further question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Connecticut spoke with feeling about the necessity of the United States preventing the overrunning of western Europe by the forces of communism. I should like to ask the Senator whether in his opinion there is any greater danger facing the people of the world today than the danger which would come from undermining the economy of the United States, the last and greatest and finest bulwark of democracy?

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, Mr. President, the answer to the Senator's question is perfectly apparent. The economy and the strength of the United States must be maintained as the keystone and cornerstone of the union of free peoples which we are trying to erect to combat the ideological tide, the ideological state, which is moving all over the world against freemen and free institutions.

I say to the Senator from Missouri that just as it is desperately necessary that we do what the Senator wants—and with which I agree—it is likewise essential that we maintain as our allies the countries of western Europe and its 270,000,000 people.

If the Senator from Missouri believes that Communist Russia is no threat to us; if he believes that if we had not undertaken to assist western Europe, Russia could have gone in there with impunity and it would have made no difference to us; if he is not at all concerned about her armament situation; if he is not concerned with the fact that Russia has enslaved 10 countries in the past 2 years—if he is not concerned about any of those things—then I say he has no right to vote for the authorization or expenditure of a single dollar under the Marshall plan or under any other plan which would take a dollar from the

United States for expenditure in England or France. Regardless of what I might think about the Senator's judgment in such case, nevertheless he has a right to his judgment; and if he believes that, it is his duty, I presume, to vote against such authorizations or expenditures.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I am sure the able and fair-minded Senator from Connecticut does not mean that those of us who favor the pending amendment are alined with the forces of communism.

I should like to ask the able Senator if he feels that it would be fair for me to make this argument against certain measures which the Senator from Connecticut is advocating with reference to the secrets of the atomic bomb: As I understand the situation, the Senator from Connecticut feels that those secrets should be made, in part at least, the property of the world. That idea certainly is in accord with the ideas held in the Kremlin. Because of that fact, does the Senator from Connecticut feel that it would be fair for me to indicate that the Senator from Connecticut is in any way sympathetic with the forces of communism, or that in taking the position which he does take he is alining himself with those forces?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's observation, let me say that I suppose it is somewhat difficult for any of us to have our position understood, no matter how plainly we may state it. Although I do not like to take a great deal of time now, yet this might be a good opportunity for me to restate my position as plainly as I can: No one has been more zealous or more insistent than I have been that the vital secrets of our atomic program not be disclosed to any nonauthorized person. About 3 months ago I made a speech, which, in part, I repeated on the floor of the Senate on one occasion when the matter was brought up here. The speech I mention was made at Detroit, and in it I pointed out that it was time for this Nation to consider seriously whether we could safely divulge the size of the stock pile of atomic bombs—not, mind you, how to make them; I wish the Senator to understand that point clearly—but the number that we had on hand. The Senator from Connecticut, realizing that that was a most important question, very carefully listed the arguments which could be made for that position, and also the arguments or reasons which could be urged against it. I suggested that it was high time we made a study, but I said that at that juncture I was unable to come to a conclusion. That was my position then, and it is my position now.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a further question: I ask him if he joins me in the thought that an argument *ad hominem* in either case would be wholly unfair and out of place.

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator from Missouri that I was entirely unaware of any attempt to make an *ad hominem* argument here. I was trying to point out to the Senator from

Missouri the main objective of the program in which we are engaged.

The main objective of this program is to maintain the freedom and security of the United States of America. The main objective of the program is to see to it that the tide of communism does not sweep over 270,000,000 people, with their resources to be drained off, and to be joined with a ruthless state for the purpose of conquest. I have pointed out to the Senator, not in any effort to make an ad hominem argument, that if we were in the bill to insist upon conditions with respect to the type of government the recipient countries should have, we would be at the same time entering a plea of guilty to the claim that has been made all over the earth by the Kremlin that we are seeking to imperialize the earth and to dominate the lives of men, women, and children everywhere. That is all I have been trying to point out to the Senator.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Was not the statement, in effect, that the ideas behind the amendment would be received with great satisfaction by Mr. Molotov and his associates?

Mr. McMAHON. I am afraid they would be. I know they would be. I can see Pravda, if the Senator will permit me, and I can hear the Red radio, saying, "See, we told you so. We told you in Paris that if you went into this thing you were going to lose your liberty. We told you that edicts would come forth from the United States which would dictate how you should conduct your Government. We told you so, and now it has been proved, because they have said to the British Government, 'the action which you propose to take with regard to your internal affairs, as to how you will operate your steel industry, shall not take place.'"

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether he does not believe that the release in whole or in part of information regarding the atomic bomb would be received with satisfaction by Mr. Molotov and his associates in the Kremlin?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Connecticut cannot quite see the pertinency of the question. I may say to the Senator from Missouri, I have tried to tell him what my position is in that regard. I doubt very much whether Mr. Molotov would receive information, as to the size of the stock pile, with any satisfaction whatever. The Senator from Connecticut is not aware that that would be good news for Mr. Molotov. I should certainly think it would not be good news. Some secrets as to how we do the thing and put it together, I presume would be received by them with satisfaction. So long as I have anything

to do with it, I am going to make it as difficult as possible for them to obtain that information.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether any news would not be good news to Mr. Molotov?

Mr. McMAHON. No. I may say to the Senator it would not be good news to him that the pending bill had been passed, or that the North Atlantic Pact had been ratified, or that we had provided for its implementation from a military standpoint, if that shall be necessary. That would not be good news to Russia and her satellites. The determination we have shown in our leadership of the nations to keep ourselves free and to maintain civil rights and civil liberties, to maintain the ordinary decencies among men, to recognize mankind as the creatures of God, not as creatures of the state, to recognize men as being endowed with certain natural rights and our willingness to act to defend those rights—that is the kind of news Russia does not like.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Did the Senator understand my question about news to relate to the passage of the pending bill, or to the divulging of information in regard to the atomic bomb?

Mr. McMAHON. I have stated to the Senator what my position is in that respect, and I am trying to point out that the Senator from Connecticut is not in favor of giving Molotov a scintilla of information that will enable him to make this fearsome weapon. I may say to the Senator I probably am in agreement with him on that; I take it I am, but I do not wish to become involved in a discussion of the atomic question, for it brings up many other things which, while they could be profitably discussed, and which should be discussed in the Senate in the near future, are not appropriate at this time.

Mr. KEM. I think perhaps the Senator is correct about that.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator and I do not agree—although I am not sure of it—but, in my opinion, the United States, when it made the offer to Russia and the world to furnish information on atomic energy in exchange for effective security from its misuse, wrote the most glorious page that has ever been written in the diplomatic record of any country at any time. I may say further to the Senator that, in my opinion, had that offer, magnanimous as it was, been accepted—and I have regarded it personally as the acid test of Russia's intentions—I dare say the Senator and I would not be here today debating an ECA authorization. Nor would we have to debate the North Atlantic Pact, because if that offer had been accepted, peace would have been well on its way to every corner of the earth.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to say by way of a preliminary that I agree with the Senator from Connecticut on many things, and I have not the slightest doubt either of his ability or of his patriotism.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. But I should like to ask the Senator, is it not generally understood that the approach of Mr. Molotov and the Kremlin is to wait until the American economy is weakened by unsound measures taken in this country, and then to move in for the kill?

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator that I am as much concerned as any sensible American must be, about \$50,000,000,000 budgets. I know the drain such expenditures impose upon any free-enterprise economy. I should be very happy indeed if we could now take about \$25,000,000,000 or \$30,000,000,000 and wipe it off the books. There is no one who would like to do it more than I. I share the fervor of the Senator from Missouri with respect to reduction of Government expenditures, but I have to make my estimate of the danger which faces this country, and of the wisdom of the methods and of the means we are taking to meet it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to inquire whether the Senator anticipates being able to activate his fervor at any time during the present session.

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator that I have some doubt. I must be entirely honest with the Senator. I look at the expenditures for the veterans, and I see no chance of cutting them. I see the expenditures for arms, and I see no chance of reducing them. I look at ECA, and I do not see much opportunity of reducing the expenditures for that undertaking. I look at the interest on the national debt, and I see no chance of reducing that by so much as a penny. Adding up all those expenditures, they amount to about two-thirds, I think, of the national budget, and there is left \$10,000,000,000 or \$11,000,000,000 with respect to which, in the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, economies may possibly be made. Of course, the Senator from Missouri may say there is an opportunity to make reductions by wiping out ECA; but I cannot go along with the Senator on that, because I am afraid, if we were to take that method of reducing expenditures, it would be the most costly economy ever known in the history of the world. If we were to reduce or wipe out this expenditure, it might well be that we would spend ten, twenty, or a hundredfold more in an effort to stave off the very thing which we would invite by producing a state of weakness, where there now exists a state of increasing strength and recovery.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator believe that the authorization of this money is sacrosanct, and would he, for the RECORD, give us his opinion as to whether it is the responsibility and the duty of the members of the Appropriations Committee—because I understood the Senator to say that he did not feel that the appropriation for ECA would be very much reduced—to go over the appropriation and recommend to the Senate a figure which is justified by the projects which are listed?

Mr. McMAHON. It is, as I see it, an obligation upon the part of the Appropriations Committee, another agency of the Senate, to scrutinize the program and the estimates with the greatest of care. It strikes me that if the estimates can be shown to have been made up on November 30 to one scale of prices, and there has since been a 5 or 6 percent decline in prices, certainly the Appropriations Committee has a right to take that fact into account.

Mr. President, while I am on that subject, I may say that, so far as the Senator from Connecticut is concerned, he does not view the assurances given by the committee as binding him to simply any kind of a reduction the committee shall choose to bring forward. I am not prejudging the committee in any way, manner, or form, but I say that if, in my judgment, the appropriation is cut to such a point that it might jeopardize the success of the program, I shall be found on my feet seeking to increase the appropriation and to upset the Appropriations Committee in that respect.

I shall do it from the deepest conviction, instinct, and impulse to which any man could be subject, because the world is marching to a climax which can be avoided, in the opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, only by the marshaling of force, so that the desperate men who would hurl humanity into the abyss will retreat and give way. Let them get the idea that we are not serious in our efforts and that we are willing to permit Europe to retreat into confusion and chaos—once give them the idea that they are free to marshal the peoples of those countries into their camp, and the United States will be fighting the most desperate battle for its existence mankind has ever conceived, a battle which, if we win, I say once again, we shall lose. A third world war about which we have been talking—some of us too lightly—we had better talk about preventing, and we had better be thinking solely in those terms, because, in my opinion, we could not fight such a war and, at the same time, preserve the kind of government we have maintained in the United States.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the Senator this question: If the receipts which are anticipated, from all sources, for the fiscal year do not exceed \$42,000,000,000 and the appropriations which we

are about to make for ECA, the implementation of the Atlantic Pact, for defense, for the integrated programs, and domestic appropriations for our own economy, exceed \$50,000,000,000, would the Senator feel we were justified in making a straight cut right through all appropriations in order to avoid increasing taxes or engaging in deficit spending?

Mr. McMAHON. Frankly, I do not want to answer that question at this time. I do not wish now to tie my hands for the rest of the session, because the question which the Senator asks implies a commitment over a period of time to which I do not think I want to bind myself. So, with all due deference to the Senator's question and its propriety, I still say that I refuse to be bound at this time.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEM. The Senator has spoken very feelingly and forcefully regarding the use of ECA money for national defense. I should like to ask him if he believes the ECA is an adequate substitute, in whole or in part, for national defense?

Mr. McMAHON. Oh, no; certainly not. I regard it as being supplementary to our national defense budget. I agree with what Dr. Nourse said, as quoted in the newspapers today, that it is all one picture—ECA, defense, implementation. It is all for the defense and security of our own people.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Do I correctly understand the Senator's position when I understand it to be that ECA is supplementary to national defense, that national defense should be our first consideration, and then, after we have adequately armed ourselves, if we have funds for ECA, we should devote so much as we can to that purpose?

Mr. McMAHON. No; I do not think I would come to that conclusion, because I regard our policy as an integrated whole. I will say to the Senator that I am not so sure that perhaps some economies cannot be made in the national defense budget. The Senator from Connecticut has certain ideas about that which he will express when the appropriation bills reach the floor of the Senate. However, it seems to me we make a mistake in regarding the size of our national defense budget, the ECA, and the North Atlantic Pact as being anything except a part of the national defense of the United States. If it is not that, we have no right to undertake these things.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Connecticut to refer to ECA as being supplementary to the national defense?

Mr. McMAHON. Call it complementary, if the Senator will. It is all a part of the whole. That is what I am trying to tell the Senator.

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

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator seems to have great faith in our financing the British Isles and the continent of Europe as being a part of our defense against communism. I will ask the Senator if he agrees with Mr. Winston Churchill when he says that the Socialist Parties of Europe are handmaidens and heralds of communism.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say that we have been through an election campaign recently, and I heard far worse things than that said about the party of which I have the honor to be a member. Such things are still being said. That does not prove that they are true. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Churchill. I think he is one of the great statesmen of our time or of any other time, but, at the same time, I know that Mr. Churchill is human and that he was confronting a constituency in an election.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator from Connecticut permit me to suggest to him that he has been led into error, that the statements made by Mr. Churchill were made by him in the House of Commons on the bill to nationalize the iron and steel industry of Great Britain, and were not in any sense a part of a campaign speech?

Mr. McMAHON. In one sense every speech members of the legislature make is a campaign speech in a democratic country, because it is upon the basis of what we say and do here that we must defend ourselves before the electorate. As the Senator from Connecticut understands, the iron and steel question in Great Britain is going to be determined in the 1950 election. The people of Great Britain will have the opportunity, in the same way we have the opportunity, to pass upon national policies, to go to the polls and cast secret ballots to determine what they as a people shall do. The right of a free ballot is one of the best evidences of the exercise and workings of democracy of which I know. That is the way the people of Great Britain are going to determine this question in the election of 1950.

Mr. KEM. Will the Senator permit me the observation that the decision as to whether Great Britain shall nationalize the iron and steel industry of Great Britain should not be made by the British people at the election in 1950, but should be made by the Congress of the United States at the present session?

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Connecticut has already expressed his ideas about that, and there is no use reiterating them.

Mr. President, I am anxious to take my seat, but I should like to say just one word before I conclude. When the Government of Great Britain nationalized its banks and nationalized its railways, it paid its own people with British notes and British pounds, not dollars. I can anticipate the Senator rising and saying, "Yes, but it is the Marshall-plan aid that sustains the whole economy, and gives their money some worth." That, I grant, is true, and no sensible man can deny it. At the same time, we must also admit that the pound notes which are

handed over to the owners of the securities of the British industries are not acceptable for dollars, but are really tradable only in the sterling area.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if the losses in the nationalized industries in Great Britain are not a part of the deficit in the British budget which we are called upon to make up under the Marshall plan?

Mr. McMAHON. No, I do not think so. I do not believe they are.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if he would be kind enough to elucidate that point a little further, and explain to the Senate, and for the RECORD, in what way the losses incurred by the nationalized industries of Great Britain are not a part of the deficit in the British budget which we are called upon to make up under the Marshall plan.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from Connecticut is now at the end of his argument on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. I do not feel that I should prolong the discussion. I have given the Senator my opinion, and I shall now take my seat.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should prefer to make such suggestions as I shall present in a colloquy with the Senator from Missouri, but under the existing stringency of the rules under which the Senate is operating, I presume I should occupy the floor in my own right, and attempt to speak to the Senator from Missouri in that capacity. I shall invite his questions to me, and in advance, without going through too much detail, I assure the Senator from Missouri that I shall yield, while I have the floor, at any time he may wish to ask me a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will indulge the Chair a moment, the Chair observed the phrase in the Senator's remarks "the existing stringency of the rules." The present occupant of the Chair does not consider that there is a present stringency of the rules. The present occupant of the Chair regards the rules as stated, clear and definite, and so long as he remains the occupant of the Chair, the rules will be enforced without fear or favor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I find myself in some disagreement with the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. Without taking the time of the Senate to any great extent, I shall say that I am not satisfied to support the Senator's amendment as it now reads because of its reference to a specific industry, such as the iron and steel industry, and because of certain other verbiage which is used in the amendment. I have been giving it considerable thought, because I am definitely sympathetic with the point the Senator from Missouri is trying to make.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to certain basic assumptions I make. In the first place, we have heard of the "do not touch" philosophy so far as the operation of the internal affairs of other governments under ECA are concerned. I have supported the theory that we probably should not attempt to dictate the internal social and political operations of the governments we are trying

to aid, and the peoples we are trying to aid, but I submit that we are in every act of the ECA dictating the terms under which ECA will be used within those countries.

I submit that it has been made abundantly clear repeatedly by officials of the State Department, and on the floor of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, that if a country is a Communist-controlled country we will extend no ECA aid to it at all. That is a determination as to the use of ECA aid based upon a social and political philosophy entertained in the particular country.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question? The Chair is not attempting to be unduly stringent, but acting in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I stated, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri at any time for any question he may care to propound.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator whether at the outset of the Marshall plan program it was not indicated, at the OEEC meeting, that Spain did not have a government which met with the approval of the conferees there, and that as a result throughout the Marshall plan we have declined any aid to Spain.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am happy the Senator asked the question, because I was going over to the other side of the political and social fence to call attention to the fact that in Fascist Spain we have adopted the policy of not extending Marshall plan aid, because we do not like or approve, apparently, the type of government operating there. So in the Marshall plan we have undertaken to circumscribe the use of the funds, both for Communist countries on the one hand and for Fascist countries on the other, a direct program to determine the philosophy of government which we will elect to support with ECA money.

Mr. President, we hear much said repeatedly to the effect that we must not touch nationalism of industries or anything of the kind because we would be violating the freedom of self-determination in the participating countries. I think that argument falls when we consider the Communist philosophy on the one hand and the Fascist philosophy on the other, both of which we have said we would not aid with ECA money.

Mr. President, I may disagree, indeed I do disagree with the Socialist philosophy of nationalization, but, by the same token, I agree that the people of Great Britain have an inherent right of self-determination, and if they want socialism and nationalization, and if it is accomplished on a voluntary and free basis, that is their business. I shall not attempt to change or alter their form of government or their attitude toward their social or political forms so far as that is concerned; but I believe I have some right to say in advance how a portion of my tax dollar shall be spent in connection with the social and political activities of other countries. Without

attempting to change their forms I ought to have some right to place a limitation upon how the American taxpayer's dollar is to be spent abroad.

We are against communism, we are against fascism, and certainly I hope that the overwhelming majority of the people in the United States are against socialism and against nationalization. But eliminating the blood purge and a few things like that, I hope we see in it the same evils to a free and competitive society that we see in communism or in fascism.

If we go further into the operations of ECA, it becomes apparent that every dollar spent by ECA in countries abroad is a dollar spent with a limitation placed upon it by the Administrator. He even examines every private-business venture which ECA dollars are supposed to support, and he says "No, this is not good for your economy," or "This is good for your economy." "I will advance and authorize ECA dollars in this project," or "I will withhold them in that project." Those are private-enterprise projects. So in effect we control every dollar of money that is spent under the ECA program. If we did not so control our money, if we did not so use our money in the ECA countries, there would be no restrictions in the bill, and we might as well make a flat appropriation in dollars to each country, and say, "Use the money as you please."

While I do not like the Senator's amendment as such because I think there are certain restrictions in it which I feel I could not support, I should like to suggest to the Senator an amendment to or a substitute for his amendment to see what he thinks about it. In place of the language he has in his amendment I should like to suggest language something like this, to be inserted at the proper place:

The Administrator shall not authorize assistance under this act within any participating country when such assistance will provide dollars or dollar credits which may be used by such participating country directly or indirectly to acquire and operate, in whole or in part, any basic industry as a nationalized industry.

Mr. President, I call attention to the language of that proposal and its effect. My amendment does not attempt to dictate how countries shall conduct their internal affairs so far as nationalization is concerned. It does not say to any country, "You shall not nationalize your industry." But it does say that no American dollars or dollar credits shall be used to aid in the nationalization of their industries or to support such nationalization. They can proceed to nationalize if they want to. We place no prohibition on them. But if they do hereafter, they have to do it completely under their own power and without the aid of American dollars or dollar credits either in the acquisition of or the operation of such nationalized basic industries.

In my judgment, Mr. President, that preserves the principle of not dictating to a country whether it shall or shall not nationalize. It does not dictate what the people shall do under their own power within their country if they have the

means and will to do it. It only provides—and I will read it again:

The Administrator shall not authorize assistance under this act within any participating country when such assistance will provide dollars or dollar credits which may be used by such participating country directly or indirectly to acquire and operate, in whole or in part, any basic industry as a nationalized industry.

Mr. President, if we do not believe that nationalization of industries is good for a free economy and for the type of government and economy in the world in which we want to live; if we believe in leaving the other fellow still free, however, to do as he pleases within his own country with his own political and social forms, then I cannot see any objection to this prohibition. It only says that American dollars or dollar credits shall not be used hereafter by any country to nationalize or operate its nationalized basic industries.

I believe we have a perfect right to make reservations on the use of American dollars. I believe we not only have the right to do it, but we are doing it every day and in every transaction under the ECA. We evaluate projects. We say we will give money or withhold money based upon our judgment on the projects over there. We do not give money to Communist countries because we do not like the Communist philosophy. We do not give money to Fascist countries because we do not like the Fascist philosophy. If we do not believe in nationalization, I think we have a basic responsibility to put some kind of a string, not upon whether the British people or other people can nationalize their industries, not upon that, but we have a right to put some kind of a string on how American dollars and American credits shall be used in going forward with socialistic experiments of nationalization among peoples we are trying to help.

I am happy to help them even if they are Socialists. That makes not too much difference. I believe they have a peaceful method of attempting to accomplish their reforms. There is a difference between the National Socialists of Europe and the Communists. The objectives socially and economically are the same. The methods of attaining them and the methods of enforcing them are different, as the Senator from Missouri has pointed out. The National Socialists believe in an orderly procedure in attaining their nationalization and control. The Communists believe in the blood purge and revolution as the basic method of accomplishing their end. But respecting our American dollars, which have been obtained through the sacrifices of the American taxpayers, I believe we must think and act clearly and wisely in preventing their use and the use of credits for nationalization purposes, in which I believe the overwhelming number of Americans disbelieve.

I simply wish to say again to the Senator from Missouri that I have made my suggestion to him, I hope, in a spirit of cooperation and purpose which I believe we have in common. I do not mean to be offensive, and I hope he will forgive my criticism of his original amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, may I say very briefly—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized in his own right.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri addressed the Chair first.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I will yield the floor to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri cannot yield the floor to another Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan now addresses the Chair and asks for the floor in his own right. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Missouri is recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has resigned the floor, and the Senator from Michigan has been recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] will accept the substitute which has been suggested. I have not had much to say on the floor of the Senate in relation to the ECA, but I wish to say a few words on the pending amendment, and particularly on the substitute suggested by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

I was greatly impressed by the argument of the able Senator from Iowa when he stated that we have something to say as to the use to which our dollars shall be put. He indicated—and it is clear—that we said we would not extend aid to Spain because in the opinion of the American people Spain is a Fascist dictatorship. We had something to say when it came to giving ECA aid to Russia, which is a proletariat dictatorship. We have something to say, in the amendment which was offered by the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] in connection with aid to China. We have restricted the President. We have said that he shall not extend aid in areas in China which are dominated by the Communists. So we do have the right to say what American dollars shall be used for. Every dollar that is spent will be raised by taxation, and the sweat and tears of the American people will pay for these appropriations. Quite properly, America should say what the money shall be used for.

We talk about socialism and about communism; but I believe that anyone who understands the fundamentals of communism, of socialism, and of Marxism will say that they are so similar the difference is only a matter of degree. We think of Britain as being an outstanding nation in the preservation of freedom. We think of Britain in connection with our judicial system. We who are trained in the law go back to the days when we studied the judicial system of Britain. We know that in this country we have adopted many of the British legal principles. The great common law of America is the common law of the British Empire.

We cannot imagine that America could ever go socialistic or communistic. We cannot understand how the great British Empire, with its traditions, could ever go socialistic or communistic; but I say that it can happen there, and it can happen here. That is the question with which we are concerned today.

Anyone who read the article, Stalin on Revolution, published in the Foreign Affairs Quarterly for January of this year, has a better understanding of the subject. If one will read the Manifesto of 1848 by Marx and Engels he will understand how close socialism is to communism. Communism is able to move with the ebb and flow of the tide. It retreats here and advances there.

Let me bring to the attention of the Senate something which I received in the mail only yesterday. This pamphlet is being distributed at the University of Michigan. A few years ago the then Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Biddle, made a finding that the Communist Party in America stood for the overthrow of Government by force and violence. Does our present Government feel that is the principle of the Communist Party? It must, because it has indicted and is now trying in the District Court of the United States in New York City the heads of the American Communist Party for conspiring to overthrow the American Government by force and violence. Will the Communists retreat and try to advance upon some other front?

Mr. Foster, in his book published in 1931 or 1932, stated that the Red Army would help to establish communism in America.

Let us find out what is said in the pamphlet which is being distributed to students of the University of Michigan. I am sure that it is being distributed at other universities. At the end of the pamphlet we find the following:

Write to the National Youth Commission or Council of Student Clubs, Communist Party, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York City.

Then there is this line:

I would like more information on the Communist Party—

Name.....
Address.....
City.....
State.....

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the Chair will enforce the rule requiring the Chair to be addressed.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I entered the Chamber after the Senator had started his address. Who issued this pamphlet?

Mr. FERGUSON. The National Youth Commission or Council of Student Clubs, Communist Party, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York City.

Mr. President, I wish to read a portion of the pamphlet, and then I shall

place all of it in the RECORD. It is very cleverly written. On page 5 we find the following:

Now we will tell you what the Communist Party stands for.

On another page there is the following language:

The Communist Party does not now and never has advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. Its constitution specifically calls for the expulsion of any member who conspires to overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy.

That is the retreat, because they know that there is a law in the United States, the Smith Act, which makes it a criminal offense to conspire to overthrow the United States Government by force or violence.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if the Youth Commission or Council of Student Clubs of the Communist Party, the platform of which the Senator is reading, has not brought its platform exactly in line with the platform of the Socialist Parties of Great Britain, France, and other countries of western Europe.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am of the opinion that it is very similar.

On page 5 it is said:

Now we will tell you what the Communist Party stands for.

I now read what it is said the Communist Party in America stands for:

Peace, the Bill of Rights, full equality for the Negro people, the right to work, the right to strike, the right to social security, the right to advocate socialism to end the wars and depressions which capitalism breeds.

There is the secret of the whole thing; we find it in the last line of this publication, I say to the Senator from Missouri. All of us will agree to the first principles mentioned in the pamphlet, as I have just read them; they are humanitarian principles.

But then it is said in this pamphlet: the right to advocate socialism to end the wars and depressions which capitalism breeds.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I shall ask to have all of this pamphlet printed in the RECORD, but I wish to refer now to what it states. Mr. Foster says:

"In fighting against all these monstrous evils, in working for a Socialist America, I am performing the profoundest patriotic duty."

Then on page 6 they say to the students of the University of Michigan and, I am sure, to other university students—and now I read further from this pamphlet:

And . . . we'll tell you what the Communist Party demands for young people:

Mr. President, what do they demand for young people? I am reading from a statement made by the party which, so it says, has no tie to Russia. Oh, no; they

do not believe in revolution, they do not believe in what the Communist Party of Russia stands for, so they say; but here is what they say in this pamphlet; here is what the Communist Party demands for the young people:

First. Repeal the draft.

Mr. President, there are many persons who do not believe in the Communist Party, but who do believe in repealing the Draft Act, of course.

I read further from the pamphlet:

We stand for the defense of the United States against all its real enemies. But America is in no danger of attack from anyone. We are the most powerful Nation in the world today. The draft was engineered in order to create a war scare so that Wall Street could send American boys to China and Greece and the rest of Europe. Not to defend America . . . but to multiply Wall Street profits. To gobble the world.

Second. End Jim Crow in the armed forces. Discrimination, segregation, Jim Crow—these are the real subversives.

Third. Give 18-year-olds the right to vote. If they are old enough to be drafted they are certainly old enough to cast the ballot.

Fourth. Give youth a real job-training program; teach them skills; get them jobs.

Fifth. A public-housing program which will give young people homes—not promises.

Sixth. An end to quota system and all discrimination in education.

Seventh. Pass Federal aid to education bill.

Eighth. Full academic freedom for students and teachers. An end to thought control.

Senators will notice that the Communists apparently have retreated, and seem to be arguing now for humanitarian principles. Imagine, Mr. President. The Communist Party, which is part and parcel of the dictatorship of Russia, now wants an end put to thought control, so they say; and they expect the American people to believe that.

At Oregon State College, or at the University of Washington, not long ago, a professor was discharged, supposedly because of his Communistic tendencies or his beliefs in communism or his connection with it. Quite a case was made of it, but actually he was discharged on the ground that if a person is a Communist, he does not have the independence of thought necessary to a free academic mind. His thoughts are controlled—and that is exactly the truth. But in this pamphlet the Communists advocate to the youth of America, "An end to thought control."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire pamphlet printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit A.)

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Michigan to make reference to the recent Oregon State College and University of Washington cases?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I wish the Senator from Oregon would give us a little more light on that,

Mr. MORSE. I shall do so by way of asking a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Oregon, to permit him to ask a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Michigan know that the dismissals at the University of Washington were the result of hearings in which it was found, in the opinion of the persons who conducted the hearings, that the members of the faculty who were dismissed were or are avowed Communists?

Mr. FERGUSON. I was not certain that it was brought out at a hearing, but I had the other information.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Michigan was of the understanding that a finding was made that those persons were Communists?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Oregon propounding a question to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. And the Senator from Michigan understands the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. I say that I understand that a finding was made that they were Communists.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Michigan agree with the Senator from Oregon that no principle of academic freedom is violated whenever an institution of learning in this country takes the position that persons who are avowed Communists should not have the right to teach in American institutions of learning?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say that is absolutely true, because the moment a man adopts the Communistic philosophy, he closes his mind to everything except the things which are agreeable to the communistic line, and therefore he has no freedom of thought.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Michigan agree with the Senator from Oregon that there is a great deal of difference, and that the difference should be recognized, between academic freedom to search for the truth, no matter where the path of search may lead, and license to infiltrate into our educational system the indoctrination of the Russian ideology?

Mr. FERGUSON. I recognize that, and that is the real distinction. The people of America generally should understand that that is the real distinction between the two propositions, as the Senator has stated it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon, to permit him to ask a question.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Michigan permit me to call his attention—and I say this most humbly, for fear the majority leader may think I am again demonstrating that I think I know the answer to a great many questions, although I hope I know the answer to a few, but certainly not too many—will the Senator from Michigan permit me to ask him whether he is familiar with a piece of writing which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day in regard to the differences, as I see them, between academic freedom and the lack of right on the part of any teacher to hold his job when he is proved to be a Communist and uses his teaching position to infiltrate, by way of indoctrination, Russian propaganda into our schools?

Mr. FERGUSON. I must apologize to the Senator from Oregon when I say that I did not see that in the RECORD and I was not on the floor at the time when it was inserted. But I understand what the Senator from Oregon has in mind, and I recognize the difference.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to state one sentence at this point, I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that I desire to associate myself with his comments on the danger of permitting our school system to be used as a source for the indoctrination of communism.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, sometimes such matters make me feel that those who would have Communists, with their closed, arbitrary minds, teach our youth communism, should think about whether we would tolerate for a moment having a criminal teach criminal law, for instance, in our schools. The situation is quite similar, because it is a violation of our institutions and of our laws to permit crime to be taught in our schools; and, of course, after a declaration of war, some of the acts we have been referring to here would be treason.

Mr. President, returning now to the original subject. The Senator from Michigan believes that socialism of industries, if carried to a certain point, necessitates dictatorship for their operation, and the minute England or any other nation proceeds to socialize, to have the state become the owner of its institutions, of its industry, and, thereby, of labor, they must go then to dictatorship.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wanted to ask the Senator from Michigan whether the man to whom he was referring was a teacher in the State schools of Michigan or was employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the able Senator will bear with me, I was quoting from a folder which was mailed or delivered to a student at the University of Michigan. It was mailed to me yesterday, with a letter.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Did the Federal Government, or any of the agencies of the Federal Government, have any part in it?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. It is a pamphlet. And, by the way, this is one of the few times a document of this kind has been labeled as being Communist literature. It is stated on the pamphlet: Write to National Youth Commission or Council of Student Clubs, Communist Party.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield further to the Senator from South Carolina for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Where was the pamphlet sent from?

Mr. FERGUSON. From New York City.

Mr. MAYBANK. What has that to do with the Federal Government? I am as much opposed to communism as is the distinguished Senator from Michigan. We have none of that in the schools of South Carolina, I may assure the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the able Senator will bear with me, I do not claim it has anything to do with the Federal Government. I am trying to develop the argument that in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan socialism and communism are so near together that the Communist Party in America has retreated from its open and avowed principles, although the Senator from Michigan believes that they still have in their hearts principles of force and violence so far as wishing to overthrow the Government is concerned. Those who are familiar with the doctrines of Marx know that communism and socialism are close together. Both of them, I may say advisedly, hate capitalism.

America is founded upon the idea of free institutions, of individual liberty—yes, on the Bill of Rights as we understand it, not as communism understands it. I say the American people have a right to say that their dollar shall not be used directly or indirectly to acquire and to operate in whole or in part any basic industry as a nationalized industry.

As I said before, Mr. President, when a government passes beyond a certain point in socializing its industry, it must ultimately resort to a dictatorship for the enforcement of rules and regulations. Therefore, if we are sure to have a free world, we have a right to say that our dollars shall not be used to do that which can ultimately result in a dictatorship, at which time the country would not be

entitled to any aid according to standards we have already prescribed. We say today that we will not give aid to Russia, we will not give it to Spain, we will not give it to China, except in areas which are not dominated by Communists.

If the conscience of any Senator tells him that through socialization a country can step over into totalitarianism, then he should not vote to give one dollar of the taxpayers' money to any nation which, in his opinion, by the use of it, could become a dictatorship, and therefore not a real ally with America in the cause of furthering world peace.

So I say that if the able Senator from Missouri will accept the substitute of the Senator from Iowa, I think we shall have squarely presented to us the question: Do we believe in the socialization of major basic industries? Do we believe that by socializing them, sooner or later it will be necessary to have a dictatorship to operate them? If a dictatorship is required to operate them, a nation in such circumstances cannot be an ally of the United States under the North Atlantic Pact or the ECA. I think the issue is presented to us fairly, and I hope Senators will see fit to vote for the substitute. Its adoption will tell the world where we stand on this great question involving the differences between ideologies—between America and her institutions, on the one hand, and the ideology of the other extreme, as exemplified by Russian institutions.

EXHIBIT A

SOMEbody's GOING TO INVESTIGATE YOU IF YOU DON'T WATCH OUT!

You don't believe it, eh?

Who's that guy working with you?

Who's that student you're rooming with this year?

Who's that new kid on your team?

Sure, we know his name is Joe. We know his father works in a hardware store and his brother is a mechanic at the plant downtown. But did you know his third cousin by marriage has an uncle who is known to have signed a petition to place a Communist candidate on the ballot in Pennsylvania in the year 1940? You didn't, eh? Well, how do you feel about it now—associating with an American whose third cousin's uncle believes everybody, including Communists, have constitutional rights?

Boy, wait till the un-American Committee gets you on the stand. Suppose they ask you what you were doing on December 26, 1947?

You don't remember that night; do you? But the committee does.

That was the night someone persuaded you to go to a peace rally. There were maybe 7,000 people there, but the boys were able to pick you out because you're a big guy and because you've got red hair. Red! Get it? And do you remember who spoke at that rally? VIRO MARCANTONIO—the United States Congressman from New York.

'Nuff said!

ONCE UPON A TIME

Once upon a time we had gremlins.

Now we have Communists instead.

If the people get mad about high prices, if you want more pay in your envelope, if you think every young person is entitled to a job regardless of the color of his skin, if students ask for education instead of UMT, if vets are getting worked up about no housing and exorbitant rents, if the voters get disgusted with the old parties, if Wallace's Progressive Party campaigns for peace, then this is what the big boys of Wall Street do:

They yell Communist loud and strong.

If they yell it loud enough and strong enough and long enough they hope you'll forget that Congress hasn't done anything to bring prices down or give the Nation housing or guarantee them peace. (Because the GOP and the Democrats are both in hock to big business.)

And the papers will be full of nice fat, scare headlines which are aimed to scare anybody who wants to vote for Wallace.

And to keep the fat headlines rolling, the un-American Committee cooks up a big fake spy scare.

And Harry says to Tom Clark: "Investigate the Reds! Call a grand jury! Make a big noise! Or they'll vote for Henry and we'll both be out of a job come November 4."

THEY DREAM UP FORCE AND VIOLENCE

So they call a grand jury. It's supposed to be a big hush-hush. But they let it leak out to the press that startling revelations are coming: big spy story—tie-up of Communist espionage in high places.

And when the grand jury finally emerges, does it say anything about Communist spies? It does not. Because there are no Communist spies. The jury admits it has absolutely no proof.

So lacking a bona fide spy scare they drag out an old lemon known as force and violence. On this charge they indict 12 leaders of the Communist Party. They plot to outlaw the Communist Party. This is the way the indictment goes: The Communists are "a society . . . of persons who teach and advocate the overthrow and destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence."

That charge is a lie.

This is the truth: The Communist Party does not now—and never has—advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. Its constitution specifically calls for the expulsion of any member who "conspires to overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy."

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the *Schneiderman* case, in 1943, stated that the Communist Party "desired to achieve its purpose by peaceful and democratic means."

Now, we'll tell you what the Communist Party really stands for:

Peace, the Bill of Rights, full equality for the Negro people, the right to work, and to strike, to social security, the right to advocate socialism to end the wars and depressions which capitalism breeds.

What we believe in was never said better than by William Z. Foster in answer to the *Herald Tribune*. He said:

"As an American I love our broad and beautiful land, its liberty-loving people, its wonderful industrial achievements, its glorious democratic traditions. But I do not love its capitalist system. All my adult life I have rebelled against an order of society which permits individuals to grab and hold as their private property the great natural resources and industries of our country, and which allows them to exploit for personal profit the masses of our people. I refuse to accept a social system under which a vast disproportion of the national wealth is owned by a few, and which forces one-third of our people to remain ill-clad, ill-fed and ill-housed, while armies of useless, parasitic capitalist idlers revel in luxury; a society which permits the barbaric lynching of Negroes to go unpunished; which inflicts our country periodically with devastating economic crisis and gigantic mass unemployment, and which is now deliberately organizing to plunge the world into another still more terrible war. In fighting against all these monstrous evils, in working for a Socialist America, I am performing the profoundest patriotic duty."

XCV—257

It is this kind of belief and the right to hold these beliefs that the Government is trying to stifle by indicting the 12 Communist leaders. The grand jury could charge no specific actions; it indicts the Communists for holding ideas. "Dangerous thoughts!" Of peace, security, democracy. If the Communist Party is outlawed—which is the purpose of the indictment—the gates are open to Fascism. Exactly as it started in Germany.

And we'll tell you what the Communist Party demands for young people:

First. Repeal the draft. We stand for the defense of the United States against all its real enemies. But America is in no danger of attack from anyone. We are the most powerful nation in the world today. The draft was engineered in order to create a war scare so that Wall Street could send American boys to China and Greece and the rest of Europe. Not to defend America . . . but to multiply Wall Street profits. To gobble the world.

Second. End Jim Crow in the armed forces. Discrimination, segregation, Jim Crow—these are the real subversives.

Third. Give 18-year-olds the right to vote. If they are old enough to be drafted they are certainly old enough to cast the ballot.

Fourth. Give youth a real job-training program; teach them skills; get them jobs.

Fifth. A public-housing program which will give young people homes—not promises.

Sixth. An end to quota systems and all discrimination in education.

Seventh. Pass Federal aid to education bill.

Eighth. Full academic freedom for students and teachers. An end to "thought control."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator be so kind as to send it to the desk? And does the Senator mean, by accepting it, that he is modifying his own amendment to read as it shall now be read by the clerk? Is that the meaning of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KEM. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri modifies his own amendment. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, between lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) Section 111 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(d) The Administrator shall not authorize assistance, under this act, within any participating country when such assistance will provide dollars or dollar credits which may be used by such participating country directly or indirectly, to acquire and operate in whole or in part any basic industry as a nationalized industry."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri as modified.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, under all the circumstances, I think the Senate ought to recess now. I move the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow—

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas withhold his motion?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor. Does the Senator from Texas yield the floor?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Generally speaking, a Senator can yield only for a question, in line with the policy laid down by the Vice President, but since the Senator from Pennsylvania is the acting majority leader, he may make a statement.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it is our intention that when the Senate takes a recess, it recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. We hope that we may then be able to finish the consideration of the bill sometime tomorrow. I am sure that most of the Members of the Senate would like to avoid a Saturday session, and in order to accommodate the membership, it is our hope to remain in session tomorrow until we conclude consideration of the bill. But before we recess—

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask the acting majority leader if his statement means—and I agree that we should try to press for a conclusion of the bill—we will stay in session with the idea of finishing the bill tomorrow or tomorrow night?

Mr. MYERS. That is correct. We have fixed no definite time. It is our hope that we can finish tomorrow. I say that only because I think most of the Members of the Senate desire to avoid a Saturday session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from California is recognized for that purpose, as any other Senators will who wish to offer insertions for the RECORD.

ALLEGED DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST AMERICAN INDUSTRY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter dated March 24, which I addressed to Honorable Dean Acheson, regarding quota restrictions which discriminate against American industry and agriculture, the reply of the Secretary of State, dated March 30, 1949, and a letter from Under Secretary Webb dated April 1, 1949.

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

MARCH 24, 1949.

HON. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We would be very much interested to know what steps have been taken by this Government to have the British Government materially reduce or

eliminate quota restrictions which discriminate against American industry and agriculture. At a time when the Congress is being urged to contribute to the opening up of the channels of trade it seems to us to be inconsistent for the British Government to establish economic iron curtains against American industrial and agricultural products, whether such restrictions be in the nature of quota arrangements, discriminatory taxation, or currency restrictions.

Any information you could furnish relative to this situation would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
California.

STYLES BRIDGES,
New Hampshire.

ROBERT A. TAFT,
Ohio.

EDWARD MARTIN,
Pennsylvania.

OWEN BREWSTER,
Maine.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 30, 1949.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have received the letter of March 24, 1949, signed by you and Senators BRIDGES, TAFT, MARTIN, and BREWSTER asking for information about the steps which this Government has taken to have the British Government eliminate quota restrictions.

I have asked officers in the Department to look into this matter carefully and will write to you again on the subject in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 1, 1949.

The Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I refer to the letter of March 24, 1949, in which you and Senators BRIDGES, TAFT, MARTIN, and BREWSTER ask for information relative to certain discriminations by the British Government against American industry and agriculture and in which you state that the existence of such discrimination seems to be inconsistent with the objective of opening up the channels of trade.

Such discriminations against American industry and agriculture as are now in effect among European countries are part of a pattern whereby such countries are seeking to derive maximum benefit toward European recovery from their inadequate supply of dollars. In the main, these restrictions limit the import of products requiring dollar expenditure which the countries can do without or can obtain from their respective domestic economies or from soft currency sources. By conserving their dollars in this fashion, European countries are in a position to make the most of the assistance which they receive under the European Recovery Program and thereby to insure that European recovery will progress at the speediest practicable rate and at a minimum cost to the American taxpayer.

Current policies, which have been developed jointly with the Economic Cooperation Administration and with other interested agencies, have been framed with a full recognition of the desirability of returning at the earliest possible date to a pattern of nondiscriminatory multilateral trade. In order for such a pattern to be established on a sound and lasting basis, European recovery must have progressed to a point where not only the over-all balance of payments of the European countries can practicably be brought into balance, but also their balance of payments with the dollar area.

It is the aim of the ERP to achieve such a situation as rapidly as practicable. Progress toward this objective during the last year has been real, but a point has not yet been reached where it would be possible for European countries to achieve a balance in their dollar payments without careful conservation of their dollar earnings supplemented by assistance from the United States.

As you no doubt know, the relaxation of existing restrictions upon trade and currency convertibility involve questions of timing which are of the utmost complexity. You will recall the unfortunate experience which the British suffered when, in the summer of 1947, under the terms of the loan agreement, they reestablished limited sterling convertibility. You will recall that the British Government was compelled to abandon such convertibility within a few weeks, but only after serious inroads had been made upon her dollar reserves. In its participation in the development of policies in this field, the Department is earnestly endeavoring to avoid such premature measures in the future, which would only result in an increased burden on United States taxpayers, while at the same time moving toward the earliest attainment of multilateral, non-discriminatory world trading. The Department shares with you the conviction that such a pattern of world trading is the only lasting basis upon which economic relationships with Europe can be built.

I am enclosing extra copies of this letter and I should appreciate your giving one to each of the Senators who joined you in signing the letter.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted immediately following that correspondence a copy of an article which appeared in the London Times under date of March 31, 1949, relating to film quota.

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

REDUCTION IN FILM QUOTA—OPPOSITION URGES UNDERSTANDING WITH AMERICA

WESTMINSTER.—In the House of Commons this evening Mr. H. Wilson, President of the Board of Trade, moved the approval of an order to reduce the film quota for first feature films from 45 percent to 40 percent.

He explained that the order did not represent an uncontroversial proposal. No quota in this unhappy and divided industry could be uncontroversial. He had received no representations, official or unofficial, from Hollywood or any other part of America. The quota was fixed by the Board of Trade, conscientiously and fearlessly, in relation to the available facts.

He had departed from the figure recommended by one-half of the film council. Producers and renters were in favor of accepting the 45 percent, and were supported by one-half the trade-union representation. The exhibitors and the other half of the trade-union representation supported a proposal to reduce the quota to 33 1/3 percent. Apart from the chairman the voting was exactly equal, and the chairman cast his vote in favor of a reduction, but said he did not favor a reduction as low as 33 1/3 percent. In those circumstances he did not think it could be represented that he had flouted the advice of the film council since that advice was divided.

INCENTIVE TO INDUSTRY

There were two main considerations to be borne in mind in fixing a quota. One was the paramount necessity of building up a sound and healthy production industry in this country. Last year's quota was meant

to be an encouragement and incentive to the industry. During the passage of the recent act he undertook to fix the quota at such a level as would provide a distribution outlet for all British films of a reasonable quality. They had to have in mind supplying to exhibitors a reasonable choice of films for their patrons. It would therefore be wrong to fix a quota merely in the interests of encouraging British production.

From the discussions in the film council it seemed reasonable to assume that new British first-feature films this year would number between 70 and 80. The 40-percent quota would mean that a town with three cinemas having a change of program no more than once a week would satisfy its obligation with 63 British films. The quota of 45 percent would require a total of 72 British films, and thus the new order gave a slightly larger margin between the number of films available and those required.

It was a great disappointment to him to have to reduce the quota. He did not want to sound too discouraging about it. The industry was going through difficult times, and if he thought that the reduction was more than temporary he would feel a good deal more concerned about the position than he did. He approached the reduction with the idea of reculer pour mieux sauter.

THE BIG COMPANIES

It was a fact that the big companies in the industry had been drawing in their horns for financial reasons. The films required to honor the reduced quota would have to come to a greater extent than hitherto from independent producers, who would require to be financed from sources other than the traditional ones in the industry, particularly from the new Film Finance Corp. Recent Hollywood film awards had shown that the quality of the best British films was still the best in the world.

Apprehension had been expressed that the quota was too high for the non-circuit exhibitor. The board of trade was empowered to award reduced quota percentages or in some cases total exemption from quotas to exhibitors who applied for relief and fulfilled certain prescribed conditions. It was too early to say to what extent relief would be given in the coming period but, in relation to the current year, they had granted relief of varying amounts to 1,471 cinemas, besides awarding total exemption to a further 307. In most cases it would be possible to award relief to those exhibitors who required them.

He was certain it was right to reduce the quota. It would have been an unfair burden on exhibitors in the light of the number of films expected to come forward to have required them to show 45 percent of their screen time through British films. That might have led to a break-down of the act if a large number of cinemas could not fulfill the quota set; nor would it have been in the best interests of British film production. On the other hand, to have reduced the quota further to 33 1/3 or 25 percent would have dealt a grievous blow to British film production in this country.

He could understand why exhibitors in general were pressing for a lower quota, but they must realize that the short-term direct financial interest of the cinema exhibitor did not coincide with either the short-term or the long-term economic interest of the country as a whole. However true it might be that exhibitors' profits would have increased if they had been allowed to show a higher proportion of imported films, it was true that the economic condition of the country would have been gravely prejudiced by such a course, and, indeed, it would have dealt such a serious blow at the film production industry that it might have endangered the supply of films to the exhibitors.

UNEXPECTED RESULTS FROM QUOTA—MORE FINANCE NEEDED

Mr. E. Fletcher (Islington, E., Labor) said that if the object of the quota was to give the maximum assistance to British film production, it followed that no unnecessary or unjustified relief from the quota should be given. Those cinemas which had had quota relief were able to show more American films and draw off revenue from the cinemas showing a higher quota, and he estimated that as a result there was a net loss of film to British film production.

In the current year the quota of 45 percent, while it had been fulfilled by and large, had had the unexpected result that instead of being a stimulus to British production the reverse had happened. Studios were empty, there had been redundancy and loss of employment. The reason for this was the difficulty in getting finance from private sources, and sooner or later it would be necessary for the Government to give increased financial assistance to British producers, just as it would also be necessary to work out a concordat with the Americans for quality films to be made in both countries on a basis of reciprocal showing.

Sir I. Fraser said that in a laudable attempt to encourage the making of British films and the saving of dollars the president of the board of trade had fixed the quota too high for all practical purposes.

Mr. N. Maclean (Glasgow, Govan, Labor) said that in suggesting a quota of 40 percent the president of the board of trade was acting in defiance of the Cinematograph Films Council, set up by himself, which recommended a quota of 33½ percent.

Mr. Granville (Eye, Labor) said we were losing the celluloid cold war with the United States. The cut of 5 percent in the quota and the fact that there was a great deal of redundancy in British studios proved that either the advisers to the president of the board of trade were wrong or there was something fundamentally wrong in the industry itself. The industry could not be safeguarded by quota qualifications. It needed an international agreement which would give the production side of the industry in this country the first real opportunity it had had for years.

ARTIFICIAL PROPS

Mr. T. O'Brien (Nottingham, W., Labor) said that the film industry, buttressed as it had been with a quota for the past 20 years, had now failed to stand up to the Americans. It was a source of considerable disquiet. He was not convinced that the finance was or would be available to meet the 40-percent quota. The quota would not put into employment one man who was now unemployed but would lead to further unemployment. The problem could only be solved by taking away the artificial props which this government and previous governments had put up to bolster the industry. The more props there were the more disagreement there would be among the interests in the industry. The time had come to tell the industry that it could no longer expect any government permanently to assist it.

Mr. McCallum (Argyll, Conservative) asked what consideration had been given to the position of independent Scottish exhibitors.

Mr. Levy (Eton and Slough, Labor) said that no amount of money tendered as gift or loan to the production side of the industry would be of any use in alleviating existing difficulties unless there was fairer distribution of box-office earnings.

Mr. W. G. Shepherd (Bucklow, Conservative) said that the basic difficulty was the lack of necessary cooperation by the American industrialists whose backs had been put up unnecessarily by Mr. Dalton. It was also essential that there should be some sort of unity in the British industry.

AMERICAN PRODUCTIONS

Mr. Wilson said he had warned the American negotiators last year that he would fix the highest possible quota figure. He could not have discussed with them, or even indicated to them, the figure he had in mind at that time, because he had no specific figure in mind, and by statute he was required to consult the new films council which could not be set up until the act was passed.

With regard to the present quota, no representations had been received from American interests. He would welcome much greater American film production in this country. The American industry was facing possible changes as a result of a legal decision which made it difficult for them to negotiate either with the British Government, or the British film industry.

It was completely wrong to suggest that the present situation was due to the 45-percent quota. If it was the opposition's argument that the falling off in the box-office receipts was due to the low quality of the films produced under the quota, they must realize that this quota was only announced in the middle of June and did not come into effect until October. It would have been almost impossible to get the films produced to have an effect on attendance and the finances of the industry.

BANK ADVANCES—MR. LYTTELTON'S CRITICISM

Mr. Lyttelton (Aldershot, Conservative) said the effect of fixing a 45-percent quota had undoubtedly been to give some substance to the fears about the quality of British production, which he thought had been falling. Producers admittedly were finding finance difficult. The advances which one joint-stock bank had made to one large film concern were greatly in excess of £10,000,000 and the security which the bank had against the advances largely consisted of canned films. It was not the type of banker's advance which was particularly popular either in Lombard Street or Threadneedle Street.

He could not congratulate the government on the history of the negotiations with the American film industry. We could not afford the unrestricted importation of American films, but the opposition had said that every effort should be made to gain not only an agreement with the Americans but also their cooperation. A great mistake was made at that time because immediately after the agreement with Mr. Eric Johnston had been concluded the quota was fixed at 45 percent without any previous consultation with the Americans. That was an immature piece of negotiation. It had led to a number of unpleasant consequences for us.

He noted from reports which he had received from America that the reduction of the quota to 40 percent had done nothing whatever to relieve the bitterness of the American film industry at the size of the quota generally. The Americans were extremely obstructive to British films being shown in the United States. Rightly or wrongly, they felt they had been treated in rather a smart way by the British Government.

WORST OF ALL WORLDS

Another consequence was that there was something like a sit-down strike by American producers in this country concerning the use of the blocked sterling they had accumulated here. They were sullen and uncooperative and were not using that blocked sterling to produce films here. Exhibitors were short of third-feature films and the public were definitely put off attendance at cinemas by the quality of the films. The consequence was that unemployment was beginning to be rife.

Taking it all together, the rather maladroit way in which the Government conducted their negotiations had resulted in the industry as a whole getting the worst of all worlds.

The Government's action, so far as the Government had interfered, was done in a way which would lead one to suppose that the industry was already nationalized. [Laughter.] It gave one very little confidence about the future.

He hoped that the lessons of this mess would be borne in on the Government. A certain amount of face-losing on their part had to be recognized and we should try to gain the cooperation of the Americans. It was clear that the industry was in great jeopardy. The necessary first steps were to reopen the subject with the American producers, to release some of the British film earnings abroad, and to consider at an early date some remission of the purchase tax.

This order represented a set-back to all who were hoping for a continually expanding production, but provided that the industry could settle its other problems, financial, distribution, and all the rest, he would hope not only that this quota could be realized without hardship to anyone, but, further, that they could look forward to a reversion to a higher quota in the reasonably near future and see a firmly established film industry in this country.

Mr. Blackburn (Birmingham, King's Norton, Labor) said that on the last occasion when he addressed the House, he repeated information he had incorrectly received as a member of the committee of inspection in the liquidation of the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company that Lord Baldwin had intervened in relation to the prosecution of Lord Kylsant. He wished to withdraw that statement. He now knew that it was incorrect.

We had in this country, he continued, the resources and the men to fulfill the 45-percent film quota and no valid reason had been given why it should not be fulfilled. The government should requisition the studio space and see that we produced the films for the quota. We did not want the American film industry being built up in this country. We should be fighting to have our own industry. The whole of the producers and renters were unanimous that they wanted to retain the 45-percent quota.

Mr. Gallacher (Fife, W., Communist) said that Mr. Rank and company laid the foundations of the ruin of the industry and the mass unemployment through the enormous expenditure on films in the attempt to get the American market. The 45-percent quota could easily be fulfilled. Mr. Wilson should take over control of the studios and set the people to work.

The order was approved.

EXTENSION OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1209) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to inquire if there will be an executive session this evening.

Mr. MYERS. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that there will be an executive session.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas, in view of the fact that the debate has been continuing for approximately 3 weeks and that all phases of the subject have been covered, if it would not be possible to get a unanimous-consent agreement that at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon the Senate

begin voting on the bill and all amendments thereto. It seems to me that 3 weeks is a pretty long time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it is feasible and sensible; but I do not know whether it is practicable.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas whether he will put that proposition to the test. I do not mean to be captious in asking this, but I myself think that after 3 weeks of debate we ought to dispose of the matter and proceed with something else.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will yield to the Senator from Maryland so that he may propound the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot yield for that purpose. What is the pleasure of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning tomorrow at 2 o'clock, the Senate proceed to vote upon all pending amendments, to be followed by a vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I do not share the view that the debate on this important issue before the Senate has been too prolonged. I am perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself. As a proponent of the pending legislation, I take the position that it is of the utmost importance that the point of view of Senators who are in disagreement with the legislation be made a matter of record, so that the people of the Nation—and there are hundreds of them writing to their representatives, raising objections to the pending bill—can know as a fact that we have considered all possible objections and criticisms to the proposed legislation.

Further, I want to say, Mr. President, that in view of the parliamentary situation which has developed in the Senate, in view of the course of action which has been followed by the majority leader in the handling of the business of the Senate, it will be a long time indeed before the Democratic side of the aisle will be able to transact business by way of unanimous consent. It will transact business by motion only.

The Junior Senator from Oregon objects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate—

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MYERS. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania why not proceed with the session. Why should the Senate recess at this time?

Mr. MYERS. There was a general understanding or agreement that a recess would be taken at approximately 6 or 6:30 o'clock unless there seemed to be an opportunity to complete debate on the bill by 8 or 9 o'clock. There are a number of pending amendments, and it seems

to me there is no possibility of finishing before 12 o'clock tonight. Therefore we thought it would be better to go over until tomorrow, in the hope that we might remain in session tomorrow until a reasonable hour and get a vote on the passage of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the acting majority leader says he hopes we can get through tomorrow?

Mr. MYERS. The best I can say is hope.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for a question?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Is the Senator familiar with the biblical statement that hope deferred maketh the heart sick?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Long deferred, is it not?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire would question the authenticity of the quotation as given by the occupant of the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Presiding Officer has no right to engage in conversation with Senators on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is quite correct, and if it is the desire of the Senator from Maryland, the remark will be expunged.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania have valid reasons for his hope that the Senate can finish tomorrow?

Mr. MYERS. I do. The Senate now seems to be in good humor, and I am hopeful we can finish tomorrow. I think it is probably advisable to take a recess this afternoon, because every Member seems to be in good humor at this time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for a question?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I suppose the Senator thinks that sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair makes no observations in connection with that statement.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MYERS. I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sam D. W. Low, of Houston, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 22, with headquarters at Galveston, Tex., to fill an existing vacancy; and

Victor Russell, of Port Arthur, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 21, with headquarters at Port Arthur, Tex. (reappointment).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska (reappointment).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on Executive Calendar.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hawthorne Arey to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

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

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

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

NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I respectfully ask that the nomination go over at this time. I want the RECORD to show that I am making the suggestion in behalf of a Senator who is not on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will go over, in accordance with the request.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hugh W. Cross to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

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

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oswald Ryan to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, without taking the time of the Senate to make a few remarks I had intended to make on this nomination, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I have

prepared be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator understands that under the rule the statement will be printed in small type, not in the regular type, does he?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON

Oswald Ryan is an original member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, appointed by President Roosevelt in 1938. He had previously served 6½ years as general counsel of the Federal Power Commission under the Hoover and the Roosevelt administrations, during which time he had argued important public-utility cases to the Supreme Court and other Federal courts.

Mr. Ryan was the only lawyer on the Board during its early years and the only member that had had previous experience in public regulation. Accordingly he took leadership in developing the technique of the new regulation. Thus, he urged, and the Board adopted years ago, an administrative procedure which separated the judicial from the prosecuting functions and provided for a fair hearing for all interested parties in both judicial and legislative cases. In this connection, it is a significant fact that when the Administrative Procedure Act was adopted by the Congress a few years ago, the Civil Aeronautics Board was the only quasi-judicial commission of the Government which found it unnecessary to make basic changes in its procedure to conform to the new law. That was because the basic reforms provided by the new act had been adopted years before by the Board on its own motion.

Another contribution which is credited to Mr. Ryan was the establishment of prudent investment as the basis of rate making. Mr. Ryan, before coming to the Civil Aeronautics Board, had appeared before the Supreme Court and argued as a "friend of the Court" in favor of the prudent-investment method of public-utility rate making as against the old reproduction-cost method. He successfully urged this rate-making reform upon the Board.

Mr. Ryan has also led in the past 10 years in bringing about a cooperative relation between the Civil Aeronautics Board and the various State aviation agencies which have frequently been in conflict. In 1945 he offered to the representatives of the States assembled at St. Louis a solution to the problem which contemplated congressional action which would give to State aviation agencies and courts concurrent jurisdiction to enforce Federal aviation laws and regulations. Within the past few days the State aviation commissions, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the Civil Aeronautics Board have reached common agreement upon this plan which the Congress will be asked to incorporate in legislation.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, December 16, 1942]

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday the President sent to the Senate two nominations to the Civil Aeronautics Board, one being that of Oswald Ryan, of Indiana, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the term expiring December 31, 1948, which is a reappointment, and the other the nomination of our colleague the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It was not intended

that the nomination of the Senator from Oklahoma should come up for consideration at this session. By some mistake of the clerical force at the White House his nomination was included. The Senator from Oklahoma is not eligible to appointment to that Board until after his term as Senator expires, because the Board was created during the term of the Senator from Oklahoma which is now expiring. Therefore, I do not expect any action to be taken upon that nomination, now. The other nomination, however, of Mr. Ryan is a reappointment, and I ask unanimous consent that that nomination be confirmed without reference to committee.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this matter was called to my attention yesterday. I am acquainted with Mr. Ryan and familiar with his work on the Board, and so far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Ryan at this time. It is a reappointment, and, of course, otherwise would have to go over until the next session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make the request, Mr. President, with the approval of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to make one or two remarks as to Mr. Oswald Ryan, in furtherance of the request made by the majority leader. As the author of the act under which Mr. Oswald Ryan is serving, I wish to pay the very highest possible compliment to him for his very able, efficient, and progressive administration while he has been in his present position. I think there is no man in the United States who could better fill the position than Mr. Oswald Ryan, and I am glad to join in the request that his nomination be immediately confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oswald Ryan, of Indiana, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the term expiring December 31, 1948 (reappointment).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination of Oswald Ryan is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order be withdrawn, because I understand the Senator from South Carolina desires to direct some remarks to the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order made by the Chair a moment ago will be set aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is set aside.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say that Mr. Oswald Ryan, a distinguished member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, who has been nominated for a 6-year term, served ably and long on the Federal Power Commission, and in the dark days in South Carolina we were fortunate in having Mr. Ryan serve in that position. He rendered great service to the State of South Carolina in connection with the development of the Santee River. He defended us in the circuit courts and in the local courts. The State went on record, by the adoption in the legislature of a long resolution, in appreciation of his great service as a member of the Federal Power Commission, originally appointed, I believe,

by President Hoover. He served ably and long, and I am happy to be in the Senate to cast my vote for the confirmation of his nomination. He is an outstanding American, and has been of great assistance to South Carolina and to the United States in general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Oswald Ryan, of Indiana, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board? Objection was made by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] for the purpose of allowing the Senator from South Carolina to speak on the nomination.

Mr. MYERS. I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is withdrawn.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that my only purpose in objecting—and perhaps I should have reserved the right to object—was to give the Senator from South Carolina an opportunity to speak in reference to this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the nomination.

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 8, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of March 18), 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Stephen T. Early, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

John Carson, of Michigan, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1945.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John J. Wein, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires April 7, 1949.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

Lyman A. Thackrey	Herbert S. Duckworth
Carl F. Espe	Frank Akers

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Samuel E. McCarty
George W. Bauernschmidt

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grade of captain subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the line of the Navy:

Carlton R. Adams	Burrell C. Allen, Jr.
Scarritt Adams	Robert A. Allen
James A. Adkins	William Y. Allen, Jr.
John W. Alies III	Charles H. Andrews

John B. Azer
 Harry P. Badger
 James O. Banks, Jr.
 Rudolph C. Bauer
 Paul P. Blackburn, Jr.
 Everett M. Block
 John B. Bowen, Jr.
 Alston M. Boyd, Jr.
 Parke H. Brady
 John M. Bristol
 Douglas B. Broken-
 shire
 Thomas M. Brown
 Edward Brumby
 Harvey P. Burden
 Norwood A. Campbell
 Joseph P. Canty
 Edward S. Carmick
 Albert S. Carter
 Francis M. Carter
 George M. Chambers
 Wreford G. Chapple
 Robert N. S. Clark
 Joseph C. Clifton
 Doyle M. Coffee
 Victor B. Cole
 Edward E. Colestock
 John B. Colwell
 Richard J. H. Conn
 Ray R. Conner
 John Corbus
 Howard G. Corey
 Robert R. Craighill
 Dana B. Cushing
 James W. Davis
 Edward M. Day
 Harry E. Day
 Walter S. Denham
 Jefferson R. Dennis
 Paul L. DeVos
 John B. Dimmick
 Joseph E. Dodson
 Jack S. Dorsey
 William T. Doyle, Jr.
 William M. Drane
 Charles G. Duffy
 Elmer J. Dunn
 Harold E. Duryea
 Otis J. Earle
 Walter G. Ebert
 Ian C. Eddy
 Hal K. Edwards
 John E. Edwards
 William E. Ellis
 Christian L. Engleman
 Lot Ensey
 Robert J. Esslinger
 William S. Estabrook,
 Jr.
 Charles T. Fitzgerald
 Andrew M. R. Fitzsim-
 mons
 John F. Flynn
 Robert S. Ford
 Dennis L. Francis
 Bernhart A. Fuetsch
 Robert E. Gadrow
 Edmund E. Garcia
 Kenneth M. Gentry
 Frank D. Giambat-
 tista
 George O. Gjoerloff
 Charles R. Gilliam
 Marvin H. Gluntz
 John B. Gragg
 James D. L. Grant
 Eltonzo B. Grantham,
 Jr.
 George M. Greene
 William M. Gullett
 Elvin Hahn
 Thomas B. Haley
 Mervin Halstead
 Henry O. Hansen
 Burton S. Hanson, Jr.
 Chesley M. Hardison
 William L. Harmon
 David A. Harris
 James W. Haviland III

David D. Hawkins
 George L. Heap
 Harold M. Heming
 Charles R. Herms
 Alexander S. Heyward,
 Jr.
 George M. Holley
 Herschel A. House
 John G. Howell
 Charles C. Howerton
 John Hulme
 Hayes E. Irons
 Alexander Jackson, Jr.
 Andrew McB. Jackson,
 Jr.
 Walter T. Jenkins
 Lafayette J. Jones
 John H. Keatley
 Harold W. Keopka
 John O. Kinert
 William H. Kirvan
 Denys W. Knoll
 Lyle L. Koepke
 George F. Kosco
 Donald F. Krick
 Keith M. Krieger
 Thomas R. Kurtz, Jr.
 Frederick W. Laing
 James G. Lang
 Rowland C. Lawver
 James T. Lay
 John E. Lee
 Nicholas A. Lidstone
 Horatio A. Lincoln
 Charles W. Lord
 Vernon L. Lowrance
 Frederic C. Lucas, Jr.
 Frank P. Luongo, Jr.
 Oliver D. T. Lynch
 Edgar J. MacGregor III
 Hugh T. MacKay
 Elwood C. Madsen
 Joseph B. Maher
 Ray E. Malpass
 Herbert H. Marable
 Edmund S. L. Marshall
 Henry M. Marshall
 Kleber S. Masterson
 Laurance O. Mathews
 Jr.
 Leo G. May
 Charles T. Mauro, Jr.
 Albert S. Miller
 Frank B. Miller
 Theodore T. Miller
 Ray A. Mitchell
 William A. Moffett, Jr.
 Robert R. Moore
 John A. Moreno
 Elias B. More II
 Warren H. McClain
 Charles E. McCombs
 George T. McCready,
 Jr.
 Montgomery L. McCul-
 lough, Jr.
 Francis C. B. McCune
 Robert D. McGinnis
 Louis D. McGregor, Jr.
 John R. McKnight, Jr.
 Bowen F. McLeod
 Ira E. McMillan
 Roscoe L. Newman
 James H. Newsome
 Roy A. Newton
 Kelvin L. Nutting
 Emmet O'Beirne
 Davis W. Olney
 Arthur E. Owen
 George G. Palmer
 Alex M. Patterson
 Harold Payson, Jr.
 Herman A. Pieczent-
 kowski
 William S. Post, Jr.
 Lynne C. Quiggle
 Samuel M. Randall
 Allen L. Reed
 Edward C. Renfro

Everet O. Rigsbee, Jr.
 Horacio Rilvero, Jr.
 Josephus A. Robbins
 Norman K. Roberts
 Allan B. Roby
 Bernard F. Roeder
 Joseph A. Ruddy, Jr.
 Lawrence E. Ruff
 Royal L. Rutter
 Henry G. Sanchez
 Eddie R. Sanders
 William H. Sanders,
 Jr.
 Eugene T. Sands
 Gifford Scull
 George C. Sea
 Raymond N. Sharp
 Frank T. Sleat
 Harry Smith
 William O. Snead, Jr.
 Arthur F. Spring
 Clyde B. Stevens, Jr.
 James E. Stevens
 Francis S. Stich
 Robert J. Stroh
 Walter W. Strohbehn
 Ray F. Yager
 Robert T. Sutherland,
 Jr.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Lawrence L. Bean
 Sam C. Bostic
 Byron F. Brown
 George G. Burkley
 Herman F. Burkwall
 Charles L. Denton
 Archibald M. Ecklund
 Richard H. Fletcher
 Roland H. Fogel
 James E. Fulghum
 Percy B. Gallegos
 Charles Gartenlaub
 John A. C. Gray
 John K. Hawes
 Harold Hirschland
 Peter E. Huth
 Spencer Johnson
 Louis P. Kirkpatrick
 Ernest S. V. Laub
 Jerome P. Long, Jr.
 John A. Lund
 Leslie L. MacClatchie
 Ralph R. Myers
 Ira C. Nichols
 Paul G. Richards
 Nathan L. Robbin
 Thomas P. Rogers
 William M. Russell
 Shelton P. Sanford
 Robert V. Schultz
 David W. Sherwood
 Walter J. Shudde
 Leonard E. Skilling
 Fred B. Smith
 Charles C. Terry, Jr.
 Leslie L. Veseen
 Ross W. Weisiger
 James N. Williams
 Michael Wishengrad

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Clark T. Abbott
 Thomas L. Becknell,
 Jr.
 James W. Boundy
 Aubrey J. Bourgeois
 Carlos M. Charneco
 George W. Foott
 Hugh C. Haynsworth,
 Jr.
 Willard C. Johnson
 Albert P. Kohlhas, Jr.
 William M. Landau
 Onnie P. Lattu
 Lionel C. Peppell
 Walter F. Prien

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Henry G. Clark
 Arthur I. Flaherty
 Pinckney M. Jeffords
 James C. Tily
 Alexander S. C. Wadsworth
 William F. Wesanen

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Robert E. Blair
 Jesse B. Bancroft
 Donald M. Coughlin
 Thaddeus V. Joseph
 George H. Mills
 Max A. Moon
 Edwin A. Thomas
 Lauro J. Turbini

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Naval Reserve subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lenus F. Adams
 Benjamin B. Dowell
 Arthur F. Morash
 Charles E. Smith
 Wilson Starbuck
 Frederick R. L. Tuthill

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of March 18), 1949:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Hawthorne Arey to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1950.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Hugh W. Cross to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1950.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Oswald Ryan to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1954.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of Earl R. Adams et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), effective June 15, 1949, subject to physical qualification, and with the dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, and the nominations of John R. Cross et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant in the Medical Service Corps, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), effective June 15, 1949, subject to physical qualification, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 31, 1949, and appear in full in the Senate Proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Earl R. Adams, which name is shown on page 3597, and ending with the name of Dale E. Wykoff, which is shown on page 3598.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS

Rear Adm. John W. Reeves, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Vice Adm. Arthur W. Radford, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving under a Presidential designation as Commander in Chief, Pacific, Commander in Chief, United States Pacific Fleet, and High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Orlie G. Baird
 Leo P. Bauerlein
 Robert "C" Brown, Jr.
 Edward R. Day, Jr.
 Dean C. DuBois, Jr.
 Jimmie "C" Hendricks
 Charles B. House, Jr.
 Alvin Rush
 Ralph G. Spencer
 Louis R. Tevell
 Jeremy F. Worden

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Robert C. Austin
 Lee R. Balderston
 John F. Rawls, Jr.

Robert L. Herman (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy:

George E. Allison	Robert P. McArdle
William F. Beatty	Carey P. McMurray
Harry L. Benson	James G. Measel
Victor D. Brockmann	Albert J. Monger
Alva D. Burkett	Richard D. Murray
James E. Cahill	William G. Nealon
Charles E. Cantrell, Jr.	Norman J. Neiss
Warren E. Carman	William E. Nowers
Richard E. Case	Phil G. Olsen
William A. Cody	Delbert A. Olson
Jack C. Coggins	Joseph E. Puccini, Jr.
Robert T. Darcy	Howard M. Puckett
Howard M. Davenport, Jr.	Robert N. Radtke
George D. Edwards, Jr.	David R. Reilly
Lester H. Finger	Wallace Rich
Frederick L. Foxton	Daniel P. Riley
Jack D. Fuller	Paul E. Russell
Robert W. Hargarten	Wallace L. Russell
Harry J. Hinden	William McC. Shaver
David B. Holcombe	James R. Stohl
Jack I. Holmes, Jr.	Glenn E. Trewet, Jr.
Robert T. Holmes	Bruce W. VanAtta
William C. Hoyman	Joseph M. Verlander
Glenn D. Jordan	Robert S. Vermilya
Herbert L. Jos	Cecil R. Vollmer
Frank C. Kolda	Gerald A. Warnke
Andrew F. Kruzich	Douglas A. Washburn
Joseph R. Laubach, Jr.	Eugene F. Witkowski
Edward F. Lebledz	Robert H. Witten
Walter R. Lewison	John L. Zent

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Edward Auerswald	William T. Morgan
William E. Biro	Wehrle D. Richmond
Albert T. Buckmaster	James H. Rogers
William H. Diana, Jr.	Francis M. Simmons
Charles F. Jesson	Wayne F. Smith
Wade C. Kemmerer	John H. Thayer
Alfred G. Kreinberg	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949.

Andrew M. Durham	Robert L. McClintock
Joseph L. Forehand	William F. Reiser

William T. H. Barton (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Mary A. Ayars	Elizabeth L. Kotch
Jennie Binkiewicz	Bertha A. Krumming
Irene L. Bryant	Margaret H. Lester
Elizabeth M. Dobos	Elizabeth F. Metcalf
Jessie R. Franklin	Janet R. Mullen
Edna P. Gordon	May L. Reid
Bobbie L. Henley	Jean A. Replogle
Annette A. Kalista	Mary Stefanick
Margaret A. Kane	Dannelle Westbrook

John M. Whalen to be a commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, in lieu of lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Lloyd A. Bohaker	Howard H. Fischer
Arthur D. Eastman	James C. Reader
Harold W. Feder	

LIEUTENANTS

William E. Hutson
Charles E. Rudolph, Jr.
John H. Smith

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Wayne A. Nelson

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Emile W. Achee	Edward C. Adkins
Francis McK. Adams	Richard S. Agnew
Jr.	Hugh W. Albers
Richard D. Adams	Edward L. Alderman

Robert B. Aljoe	Kenneth M. Carr
David S. Allen	Robert H. Cartmill
Milton N. Allen	John P. Cartwright
John H. Alvis	Edward S. Carver
Ted M. Annenberg	Albert L. Cecchini
Robert H. Ardinger	James H. L. Chambers, Jr.
"A" "J" M. Atkins	Samuel R. Chessman
Wilfred A. Bacchus	Edmond A. Chevalier
Allan F. Bacon	Raymond G. Chote
John A. Bacon, Jr.	Louis G. Churchill, Jr.
Herman M. Bading	Glenwood Clark, Jr.
Gilliam M. Bailey	Robert S. Clark
Richard T. Bailey	Willard H. Clark, Jr.
John C. Bajus	Horace D. Clarke, Jr.
Robert F. Baker	Wade E. Clarke
Allen H. Balch	Richard A. Claytor
William J. Balco	Richard C. Clinite
Jack E. Baltar	David G. Cluett
Robert Barden	Warrington C. Cobb
Henry B. Barkley, Jr.	Albert G. Cohen
John C. Barrow	William M. Coldwell
John F. Barrow	Leonor L. Collins
Joseph J. Barrow	William D. Collins, Jr.
Byron S. Bartholomew, Jr.	Oliver D. Colvin, Jr.
Bernard E. Bassing	Richard R. Colvin
Charles J. Baumann, Jr.	Robert N. Congdon
Fred G. Baur	Robert W. Conklin
Reaves H. Baysinger, Jr.	Harvey Conover, Jr.
Raymond W. Bean	Karl F. Cook
Reynolds Beckwith	Robert J. Coontz
James W. Beeler	Alan B. Cooper
George M. Benas, Jr.	Stanley G. Cooper
Cedric E. Bennett	Francis E. Cornett
John E. Benoit	Stanley T. Counts
Francis W. Benson, Jr.	Sidney S. Cox
John S. McK. Benson	Billy H. Craig
Richard H. Benson	Donald E. Craig
Manuel S. Bentin	Edgar A. Cruise, Jr.
Richard H. Berby	John B. Culp, Jr.
Melvin Berngard	George W. Cummings
Karl J. Bernstein	Theodore A. Curtin
Frederick J. Blodgett	Stanley W. Curtis, Jr.
Thomas E. Bloom	Donald A. Dahlman
Paul R. Boggs, Jr.	John M. Dalrymple
Roger M. Boh, Jr.	John F. Danis
Donald B. Bosley	Chester G. Davis
Alfred C. Boughton	Whittier G. Davis
William DeW. Bourne	Julius H. Demyttenaere
Rhodes Boykin, Jr.	Edwin L. Dennis, Jr.
Robert E. Brady	Lawrence H. Derby, Jr.
Walter J. Brajdich	James D. Dickson
William W. Brandfon	Joe A. Dickson
Carl R. Brandt	Edward O. Dietrich
Charles B. Breaux, Jr.	Louis W. Dillman
Edward S. Briggs	Horace E. Dismukes
William R. Boughton, Jr.	John C. Dixon, Jr.
Coleman "T" Brown, Jr.	Stephen A. Dobbins
Ernest B. Brown	John F. Dobson
Frank P. Brown, Jr.	William C. Doby
James B. Brown	John F. Docherty, Jr.
Robert A. Brown	Harry J. Donahue
Gerald F. Brummitt	John M. Donlon
William L. Bryan	James A. Donovan
Harry F. Bryant, Jr.	Kurt F. Dorenkamp
Winfred L. Buckingham	William C. Dotson
Robert W. Bulmer	Robert McI. Douglass
Gerald L. Burk	Barton M. Downes
John F. Burke	John E. Dralm
Barksdale A. Bush, Jr.	Royce C. Dreyer
Herman J. Bushman	James R. Dugli
Jr.	William E. Duke, Jr.
Dempsey Butler, Jr.	Valerio "M" Duronio
James D. Butler	Gordon G. Duvall
Kenneth LeR. Butler	Behrend J. DuWaldt
Thomas O. Butler, Jr.	Gerald W. Dyer
William McC. Callaghan, Jr.	William T. Eaton
John J. Campanile	James E. Edmundson
David O. Campbell	John R. Edson
Donald H. Campbell	Howard R. Edwards, Jr.
Lucien Capone, Jr.	Henry W. Egan
James A. Carmack, Jr.	Montraville W. Egerton, Jr.
Bruce A. Carpenter	John J. Ekelund
James W. Carpenter	Richard M. Ellis
Andrew R. Carr	Presley E. Ellsworth

Merton R. Fallon	Charles A. Hotchkiss II
Robert L. Farley	Charles M. Howe
Robert E. Fellowes	James C. Hughes, Jr.
Leslie K. Fenlon, Jr.	Eugene St. C. Ince, Jr.
Eric N. Fenno	James E. Inskeep, Jr.
James V. Ferrero, Jr.	Robert C. James
Stanley S. Fine	Rodney R. James
William A. Finlay, Jr.	Albert L. Jenks, Jr.
John E. Fishburn III	Shepherd M. Jenks
George D. Florence	Whitney Jennison
Philip F. Florence	John E. Jensen
Henry P. Forbes	John A. Jepson
Sydney E. Foscatto, Jr.	Theodore N. Johnsen, Jr.
James R. Foster	Dallas DeS. Johnson
John B. Foster	Gerald R. Jones
Joyce M. Frazee	Herman W. Jones
Warren J. Fredericks	John V. Josephson
Richard A. Frost	Daniel H. Kahn
Peter L. Fullinwider	Joseph N. Kanevsky
James L. Furrh, Jr.	Thomas M. Kastner
Donald A. Gairing	Keatinge Keays
Channing Gardner	James K. Keihner
Paul A. Garrison	Richard W. Kelly
John P. Gartland	David S. Kendrick
David E. Gates	Richard A. Kennedy, Jr.
Matthew J. Gauss, Jr.	Robert W. Kennedy
Bernard S. Gewirz	William R. Kent III
Ralph McD. Ghormley	Thomas J. Kilcline
Beaumont Glass, Jr.	Herbert J. Kindl
Stephen S. Glass	Archer E. King III
Frank S. Glendinning	William C. King
William I. Goewey	Clark M. Kinney, Jr.
Milton D. Goldberg	John R. Kint
Roy E. Goldman	Gilbert J. Kirk, Jr.
Joseph H. Gollner	Joseph O. Kirkbride, Jr.
Russell F. Goodacre, Jr.	Peter F. Klein
Robert W. Goodman	Vernon P. Klemm
Franklin P. Goulburn, Jr.	George M. Kling
William C. Grant, Jr.	James E. Kneale
Roy R. Grayson	Wallace J. Knetz, Jr.
James H. Green	Arthur K. Knolzen
John W. Green	John H. Koach
John L. Greene	Richard G. Greenwood
Richard G. Greenwood	Philip J. Koehler
Stanley "J" Greif	Walter J. Kraus
Michael B. Guild	Stephen R. Krause
Davis L. Gunkel	William S. Kremidas
Milton Gussow	Otto E. Krueger
Douglas B. Guthe	Robert G. Kuhne
William S. Guthrie	Michael K. Lake
James V. Haley	William G. Lalor, Jr.
William H. Hamilton, Jr.	Chris W. Lamb
Theodore J. Hammer, Jr.	John G. Landers
James W. Hanson	John S. Lansill, Jr.
Norton D. Harding, Jr.	Paul H. Laric
William N. Harkness	David C. Larish
Donald M. Harlan	Norman O. Larson
John F. Harper, Jr.	Theodore J. Larson
William L. Harris, Jr.	Lloyd K. Lauderdale
Charles P. Hary, Jr.	Robert L. Lawler, Jr.
William C. Haskell	William G. Lawler, Jr.
Dale A. Hawley	Mark B. Lechleiter, Jr.
George A. P. Haynes	Thomas F. Lechner
Walter L. Helbig, Jr.	Jack R. Leisure
Dale P. Helmer	John F. Leyerle
John W. Hemann	Theodore E. Lide, Jr.
Donald Henderson	James B. Linder
Robert C. Hendrickson, Jr.	Wesley E. Lindsey, Jr.
Robert C. Hennekens	Thomas D. Linton, Jr.
Hugh E. Longino, Jr.	Donald Lister
Harvey S. Henning, Jr.	Hiram P. F. Llewellyn
Frederick W. Herbine	Joseph H. Logomasini
John D. Lund	Robert C. McCoy
William H. Lynch	Major I. McCreight
Robert M. McNulty, Jr.	Carlos d'A. McCulloch
Kenneth V. McArthur	Ewing R. McDonald, Jr.
Ralph W. McArthur	
Jeremiah R. McBride	
Gerry M. McCabe	
Elbert J. McCoy	
John C. McCoy	
Major I. McCreight	
Carlos d'A. McCulloch	
Ewing R. McDonald, Jr.	

Thomas E. McDonald
 William D. McFarlane, Jr.
 John S. McFeaters, Jr.
 Thomas P. McGinnis
 William C. McMurray
 James A. McQuilling
 Edward I. McQuiston, Jr.
 John A. McTammany
 James L. McVoy
 Clinton D. MacDonald
 Reginald M. Machell
 Jack E. Magee
 Edward J. Maguire, Jr.
 Timothy R. Mahoney
 Charles W. Maier, Jr.
 John E. Majesky
 John B. Mallard, Jr.
 Halford E. Maninger
 Robert G. Manseau
 William F. Marr
 Charles E. Martin
 William L. Martin III
 James W. Matheney
 Stanwix G. Mayfield III
 William H. Meanix, Jr.
 Gilbert D. Mello
 Charles F. Meloy
 Richard Mergl
 Warren H. Merrill
 Frank Messenger III
 Edward J. Messere
 John T. Metcalf, Jr.
 Harry B. Meyer
 Charles W. Meyrick
 John D. Middleton
 Arthur H. Mikosovsky
 Conrad C. Miller, Jr.
 Edmund A. Miller
 Gerlous G. Miller, Jr.
 John R. Miller
 Raymond L. Miller
 Robert O. Minter, Jr.
 George L. Moffett, Jr.
 Robair F. Mohrhardt
 Oliver S. Mollison
 Ludi A. Moore
 Robert S. Moore
 Alfred J. Morency
 George E. Morgan, Jr.
 Hal McN. Morgan
 Harry W. Morgan, Jr.
 James F. Murphy
 James D. Murray, Jr.
 William A. Myers III
 Donald A. Nadig
 Guy M. Neely, Jr.
 Andrew G. Nelson
 Philip S. Nelson
 Robert H. Nelson
 Meredith W. Nicholson
 Lionel MacL. Noel
 Calvin C. Norman
 George L. Norman, Jr.
 William J. Norris
 Curtis R. Norton, Jr.
 John A. Oesterreicher
 William A. O'Flaherty
 Patrick G. O'Keefe
 Oscar E. Olsen
 Robert B. Ooghe
 John C. Ostlund
 Edward J. Otth, Jr.
 Dean T. Ousterhout
 Andrew J. Owens
 Edward W. Page
 James R. Page
 Anthony L. Palazzolo
 Courtland A. Palmer, Jr.
 Howard B. Parker, Jr.
 Warren S. Parr, Jr.
 James E. Patton
 Milton O. Paul
 John H. Perkins, Jr.

Richard J. Peterson
 Willard S. Peterson
 Malcolm E. Phares
 Thomas J. Piazza
 Richard B. Plank
 Kenneth A. Porter
 Robert S. Pottelger
 William W. Potter
 Bobby L. Potts
 Edwin S. Pratt
 Lee S. Pyles
 Calvin E. Rakes
 Shirley McC. Ramsey
 William M. Ratliff
 Edgar A. Rawsthorne
 William G. Read, Jr.
 William L. Read
 James P. Reddick, Jr.
 Charles E. Reid, Jr.
 Eugene J. Reiher
 David R. Rice
 John T. Riggsbee
 Robert K. Ripley
 James B. Risser
 Gerald G. Roberts
 Thomas M. Rogers
 Paul D. Roman
 Richard M. Romley
 Robert E. Rowe
 Jack W. Rupe
 William H. Russ III
 William N. Rutledge
 Merwin Sacarob
 Frithlof N. Sagerholm, Jr.
 Frank C. Sain
 Robert J. Salomon
 Wilbur H. Sample
 Ernest D. Sanders
 William C. Sandlin, Jr.
 Peter J. Saraceni
 Peter J. Sarris
 William J. Sawtelle
 Valentine H. Schaeffer, Jr.
 Albert A. Schaufelberger, Jr.
 Frank P. Schlosser
 Donald R. Schmidt
 Bernard Schniebolck
 Paul L. Schoos
 Walter A. Schriefer
 George S. Schuchart
 Elliott P. Schuman
 James H. Scott
 Jack Scoville
 Carl H. Sebenius, Jr.
 Thomas T. Seelye, Jr.
 Angelo P. Semeraro
 Louis M. Serrille
 Richard H. Seth
 Harry E. Shacklett
 William M. Shanhouse
 Sumner Shapiro
 Lewis A. Shea, Jr.
 Oscar C. Shealy, Jr.
 Byron M. Shepard
 Frank E. Sherman
 Eugene F. Shine, Jr.
 Earl R. Short
 Rodric M. Singleton, Jr.
 George L. Siri, Jr.
 Robert E. Sivinski
 Stephen A. Skomsky
 Carl R. Smith, Jr.
 Charles R. Smith, Jr.
 Donald A. Smith
 Earl W. Smith, Jr.
 Frederic W. Smith
 Gerald F. Smith
 Homer L. Smith
 James H. B. Smith
 Paul E. Smith
 Robert F. Smith, Jr.
 Robert L. Smith
 Robert McK. Smith
 Wayne D. Smith

Cornelius S. Snodgrass, Jr.
 William H. Somerville
 Felix S. Spielmann
 David H. Sprague
 Edgerton T. E. Sprague
 Dennis C. Stanfill
 Walter D. Stapleton
 Leland R. Stegemerten
 Robert E. Stewart
 Charles L. Stiles
 Donnell M. Still
 Clarence W. Stoddard, Jr.
 George B. Stone
 Reid Stringfellow
 Herman A. Stromberg, Jr.
 James A. Stubstad
 William C. Stutt
 Phillip B. Suhr
 John H. Sullivan
 George W. Sumner, Jr.
 Charles O. Swanson
 Peter S. Swanson
 Claude E. Swecker, Jr.
 Harry F. Sweitzer, Jr.
 Gerald E. Synhorst
 Richard W. Taylor
 Malcolm H. Thiele
 Philip H. Thom, Jr.
 Wallace J. Thomas
 Alexander D. Thomson
 Harry R. Thurber, Jr.
 John A. Tinkham
 Harold F. Tipton, Jr.
 Robert W. Titus
 Robert R. Tolbert
 Harry DeP. Train II
 Fred Troeschler, Jr.
 John K. Twilla
 Clinton R. Vall
 Wallace Valencia

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Norman Altman
 William "B" Anderson, Jr.
 William A. Armstrong
 Erling O. Barsness
 William W. Bennett
 Richard B. Blackwell
 Glenn S. Brooks
 Robert M. Brown
 Herbert F. Butler, Jr.
 Danforth Clement
 Anthony B. Coburn
 Rex S. Coryell
 Charles L. Culwell
 Dorsey W. Daniel
 Jimmy P. Dearing
 Charles DiBenedetto
 Holton C. Dickson, Jr.
 Chester L. Ditto
 Thomas J. Donohoe
 James E. Durham, Jr.
 Henry D. Elchalt
 William T. Emery
 George D. Fisher, Jr.
 Horace P. Fishman
 James J. Garibaldi
 William L. Gary
 Thomas M. Gill
 Ephraim P. Glassman
 Richard Glickman
 Jack H. Haberthier
 Don C. Haeske
 Richard W. Haley
 William G. Hall
 Robert P. Hausold
 Everett C. Higgins
 Bernard C. Hogan

Jack D. Venable
 Elias Venning, Jr.
 Phillip Vladessa
 William A. Voegel
 Leonard F. Vogt, Jr.
 Robert L. Volz
 Warren P. Vosseler
 John R. Walker
 Joseph K. Walker
 Edward C. Waller III
 Robert L. Walters
 Thomas J. Walters
 John A. Wamsley
 Frank W. Ward III
 Frank T. Watkins, Jr.
 James D. Watkins
 James H. Webber
 William D. Weir
 Henry C. White
 Richard E. Whiteside
 Barry D. Whittlesey
 Eugene J. Wielki
 Fred J. Wilder
 Edwin E. Williams
 Ralph P. Williams
 Carl B. Wilson
 James C. Wilson
 Ralph E. Wilson, Jr.
 Russell F. Wilson
 Richard S. Wolford
 Barkley T. Wood, Jr.
 George P. Wood, Jr.
 David J. Woodard
 Edwin E. Woods, Jr.
 William W. Wright
 James H. Wynn III
 Abdiel R. Yingling, Jr.
 Duane C. Young, Jr.
 Randall W. Young
 Charles J. Youngblade
 Charles J. Zekan
 Marcus A. Zettel
 Edward F. Zimmerman, Jr.

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Irving Bobrick
 Warren F. Brown
 Wesley A. Brown
 Neal W. Clements
 William L. Collins
 Rudolph F. D'Ambra
 Stephen A. Giles
 William C. Hall
 Gordon W. Hamilton
 Louis E. V. Jackson

Lemon DeK. Lang
 Paul G. LeGros
 Walter E. Marquardt, Jr.
 Claude J. Quillen, Jr.
 Donald R. Trueblood
 Roger G. Tweel
 Donald W. Wittschiede
 William E. Wynne

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 3d day of June 1949:

William D. Bassett, Jr.
 James D. Beeler
 William A. Black
 Kenneth A. Bott
 Philip C. Brannon
 Ralph H. Brown
 William J. Budge
 James J. Connors, Jr.
 Kelly J. Davis, Jr.
 Lewis H. Devine
 Richard C. Ebel
 Richard H. Francis
 James R. Gober
 Fred Grabowsky
 Thomas I. Gunning
 Wayne L. Hall
 Robert T. Hardeman
 Thomas P. Hensler, Jr.
 Carlton H. Hershner
 Irven A. Hissom
 Henry Hoppe III
 Robert G. Hunt, Jr.
 John M. Johnson, Jr.
 Charles M. C. Jones
 MacLean Kelley
 Calhoun J. Killeen
 Robert H. Krider
 Randlett T. Lawrence
 Charles P. McCallum, Jr.
 Robert L. McElroy

Charles H. Mays
 Robert C. Needham
 Edward J. O'Connell, Jr.
 Lawrence G. O'Connell, Jr.
 William C. Peterson
 Tom D. Parsons
 Roger W. Peard, Jr.
 Theophil P. Riegert
 Thomas E. Ringwood, Jr.
 Archie R. Ruggieri, Jr.
 Kenneth W. Schiweck
 Merlin F. Schneider, Jr.
 Richard W. Sheppe
 Eugene O. Speckart
 Carl M. Stalneck
 Paul F. Stephenson
 Allan MacL. Stewart
 Joseph Z. Taylor
 Jack E. Townsend
 Kenneth E. Turner
 Littleton W. T. Waller
 William Wentworth
 Richard H. West
 Charles S. Whiting
 Harry D. Woods

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 3d day of June 1949:

Robert E. Allard
 Ralph G. Dalton
 Albert S. Douglass
 Henry E. Hohn
 Bertie G. Homan
 LeRoy Klein

Donald O. Modeen
 James S. Orloff
 Glenn E. Skinner, Jr.
 Chandler G. Smith
 Charles M. Walker

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Lucille R. Kroupa
 Lolita D. Surprenant

Frances M. Tibbetts
 Barbara J. Vines

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

"J" V. Hart

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Ralph H. S. Scott

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS

Appointment to the temporary grade of major general in the Marine Corps

Merwin H. Silverthorn

Appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps

Hubert G. Bozarth

Appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps

Merle C. Davis

Appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps

Robert F. Malden Henry M. Whitesides
James E. Shugart Charles D. Fay
Dan C. Walker John R. Linnenkamp

Appointment to the permanent grade of commissioned warrant officer in the Marine Corps

William R. Yingling, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
Msg. Martin Higgins, of Catholic University, offered the following prayer:

Let us lift up our hearts to God.

We thank Thee, O God, our Father, who by making all and redeeming all hast shown us that all in Thine eyes are equal, and who from among the nations hast singled out us to be the heralds of that truth and its champions. Thou didst state the dignity of the individual in the Great Book spread wide by the nailed hands on Calvary. In Thy timeless patience Thou didst abide while man haltingly read and the law of slavery gave place to the law of serfdom and the law of serfdom to the law of privilege. But the law of equality—that Thou didst keep by Thee for a people predestined. Thou didst inspire our forefathers to dare a glorious and new thing, to write the dignity and worth of the individual into the Constitution, and upon that sacred truth to found a Nation. Through the intervening years Thou hast vouchsafed us an ever deepening insight into the meaning of that principle, through blood to know that slavery cannot be, through want to realize that economic serfdom must not be. Thou hast now exalted us, and in this hour we stand the world's hope and faith.

Therefore, O mighty Father, we, Thy lowly suppliants yet Thy children, humbly beg and beseech Thee to keep us true to the high responsibility and trust that Thy providence hath reposed in us. Send forth Thy light upon our lawmakers that they may guide us with unfaltering front in the way that Thou hast marked out for us.

In Thy power strengthen and nerve them courageously to assert the dignity, the rights, of man at home and abroad against every foe. Help them and us to the end that the glory fade not from the upturned faces of humanity and that in our land and in all lands freedom prevail ever. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McBride, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 103):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ANDREW L. SOMERS, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part

of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Vice President had appointed Mr. WAGNER and Mr. IVES members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Bristol Press March 2, 1949.

Mr. IRVING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to a statement that was made by the President of the United States in regard to rent control.

Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI 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 Common Council of the City of Cudahy, Wis., relative to the observance of General Pulaski's Memorial Day and in the other a resolution commemorating the thirty-first anniversary of the Lithuanian nation, adopted by a group of Americans of Lithuanian descent in Milwaukee, Wis.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article from the Springfield Sun, relative to the establish-

ment in 1902 of the first club which later became the 4-H Club movement in the United States.

Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made by Hon. Clare Boothe Luce at the Philadelphia Forum, despite the fact the Public Printer estimates it will cost \$175.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

DEMOCRATIC TREND IN WISCONSIN

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to report to the Congress that the people of Wisconsin have again risen to the support of the President and the Democratic Party. In a special election to fill vacancies in three State senatorial districts three Democrats were elected.

This victory was particularly significant in the Twenty-ninth District, which is a northern rural area never before represented by a Democrat. The successful Democratic candidate is John Olson, a well-known farm co-op leader in that area.

It has become quite clear to Wisconsin farmers that the fine progressive spirit which has long been their outstanding characteristic must find political expression through the Democratic Party. All over the State they are breaking with the Republican stalwarts, who have absolutely nothing to offer the farmer, the city worker, or the small-business man, and are turning to the party of real progress under President Truman's leadership.

The action of the farmers and small-business people in Wisconsin's twenty-ninth senatorial district, and of the city workers and businessmen in the third and seventh districts, is of political significance all over the country. The Republican Party stands repudiated on its record of obstruction and futility. The program and leadership of the Democratic Party is endorsed, even in areas where it has never had strength before. Those who think they can win votes away from the Democrats by a record of black, blind reaction are due for a big awakening next election.

REPUBLICAN TREND IN MICHIGAN

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] evidently belongs to that class who having eyes see not, and having ears, hear not. His attention seems to have been centered on some one little spot in Wisconsin. If he would just look toward the east, across the lake there, and get the returns from Michigan which came in not on April 1, but April 4 it was, he would learn something. In Michigan, you know, the Democratic Party has been taken over lock, stock, and barrel, hook line and sinker by the CIO, and that party seems altogether too complacent; having been kidnaped and captured they go right along with the CIO without protest from the Democratic Governor. But the farmers and others in Michigan had a different idea about it. They just turned out and voted a straight Republican ticket. The Democratic Governor, G. Mennen Williams, was repudiated. All Republicans on the ticket were elected by overwhelming majorities. Last fall it was only 45,000 majority we had; this time the majority was over a hundred thousand, and that after only 3 months of a CIO Governor in the statehouse. I suggest that the gentleman from Wisconsin—his effort seems to have exhausted him; he probably went out to see a doctor. No; there he is back there, he is over there leaning on the table with both elbows, all tired out from his effort. I say to him: Take a look at the Michigan returns.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands may sit during general debate during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Petroleum Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate during the sessions of the House today but only during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PASSMAN, for 4 days, on account of official business in the State of Louisiana, from April 18 to April 21, inclusive.

SPECIAL ORDER CHANGED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the talk I would have made yesterday under the special order granted me by the House may be printed in the Record after the first legislative bill today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an article from the Dallas Morning News entitled "This, That, and the Other."

GOVERNMENT EXTRAVAGANCE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, lots of good things come out of the West. I desire at this time to read the beginning of a resolution adopted by the Independence Lions Club of Independence, Oreg., as follows:

Whereas the lavish, reckless, wasteful, and profligate spending of public money by our Federal and State Governments and their multitude of agencies, bureaus, and departments, has reached staggering, extravagant, and unbelievable proportions, even approaching dissipation and destruction of the country's wealth and resources.

Under present conditions I like that whereas. It is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion if the Members of the House of Representatives would weigh and consider thoroughly some of the things they are doing when appropriation bills are brought on the floor here for consideration the situation would be vastly improved. Deficiency bills are continually being brought in here. Now, when we appropriate a certain sum of money for a department of government let us stop these deficiency requests from coming in from every department of government. When we make the original appropriation to the department it should be an ultimatum to that department that we intended to give it so much money and no more to run it for the year. However, they spend beyond their allotment, then come in here and ask for a deficiency and you help them out by digging down into the taxpayer's pocket and giving them more money just by a request in the name of our American solvency of our children's future welfare and good—stop the extravagance of government—stop the many unnecessary functions of government. Let us get some real common sense and the best common sense we can put in effect is to strike hard at this government extravagance and cut down on all appropriations. It is imperative and it is necessary. A word to the wise should be headed—Stop! Stop! Stop extravagant spending!

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in two instances, in each to include an editorial.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a resolution.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include extraneous material.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

Mr. CANNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include certain excerpts from communications received by the Committee on Appropriations.

RENDERING PLANTS

Mr. KEEFE. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if any or many Members of Congress have in their districts rendering plants. Do you know what is happening to the rendering business in America? It is going out of business, and plants are being closed up all over America, with a very decided influence upon the livestock industry and the price of food. Why? Because they cannot sell their products in America any longer to the soap manufacturers who are using a chemical detergent, synthetically produced, that does not require in the making of soap any longer the use of inedible fats and oils. The agricultural industry of America is gradually being pushed into a defensive position, and if you are interested in the welfare of your people and the people of America you better begin to get yourselves familiar with the tremendous strides that are now being made in the development of the synthetic chemicals to replace Nature's products that have long been upon the American market.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article entitled "Inside Soviet Russia."

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address by Undersecretary of the Navy W. John Kenney.

ST. LOUIS ELECTION

Mr. KARSTEN. 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. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I was rather amused at the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan when he said, "Cast your eyes over across the Michigan border." I say that you should cast your eyes a little further than that and look at the St. Louis results. We

had a mayoralty election in St. Louis day before yesterday, and elected a Democratic mayor by 18,000 votes. In addition we elected a Democratic comptroller. That office had been Republican for the last 30 years. We have a majority on the board of aldermen in the city of St. Louis now solidly in the Democratic column. It is interesting to note that this campaign was conducted along the line of President Truman's Fair Deal program. It is not slipping. It is gaining and gaining, and will continue to gain.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARSTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG. Since April 1 is usually termed April Fools' Day, and that Michigan went Republican again, is it not a fact, in the gentleman's judgment, that any one getting any satisfaction out of that is simply fooling himself?

Mr. KARSTEN. I think that may have had something to do with the Michigan election.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives for passing the kind of agriculture appropriation bill which this body considered on Tuesday.

I want to direct special congratulations toward the appropriation for the Extension Service which is an increase of \$1,000,000 to give adequate support for the 4-H Club activities.

I consider one of the outstanding achievements of my 4 years as commissioner of Belmont County, Ohio, the fact that I was able to make an appropriation of \$10,000 to build a 4-H building in Belmont County. I made the statement at that time, which I repeat today, that I have never seen a 4-H Club member in a juvenile court.

I am also happy to see that this Congress restored to its proper place the Soil Conservation Service and made adequate appropriation for it to function properly. Also I am pleased to see in this bill a substantial appropriation for rural electrification with a \$150,000,000 additional increase provided for, if it becomes necessary.

I feel sure that the farmers of my district, as well as of my State and the Nation, will have reason to know that the Eighty-first Congress, by its action in passing this bill, has the interest of agriculture very close in its heart.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is chairman may be permitted to

sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to include a newspaper article in the remarks he expects to make later today on the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary appropriation bill.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the question of restoring the Panama Canal toll exemptions for coastwise trade and include a statement.

Mr. HULL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1950

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 180 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding any rule to the contrary, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4016) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. I now yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 180 makes in order consideration of the bill (H. R. 4016) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

Ordinarily the Committee on Appropriations would not come to the Committee on Rules seeking a rule. However, in this bill we find seven items upon which points of order could be raised. I understand there is no objection to five of them, but in two instances the opposition raises objection. I call your attention to the sections to which objections will be made.

On page 20, lines 7 to 10, having to do with the operation of agricultural stations in foreign lands. One of the objections, is that this should come under

the Department of Agriculture rather than under the section of the bill in which it now appears, namely the international information and educational activities. This is part of that program. The purpose is to exchange ideas with our South American neighbors on advances made in agricultural developments and to demonstrate to these people our improved methods.

Another objection, will be raised to the language on page 25, lines 12 to 15, which states:

Provided, That, notwithstanding the proviso under this head in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, any funds heretofore made available to the corporation shall remain available until expended.

Ordinarily these funds would lapse. The reason a rule has been requested in this instance is that the South American countries have contributed a greater amount than we have, and it has not been possible up to this date for all countries to agree on the proper methods of procedure.

Therefore, we ask that you go along with the rule, which grants 3 hours of general debate and waives all points of order.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, as is usual in these appropriation bills, there are a very large number of items, many of them largely in the nature of limitations and contract authorizations which seldom, if ever, have a point of order raised to them.

There are in the bill, which it is proposed to take up following the debate on this rule, two items of a very unusual character. The first one is on page 20 of the bill. It is as follows:

Advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the revised statutes, as amended; the establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration in other American countries, on land acquired by gift or lease, and construction of necessary buildings thereon—

There is a little more language than I have read, but not anything of a serious nature. That language is found in the provisions for international information and educational activities, the broadcasting activities in the State Department where they are supposed to put forth the Voice of America. Now, what has that to do with developing agricultural experiment stations in foreign countries? It is beyond me. We set up the Department of Agriculture for that purpose. If we are going to have that activity spread out through every single department of the Government, we are not going to have any coordination or proper control over the way things are done. We will have duplicating activities in all directions. It is about time that we stopped this tendency to go in that direction. Why we would have to have experimental stations in foreign countries is beyond me. I hope that we will not waive points of order on any such item as that.

The next item appears to be of a very unusual character. In the appropriation

bill for Government corporations last year, this provision was inserted in a very proper way:

Provided, That funds available to the Corporation by this act and under prior appropriations, and not obligated by the Corporation on or before June 30, 1949, shall not be available for obligation after that date, and shall lapse pursuant to section 3690 of the Revised Statutes of the act of June 20, 1874, as amended.

This bill, on page 25, lines 12 through 15, provides this:

Provided, That, notwithstanding the proviso under this head in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, any funds heretofore made available to the Corporation shall remain available until expended.

That relates to this Corporation that has been set up under the control of Dillon Myer, as appears on page 25 of this bill. Dillon Myer has an unbroken record of failure. He was first prominently in the public gaze but he was given charge of the operation of the Japanese concentration camps. There he made an awful mess of it, and finally had to be taken out of it because of the way he was doing the job. Then he was put in charge of the public housing set-up. There he made another failure. He came before the committee time after time and did not know what he was talking about. He came before the committee this time and he did not know what he was going to do.

This bill proposes that we amend the law so that the funds that are available to him to spend—and we know he will make another failure of the job down in South America—will be available until expended, the Congress leaving no brake at all upon the foolish way that he can waste the money of the American people.

It does not seem to me as though we should go into that kind of an operation.

I hope that this rule will not be adopted. I may say that as far as I am concerned there are no other points of order that I would raise to the bill.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand the opposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to the passage of this rule, unless it is that there is some sort of personal feud between him and Mr. Dillon Myer, the president of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

As to the first provision in the bill (H. R. 4016) to which the gentleman referred, on page 20, beginning at line 7, the gentleman seems to be utterly misinformed concerning the purpose of this appropriation and the reason for the insertion of this language. It is not the intent of this committee that any of the funds which will be transferred to the Department of Agriculture will be used for radio broadcasting. The question of radio broadcasting and the Voice of America does not enter into this particular item of appropriation at all. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said, "Why we have to have experimental stations in foreign countries is beyond me." I must point out to the gen-

tleman from New York that the Eightieth Congress, during the time that he was chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations, passed a bill known as the Smith-Mundt bill. This appropriation is for the purpose of implementing the terms of that very bill which was passed by the Eightieth Congress. There is nothing very unusual about the character of the two items to which the gentleman from New York referred, or to any other of the few items of legislation contained in the bill. None of these few items of legislation contained in the bill originated in the mind of any member of the committee either on the majority or minority side; this language was suggested by the Bureau of the Budget in order to effectuate proper disposition of the appropriated funds. The Committee on Appropriations in this instance does not in any manner desire to usurp the authority of the Legislative Committee which might be concerned with this proposed language.

With regard to the first item mentioned which appears on page 20 and which reads: "Establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries, on land acquired by gift of lease, and construction of necessary buildings thereon"; I suggest that a fair explanation of that provision is contained in the following colloquy with Mr. William O. Hall, the budget officer of the Department of State:

Mr. HALL. That is right. The third provision there is "establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries," etc.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that a new activity?

Mr. HALL. This is "Cooperation with American Republics," too, but this is needed to supplement the existing authority in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. STEFAN. New activities not authorized by law?

Mr. HALL. No, sir. These activities are authorized by the basic statute, but the Department of Agriculture believes this language is required to supplement their existing authority in carrying out technical agricultural cooperative projects previously authorized in the CAR language.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the citation for that?

Mr. LYERLY. The citation for that is the basic law establishing the Department of Agriculture, as I understand it. We have talked with them several times on it, and the reason it is in here and the reason it has been in our CAR program before is that it is one of those things that they do not know whether they have authority for or not. It is one of those broad basic authorities establishing the Department of Agriculture which, by stretching the construction of the language, might be construed as sufficient authority.

As to the second item of proposed language, and Mr. Dillon Myer, President of the Government corporation known as the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, I may say to the gentleman from New York that we are here today to rescind the language and legislation, if you please, which was inserted in this appropriation bill last year by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who was then a member of the Subcommittee on Government Corporations, and his colleagues on that committee. They in-

serted language which now prohibits the carrying of the corporation's funds into the succeeding fiscal year. We now find that this corporation, the life of which extends only over a 3-year period, I believe, from the 7th of August 1947 to the 7th of August 1950 will not have any funds beyond the fiscal year unless the damage which was done by the gentleman from Iowa and his colleagues a year ago is undone today by this House.

This Government corporation has made a number of agreements with South American countries pursuant to the power and authority given it by this Congress. In the program with which it is concerned, South American countries who are members and participate in that program contribute many more dollars to it than does the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I now will refer to one or two of the other provisions contained in the bill, as the result of which your committee found it necessary to apply to the Rules Committee for a rule and as the result of which the Rules Committee granted the rule which is now pending before you.

Let me first refer to page 12 of the bill, lines 12 to 15, and to this language: "not to exceed \$15 per diem in lieu of subsistence for persons serving without compensation in an advisory capacity while away from their homes or regular places of business."

Many prominent businessmen want to help their Government but do not want their names on the Government pay roll, so they serve without compensation. This language concerns only such persons who serve their Government without compensation.

They go, we will say, to Europe. Unless this language is changed, as requested by the committee, they may be paid only a per diem of \$10 per day, whereas employees on the Government pay roll, being paid for their day's work, are allowed as high as \$18 per diem. The committee agreed that in fairness, and in order to enable the departments to obtain the services of such patriotic men, it would be a very, very sensible thing to increase their per diem, their actual living charge, from \$10 to \$15 per day.

On page 58 of the bill, there is an appropriation for radio propagation and standards, and certain language to which objection has been made just the same as to other language in the bill. This particular legislative language is inserted in view of the difficulty of employing personnel for assignment to duty in the Arctic region. The Bureau of the Budget claimed it is desirable that authority be obtained for the appointment of personnel without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act and titles II and III of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945.

With regard to the language appearing on the same page reading as follows: "and the departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to transfer without charge to the National Bureau of Standards materials, equipment, and supplies, surplus to their needs and necessary for the

establishment, maintenance, and operation of ionosphere observation stations," it appears that because of the difficulty and expense of transporting materials and supplies to the Arctic, it is desirable to have authority for the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, to transfer to the National Bureau of Standards without charge the materials, equipment, and supplies which they may have available in the Arctic and which are necessary to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of Arctic ionosphere observation stations.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge that the pending rule be adopted so that the committee may proceed with the proper consideration of the bill, H. R. 4016, which makes appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, State, and Justice and the Judiciary for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when this bill is considered I hope that some of the Members on the majority side will give more consideration to the facts and figures involved than apparently they did when they were discussing election returns.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN] called attention to the fact that in St. Louis the Democrats won a victory by a majority of 18,000. That, of course, sounds pretty good if you do not remember that last fall the Democratic plurality was somewhere around 100,000. We can take that kind of a victory, but if the Republicans keep on cutting down the majority, as we did in this Missouri election you over on the majority side will find yourselves on the minority side when the next general election comes along.

Another gentleman spoke about the folks in Michigan fooling themselves by the wonderful victory Republicans achieved on April 4—just 3 days ago. The gentleman evidently thought that election day in Michigan was April 1, April Fools' Day. That is not so. Nor did Republicans fool themselves by not contesting the issue. The election was later. It was on the 4th of April, after the people had gotten over their foolishness, after the farmers had discovered that all of those fine promises made in the last campaign as to what the President was going to do with his Fair Deal program just were not being carried out. The farmers are beginning to realize they were double-crossed. They have discovered that this Eighty-first Congress is worse—think of it—worse even in the President's opinion than the Eightieth Congress, which no one thought could ever be, and the eighty-first is in the President's opinion going to be worse yet. You fellows in the majority are just on slippery ground; you are sliding and slipping all the time. Even though you are sitting still, you are going to wear the seat of your pants out sliding down the political hill if you do not get on your feet pretty quick and at least make an attempt to carry out the Fair Deal, in reality, the spend-and-bust program.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN. We won by 18,000 majority in the city of St. Louis.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that the old Pendergast machine?

Mr. KARSTEN. No; we have no connection with the Pendergast machine. I would also like to say that, in addition to this 18,000 majority, we elected a Democratic comptroller. That office had been Republican for over 30 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, a change is sometimes a good thing. But 18,000 is not 100,000. If an 82,000 loss is a victory, may we have more of them. The necessity of a change is one reason why I advocate that we should get rid of the New Deal, and I am sure when the people get another chance they will do just that. Of course, it is not permissible under the rules to refer to a certain other body by name, but I wish some of these energetic gentlemen on my right would step over to the other end of the Capitol some time and see if they cannot get that immovable body going, but with discretion.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 51, noes 30.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 246, nays 137, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—246

Abbitt	Bonner	Christopher
Abernethy	Bosone	Chudoff
Addonizio	Boykin	Coffey
Albert	Breen	Colmer
Allen, La.	Brehm	Combs
Andrews	Brooks	Cooley
Aspinall	Brown, Ga.	Cooper
Bailey	Brown, Ohio	Crook
Barden	Bryson	Crosser
Baring	Buchanan	Dague
Barrett, Pa.	Buckley, Ill.	Davies, N. Y.
Bates, Ky.	Burke	Davis, Ga.
Battle	Burleson	Dawson
Beckworth	Burnside	Deane
Bennett, Fla.	Burton	DeGraffenried
Bentsen	Byrne, N. Y.	Delaney
Biemiller	Camp	Denton
Blackney	Cannon	Dollinger
Blatnik	Carnahan	Donohue
Boggs, Del.	Carroll	Doughton
Boggs, La.	Cavalcante	Doyle
Bolling	Celler	Durham
Bolton, Md.	Chelf	Eberharter

Elliott	Kelley	Poage
Engle, Calif.	Kennedy	Polk
Evins	Keogh	Potter
Fallon	Kerr	Preston
Felgahan	Kilday	Price
Fenton	King	Priest
Fisher	Klein	Rabaut
Flood	Kruse	Rains
Fogarty	Lanham	Ramsay
Forand	Larcade	Regan
Frazier	Lesinski	Rhodes
Fugate	Lind	Ribicoff
Fulton	Linehan	Richards
Furcolo	Lucas	Rivers
Garmatz	Lynch	Rodino
Gary	McCarthy	Rogers, Fla.
Gathings	McCormack	Rooney
Gavin	McGrath	Sabath
Gordon	McGuire	Sadowski
Gore	McKinnon	Sasser
Gorski, Ill.	McMillan, S. C.	Secrest
Gorski, N. Y.	McSweeney	Sikes
Gossett	Mack, Ill.	Sims
Graham	Madden	Smathers
Granger	Magee	Smith, Va.
Grant	Mahon	Spence
Green	Mansfield	Staggers
Gregory	Marcanonio	Stanley
Hardy	Marsalis	Steed
Hare	Marrow	Stefan
Harris	Miller, Calif.	Sullivan
Harrison	Mills	Sutton
Hart	Mitchell	Tackett
Havener	Monroney	Tauriello
Hays, Ark.	Morgan	Teague
Hays, Ohio	Morris	Thomas, Tex.
Hébert	Morrison	Thompson
Hedrick	Moulder	Thornberry
Heffernan	Multer	Trimble
Heller	Murdock	Underwood
Herlong	Murphy	Vinson
Hinshaw	Murray, Tenn.	Wagner
Hobbs	Noland	Walter
Hollfield	Norrell	Wheeler
Holmes	Norton	White, Calif.
Horan	O'Brien, Ill.	Whitten
Howell	O'Hara, Ill.	Whittington
Huber	O'Neill	Wickersham
Irving	O'Sullivan	Wier
Jackson, Wash.	O'Toole	Williams
Jacobs	Pace	Willis
Javits	Passman	Wilson, Okla.
Johnson	Patman	Wilson, Tex.
Jones, Ala.	Patten	Winstead
Jones, Mo.	Perkins	Woodhouse
Jones, N. C.	Peterson	Worley
Karst	Philbin	Yates
Karsten	Phillips, Tenn.	Young
Keefe	Pickett	Zablocki

NAYS—137

Allen, Calif.	Gamble	McGregor
Allen, Ill.	Gillette	McMillen, Ill.
Andersen	Golden	Mack, Wash.
H. Carl	Goodwin	Martin, Iowa
Anderson, Calif.	Gross	Martin, Mass.
Andresen	Gwinn	Mason
August H.	Hagen	Meyer
Angell	Hale	Michener
Arends	Hall	Miller, Md.
Auchincloss	Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.
Barrett, Wyo.	Halleck	Murray, Wis.
Bates, Mass.	Hand	Nelson
Beall	Harden	Nicholson
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey	Nixon
Bishop	Herter	Norblad
Bolton, Ohio	Heselton	O'Hara, Minn.
Bramblett	Hill	O'Konski
Burdick	Hoeven	Patterson
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.	Pfeiffer
Canfield	Hope	William L.
Case, N. J.	Hull	Phillips, Calif.
Chaperfield	Jackson, Calif.	Poulson
Church	Jenison	Rankin
Clevenger	Jenkins	Reed, Ill.
Cole, Kans.	Jennings	Reed, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Rees
Corbett	Jonas	Rich
Cotton	Judd	Riehlman
Coudert	Kearney	Rogers, Mass.
Crawford	Kearns	Sadlak
Cunningham	Keating	St. George
Curtis	Kilburn	Sanborn
Davis, Wis.	Kunkel	Scott
D'Ewart	LeCompte	Hugh D., Jr.
Dolliver	LeFevre	Scrivner
Dondero	Lemke	Scudder
Eaton	Lichtenwalter	Shaffer
Ellsworth	Lodge	Simpson, Ill.
Elston	McConnell	Smith, Kans.
Engel, Mich.	McCulloch	Smith, Wis.
Fellows	McDonough	Stockman
Ford		Taber

Talle	Wadsworth	Withrow
Tollefson	Weichel	Wolcott
Van Zandt	Welch, Calif.	Wolverton
Veide	Werdel	Woodruff
Vorys	Wigglesworth	
Vursell	Wilson, Ind.	

NOT VOTING—49

Bland	Hoffman, Ill.	Redden
Buckley, N. Y.	James	Scott, Hardie
Bulwinkle	Kee	Sheppard
Carlyle	Kirwan	Short
Case, S. Dak.	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Chatham	Latham	Smith, Ohio
Chesney	Lovre	Stigler
Clemente	Lyle	Taylor
Cox	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Davenport	Marshall	Towe
Davis, Tenn.	Miles	Walsh
Dingell	Morton	Welch, Mo.
Douglas	O'Brien, Mich.	Whitaker
Fernandez	Pfeifer	White, Idaho
Gilmer	Joseph L.	Wood
Granahan	Plumley	
Hall	Powell	
Leonard W.	Quinn	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Towe against.
 Mr. Welch of Missouri for, with Mr. Macy against.
 Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.
 Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Short against.
 Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. James against.
 Mr. Clemente for, with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania against.
 Mrs. Douglas for, with Mr. Taylor against.
 Mr. Chesney for, with Mr. Latham against.
 Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Morton against.
 Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.
 Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.
 Mr. Granahan for, with Mr. Plumley against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Davenport with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
 Mr. Chatham with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Lovre.

Mr. LODGE, Mr. JENNINGS, and Mr. WELCH of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4016) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4016, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I yield myself 15 minutes and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, before discussing the pending bill, H. R. 4016,

making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year 1950, and for other purposes, I wish to commend my fellow members of the subcommittee. They are hard-working, industrious Members of the House who sat and diligently heard the long testimony on this bill for over eight weeks. When I say for over eight weeks I mean for each day from Monday to the end of each week, beginning at 10 o'clock every morning.

The services rendered the committee by the new members on the majority side, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] have been of tremendous importance. It has been a real personal pleasure for me to sit again on this committee with the former chairman, the present ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the learned gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. He has the high respect and real admiration of every one of his fellow committee members, as he has of every Member of this House. It is indeed a pleasure to again serve with the distinguished and capable gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVELAND].

I also wish to say a word of commendation for our executive secretary, Mr. Jay Howe, who worked long and hard in bringing to the floor of this House the bill which is now before you for consideration.

This bill not only makes appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, it also authorizes the expenditures of corporate funds of two Government corporations, namely, the Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, and the Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

The amounts recommended in the bill for the coming fiscal year are as follows: State Department, \$271,405,656; Department of Justice, \$132,579,141; Department of Commerce, \$259,927,605; and for the Federal Judiciary, \$20,703,700, making a total of appropriations of \$684,616,102.

In addition to these regular annual appropriations for these four items, there is an estimated \$761,400 for permanent and \$8,811,800 in trust-account appropriations. Further, and in addition to the regular annual appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, this bill carries \$62,600,000 in contract authority, or a total in direct appropriations and contract authority of \$747,216,102.

Your committee has recommended very substantial reductions of \$5,407,354 in direct appropriations and \$5,400,000 in contract authority.

The total direct appropriations are \$84,911,712 in excess of those for the current fiscal year. But, of this amount, \$43,000,000 covers the taking of the Seventeenth Decennial Census, which is required under the terms of the Constitution and which has been taken every 10 years since the year 1790, and \$39,700,000 is for the liquidation of contract authority granted by the Congress in prior years.

The budget estimates for the fiscal year 1950 contain approximately \$24,000,000 for increased personnel costs resulting from the passage of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, passed by the Eightieth Congress. If we add the amount of \$43,000,000 allowed by the committee for the taking of the Seventeenth Decennial Census, to the amount \$39,700,000 required for liquidation of contract authority granted in prior years, we have a total of \$82,700,000.

I shall first direct my attention to the State Department, for which we have budget estimates for the coming fiscal year in the amount of \$285,313,756. The amount recommended by the committee for this Department is \$271,405,656, a reduction of \$13,908,100 from the amount requested.

This is a decrease of \$11,538,434 under the current fiscal year appropriation of \$282,944,090.

The so-called Hoover Commission, the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, made certain recommendations with regard to reorganization of the State Department. This committee has concurred in such recommendations and has agreed that there shall be a reorganization along the lines now suggested by the Hoover Commission, which had previously, and for a number of years, been suggested by this subcommittee. In order to fully cooperate in the proposed plan of reorganization, the committee has amalgamated five appropriations for the foreign service and departmental activities into one direct appropriation on a tentative basis for 1 year. The committee has gone along on this on the theory that it would grant greater flexibility in the use of these funds for the Foreign Service and departmental civil-service personnel in the department and field assignments. There has been no cut whatever in the personal services requested in the budget estimates.

In the report of this committee on page 5, you will find a recommendation with regard to the number of publications which are put out by the Department of State. I would like to read to you, if I may, the exact language in our report which deals with this:

The committee has observed the number of publications dealing with the affairs of the Department of State being printed at the present time. It is suggested that all public-relations work of whatever nature be centralized under one head and, in conjunction therewith, the Department make some effort to reduce the number of publications presently being printed and to initiate the printing of a publication that tells the story of the foreign policies of the Government in a simple and concise form. The day is past when information concerning the foreign policies of this Government is sought only by scholars and professors. The country as a whole is steadily becoming more international minded. In addition, there is at present a total of approximately 14,000,000 veterans of World War II who are decidedly interested in the foreign policies of this country and what our Nation is striving for in its relations with the rest of the world. The average American does not have the time to devote to the reading of a tome written in technical and legalistic terms but needs this information currently and in simple, easily readable form.

Insofar as the subdivision of appropriations for the State Department entitled, "Salaries and Expenses, Department of State," is concerned, the only cuts made by this committee have been in the item for equipment for the Foreign Service, to the extent of \$200,000, and in "Supplies and Materials" for that service to the extent of \$100,000, or a total decrease of \$300,000.

There has been reduced from the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget for the buildings fund of the Department of State the amount \$5,000,000, which leaves a total of \$20,000,000 for the purchase and acquisition of buildings and sites in cities throughout the world, for use by our Foreign Service. None of this money actually passes out of the possession or control of the United States. In the acquisition of these buildings and sites which are taken over on credits due from Lend-Lease et cetera, there is merely a book-keeping transaction. The committee has found fault with the director of the buildings fund for having acquired a property in Bermuda and another in Prague, Czechoslovakia, which have turned out to be white elephants, insofar as the members of this committee are concerned.

In Bermuda, where we had a consul's residence, which cost approximately—and I am relying on memory now—\$2,500 a year in rent, we find we have taken over a very beautiful multi-millionaire's residence, known as the Wier estate. While it does not cost us very much in dollars, we shall find in the future that the operation and maintenance of such an elaborate estate will be far in excess of the money it cost the taxpayers for the consul's residence previous to its acquisition.

Insofar as the United States' participation in international organizations is concerned, the committee has had to allow the full amount of the budget estimates for this purpose. This is the item under which the United States of America pays its dues to the various international organizations beginning with the United Nations. The committee's report gives a list of these organizations and the amounts that it costs the United States to participate in each of them.

We find that in practically all instances the share which the United States is called upon to contribute is far in excess of a reasonable and proper amount for our membership in these organizations. It is true that insofar as some of these international organizations are concerned, efforts have been made by the State Department to reduce the percentage share of our participation in them. However, we are still paying entirely too much money as our share to many of them. Among such organizations, besides the United Nations are UNESCO and IRO. The committee has severely criticized the management of the International Refugee Organization. The repatriation and resettlement services have been permitted to lag woefully.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we find that instead of clearing out these IRO camps and getting these displaced persons to countries where they may retire and live a normal life and have some future ahead of them, IRO has forced them to wait an unusual length of time. The time IRO takes to clear them once they have been approved by the Displaced Persons Commission is utterly unreasonable.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the gentleman say that the failure to clear or the lag in clearing the camps by IRO is somewhat attributable to the unfortunate and discriminatory displaced-persons law adopted by the United States and which it is now sought so diligently to be amended by so many people who are interested?

Mr. ROONEY. There is not a question of doubt about that being so. We further find that although we expected that the International Refugee Organization would have screened the people in these camps by now as to their tendencies or possible tendencies toward communism or fascism, nothing whatever in this regard has been done. We found that practically no investigation whatever takes place until such time as the displaced persons are actually called out of the camp for shipment to the United States or some other country.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I shall be pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Is not the gentleman overlooking the fact that the Army very carefully screens all of these people after the assurances are sent to Europe?

Mr. ROONEY. That is not my understanding.

The committee was utterly amazed to find that some of these people who had been in these camps for 3 or 4 years, when taken out of the camps and placed on a boat bound for the country to which they were being sent for resettlement, were found to be Communists, Fascists, or other people who did not believe in decent, orderly government.

When we were called upon to make appropriations for the International Refugee Organization for the coming fiscal year we found that their budget estimates were made almost a year before the matter came to us, and we found that in those budget estimates no allowance had been made for reduction in food costs or reductions in the price of other commodities; so, in our report we pointed out that we do not expect to have to make any further appropriation in the next fiscal year after the coming one for the purposes of the International Refugee Organization. We trust that by that time all of these people will have been cleared out of these camps, and further, that the amount of money which they may need will be on hand at the end of the fiscal year for which we are

now appropriating, and will be sufficient to cover any short period of time beyond that until the camps are finally cleared.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to the learned gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. From that statement do I understand the gentleman to mean that the displaced persons commission has been allocated the amount of money that they feel is necessary in order to carry out the work up to July 1, 1950?

Mr. ROONEY. This appropriation, I must say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, has nothing to do with the Displaced Persons Commission; that is another appropriation. This appropriation is only for our share of the International Refugee Organization which maintains these people in these camps overseas.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I would appreciate it if the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] would be good enough to enlighten us on one point. Is it not a fact that whether or not this problem can be materially wound up or reduced—this is now the third year in which we have had an appropriation of roughly the same amount of \$70,000,000—will depend to a very large extent on whether or not the Congress and our whole machinery of government brings about an amendment to the displaced persons law, in which the number of 200,000 for admission into the United States is low considering our ability to absorb these people and in which such discrimination has been practiced that only a mere fraction of those we provided for have found their way to the United States so far although the law has been in effect for close to a year.

Mr. ROONEY. The displaced persons law should be amended so as to prevent any discrimination.

With regard to the appropriation for the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, the committee has allowed the full amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget, except it has allowed this amount by way of contract authority instead of in cash. The committee did this because of the fact that there will be an approximate balance of \$7,917,700 available at the beginning of the new fiscal year on July 1, 1949. The action of the committee will in no way retard the construction of a very worth-while project known as the Falcon Dam.

I may say that the committee has allowed the full amount, \$15,000, for the Rio Grande emergency flood protection item, for which only the sum of \$100 was allowed last year.

The Bureau of the Budget requested \$36,000,000 for the international information and educational activities item, but the committee saw fit to cut this appropriation to the extent of \$2,000,000. There is now included in this appropriation for the international information and educational activities a program which was previously financed from an

appropriation entitled "Cooperation of the American Republics," which has been consolidated with this appropriation as the result of the passage of Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress, known as the Smith-Mundt bill, which I referred to previously in the debate on the rule under which we are now considering this bill. The actual increase for the information and educational activities item is approximately \$5,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, it is amazing to learn the desire of people in European countries, particularly those behind the iron curtain, to learn the true facts of what is going on in the rest of the world, particularly here in America. I have found this to be true in each of my visits to Europe. It has again been forcefully brought to my attention during the course of our hearings when the able Assistant Secretary of State in charge of this program, Mr. George Allen, testified. I would like to quote what Mr. Allen had to say from page 719 of the hearings of this committee:

I shall give you an illustration of how we try to tell foreigners what Americans are like. We had a report recently from our Embassy in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, regarding a Sears, Roebuck catalog which was put on the table of the American Information Library in Belgrade. The librarian had no idea of the result that would come from that incident. Before 10 days had gone by people were forming lines going all around the block, waiting to see this catalog. It upset the whole operation of the library.

The librarian and his assistants had to spend their whole time showing Yugoslavian women how to measure for dresses they wanted to order from Sears, Roebuck, or explaining the relative value of this and that material, and so on.

It turned out that the financial regulations of Yugoslavia contained a provision in fine print that anybody who wanted to make a small personal order abroad, for his own use, could buy a dollar draft up to a maximum of \$6. The news spread around that there was this loophole in the foreign-exchange regulations, and when the people of Yugoslavia found the Sears, Roebuck catalog, they were so anxious to order things in the catalog that the national bank was suddenly called on to issue 150 drafts every day of \$6 and below. It swamped the bank and the library and everything else.

We did not know what to do about it. The catalog was disrupting every other activity of the library. The bank solved the problem by removing the permission to buy the dollar drafts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

For the program of the international information and educational activities, the committee has been very generous and recommends to you approval of the amount of \$34,000,000 for this purpose for the coming fiscal year. In a number of the countries behind the iron curtain most of the folks are not satisfied with their Red Fascist government. Most of them want to be free, most of them do not want totalitarianism. In Poland 90 percent of the people are strongly opposed to the present government. The same situation prevails in Hungary, in Yugoslavia, in Bulgaria, and particularly in Czechoslovakia. It is only by the use

of such a program as the one for which appropriations are now being requested that we can arouse these good people to an understanding of what is right and what is wrong, when they should sit supinely by, and when they should become really active in the cause of true liberty.

There are 44 important radio transmitters in the Soviet Union. As the result of our broadcast of the Voice of America program the Soviet Union has had to use as many as 18 of their transmitters at a time in order to attempt to jam the Voice of America, with the result that 18 of their vicious, lying propaganda transmitters were dead, so to speak, insofar as getting their foul messages over to the people.

As to the activities of the Department of Justice, the Bureau of the Budget requested the amount of \$132,402,000. This committee has allowed in the bill \$132,579,141, or an increase of \$177,141. This is the only increase for the four general items contained in this bill. This increase, mind you, is only \$177,141 after the committee increased for the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation the amount requested by \$1,598,141, and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice by \$100,000. Approximately \$8,550,000 has been an added expense over the amount appropriated for the Department of Justice for the current fiscal year for the employees' pay raise under the provisions of Public Law 900.

In connection with the activities of the Department of Justice this committee has taken a step which may to some employees seem quite revolutionary. I have discussed this with the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN], who was, before becoming a Member of this House, the head of one of the great divisions of the Department of Justice, the Criminal Division.

In previous years, each of the divisions of the Justice Department was a separate, autonomous outfit. There was the Tax Division, the Criminal Division, the Claims Division, the Land Division, and the Customs Division. Then there were funds for what are known as special attorneys. Up to now, under the system under which their appropriations were made, if there was a peak case load in the Criminal Division it was illegal, appropriation-wise, to transfer from the Claims Division two or three lawyers or half a dozen clerical employees to help out with that peak load in the Criminal Division. Your committee has now grouped together these six items under one appropriation entitled "Legal Activities Not Otherwise Provided For," so that lawyers and clerical help and appropriations for other objects may be transferred within these amalgamated six divisions so as to bring about an increase in efficiency and in time saved.

The only cuts the committee made for these divisions have been \$15,000 in the Tax Division, \$30,000 in the Claims Division, and \$46,000 in the Lands Division.

There is a new item in this bill inserted because of Public Law 886 of the Eightieth Congress, entitled "Claims of Persons of Japanese Ancestry," for which

the amount \$1,300,000 was asked. The committee allowed the full amount estimated as an advance on the sums which may have to be paid out in claims, to wit, \$1,000,000, but reduced from \$300,000 to \$200,000 the money asked for administrative expenses. These claims result from the evacuation of persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders.

The next item to which I shall refer is for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. The committee saw fit to increase their appropriation by \$100,000. The full amount allowed by the committee is \$3,750,000, an increase of \$338,300 over the current year appropriation. The committee unanimously felt that one of the most important things with which we should be concerned is the protection of the over-all economy of this Nation.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CELLER. I am very happy to note that your committee has seen fit to increase the appropriation for the Antitrust Division. Heretofore that committee has been stymied in its prosecutions and antitrust suits. I have in mind, for example, a suit that was brought in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York against quite a number of investment houses, in which a number of insurance companies were likewise involved. Because of lack of appropriations, that highly important litigation had to be stopped. I hope that with the increase the gentleman and his colleagues have seen fit to provide the Antitrust Division will no longer be stymied. I offer my congratulations to you gentlemen for your foresight and wisdom in increasing the appropriation.

Mr. ROONEY. The congratulations of the gentleman go, I am sure, not only to the members of the committee on the majority side but to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER] on the minority side.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. I am very much disturbed, I may say to my friend from New York, who made the statement that the Antitrust Division was stymied because of lack of appropriations last year. When I was chairman of this committee last year this committee increased the funds for the Antitrust Division over \$1,000,000 above the President's budget. It was not the lack of appropriations that caused some stymieing of the Antitrust Division. If you will read the record and read the report, you will find that the bottleneck, according to the testimony, is not the bottleneck of appropriations, but a bottleneck in your committee, because the Antitrust Division officials say they need legislation in order to become more effective. I recommend that your committee take some action.

Mr. CELLER. I assure the gentleman that as far as the present chairman is concerned every effort has been made and will be made to strengthen the arm of the Antitrust Division. Only recently the head of the Antitrust Division, the very distinguished public servant, Mr. Bergson in conference with me said he felt that the antitrust laws were ample, as they are now written, to take care of getting after monopolies and trusts. I am rather startled by the statement made by the gentleman from Nebraska that the Committee on the Judiciary is to blame.

Mr. ROONEY. If I may have the floor, since this is my time, I must say that I agree thoroughly with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. This committee at no time curtailed funds for the Antitrust Division. Last year and the year before the Democratic members of this committee went along wholeheartedly with the Republican majority in increasing the appropriations for the Antitrust Division by approximately \$1,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield.

Mr. YATES. I, too, want to congratulate the committee on its appropriation for the Antimonopoly Division of the Department of Justice. I think it is in line with the previous action of the Committee on Appropriations in appropriating money for the physical health of the people of this country. I think this will do much to increase the economic health of the country as well.

On April 5 I invited the attention of the House to the increased price of one-half cent per gallon on gasoline sold by the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. This increase has taken place in spite of the fantastic record of earnings of the company for the last 3 years, which are as follows:

	Before taxes	After taxes
1946.....	\$75,000,000	\$58,000,000
1947.....	130,000,000	98,000,000
1948.....	181,000,000	133,000,000

Earnings per share after taxes, common stock:

1946.....	\$1.87
1947.....	3.13
1948.....	4.18

I noticed in yesterday's newspaper that Esso Standard had followed suit and was increasing the price of gasoline along the Atlantic seaboard by one-half cent per gallon. There appears to be something wrong in this industry when such increases take place at a time when prices for most products are coming down and when there is no shortage of gasoline upon the market. I believe that these increases may well represent the predatory practice of monopolists and on April 5 I wrote a letter to Mr. Lowell B. Mason, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, asking that he investigate to determine whether a monopoly does in fact exist in the oil industry, and requesting that he take appropriate action.

I take pride in being a member of the Appropriations Committee which has shown its concern for the economic welfare of the people of this country by recognizing that monopolists are at work in this country and by voting a sum of \$3,750,000 for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, an appropriation which exceeds by \$100,000 the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. I certainly believe it will be money well spent.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. RABAUT. What was done, or what testimony was developed before your committee concerning the small-loan sharks and their vulturing upon the people?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know that any direct mention was made on that. I was just going to refer, when the gentleman asked me to yield, to the fact that 40 new antitrust cases were instituted in the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1949 under the ample appropriation allowed by the committee when the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] was the chairman, compared with 18 new cases in the same period in the previous fiscal year.

In the first half of the current fiscal year, 124 major investigations were started, compared with 127 new investigations in the entire preceding fiscal year. This committee is very much concerned with investigation and successful prosecution of monopolistic practices in regard to food, clothing, and housing. We have directed the Antitrust Division, insofar as we have power to do so, to concentrate their efforts in the fields of food, clothing, and housing. We are concerned with the alleged monopolistic practices of the corporation known as International Business Machines.

I am sure that the Antitrust Division will immediately concern itself with the recent half-a-cent-a-gallon increase in gasoline in the East. When all the companies can get together and raise the price of gasoline a half a cent a gallon, there certainly is something wrong in Denmark.

So far as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which is the organization which safeguards our internal security, is concerned, this committee allowed not only the \$50,987,000 request of the Bureau of the Budget, but increased this amount by \$1,598,141 to the total sum of \$52,585,141. This increase is a comparatively small sum compared with the many billions of dollars being spent overseas allegedly to protect us against the ravages of communism. The committee showed no reluctance whatever in going along with the proposal to increase the money for the FBI by over \$1,500,000 when they realized, as they did, the amount of money we spend on our internal security is one of the most important items in this bill. For the sake of a mere \$1,500,000 we would not hesitate to insure our internal security as much as we can.

In connection with the FBI, in the year 1948 alone, seven new laws were

passed by the Eightieth Congress which specifically increased their work load. It might be interesting to note at this time that of the hundreds of thousands of Government employees who have been examined under the loyalty program by the FBI, it has been found that in 99.65 percent of the cases Government employees have no record of subversive activities. This speaks well for the rank-and-file employees of the United States Government, throughout this land.

I realize that I am taking a considerable length of time. I do not want my fellow committee members to be apprehensive. I want them to have ample time to speak on this bill. But this bill covers four huge subdivisions of our Government, and there are many, many items in it which are of great interest to this Congress and to the people of America.

For the Department of Commerce there was requested by the Bureau of the Budget \$301,073,500. This committee saw fit to cut that amount by \$41,145,895 to the amount \$259,927,605. While this is an increase of \$80,175,105 over the current year's appropriation, over \$12,000,000 of this increase is necessary as the result of the passage in the Eightieth Congress of Public Law 900. Twenty-five million three hundred thousand dollars is necessary to liquidate contract authorities granted by the Congress in previous years; and \$43,000,000 of it is for the taking of the Seventeenth Decennial Census.

In the Office of the Secretary of Commerce the committee has made an actual decrease of \$158,000. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has been allowed \$139,073,605, as well as contract authority in the amount of \$58,800,000.

Insofar as the Civil Aeronautics Administration is concerned, the committee finds that they are engaged in a lot of boondoggling; that they are engaged in projects which, to the committee, seem utterly ridiculous. Why it is necessary for Civil Aeronautics Administration to maintain an office in Washington for men who are sent throughout the country, and the taxpayers have to pay the cost of the travel and pay them salaries, to go down to Roanoke, Va., or to some point on the west coast to tell the local manager of an airport how to run his restaurant business, how better to cook his hot dogs, is utterly beyond the imagination of the members of the committee.

Further, why these employees have to travel to see local airport managers for the purpose of suggesting they grow wheat on a part of the land adjacent to airport facilities, at the expense of the taxpayer, when such a program could be carried on by mail by the use of a 3-cent stamp, instead of paying some seven or eight thousand dollars a year employee to travel throughout the country and pay his traveling expense as well, is beyond the committee's comprehension.

The committee has deducted from the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget for the activities of CAA \$900,000 in equipment and \$500,000 in supply material, on the theory that they have been maintaining an inventory fully a year in advance, which in these days is

utterly ridiculous—in these days when prices are expected to fall.

The committee has reduced the amount of this bill by \$1,434,895 by taking from the Bureau of the Budget estimates that amount normally included for personnel in communications control stations, class 1 and class 2. In at least most of these stations there are six employees, five of whom work a trick, the sixth of whom is the chief communicator, or the boss. The committee feels that the chief communicator could just as well take a trick and thus reduce this appropriation by \$1,434,895.

The committee has reduced the appropriation for administrative Washington personnel of Civil Aeronautics Administration by \$200,000. I should say that the committee has been unanimous in protesting the manner by which many employees have been added to the pay roll. I will give you an example of this, if I may. On page 708 of the Department of Commerce hearings you will find the following colloquy with the budget officer of the Department of Commerce with regard to putting 19 new employees on their payroll for a division known as Technical and Scientific Services.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself ten additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of the Budget and the Department asked for an appropriation of \$80,000 in order to put 19 people to work in connection with a worth-while activity. In order to add the 19 employees to the pay roll the Department of Commerce, Secretary's Office, deducted the amount of \$3,000 for their bookkeeping occasioned, as they say, by addition of 19 people to the pay roll. The following colloquy ensued:

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Cawley, in this supplemental request for an increase in appropriation, there are 19 employees. Why do we have to transfer as much as \$3,000 to the Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses?

Mr. CAWLEY. That is an estimate which we were required to form to continue the service and permit additional service. That may appear disproportionate.

Mr. ROONEY. It surely does; merely to take care of 19 additional employees as far as the Secretary's Office is concerned, \$3,000.

Mr. CAWLEY. That is the amount that was requested and approved. I may say that we have tried in the Office of the Secretary to provide as many of these services without charge as we could and we have succeeded to date in providing free-of-charge service to the American Coordinating Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. How do you arrive at \$3,000?

Mr. CAWLEY. Three thousand dollars is the additional amount we estimated to be required here. It is not directly proportionate. It is an offset to meet the free-of-cost rendered service.

The committee frowns upon this practice and has served notice on the Department that it does not intend to countenance such action in the future.

As to the item entitled "Establishment of Air Navigation Facilities" the committee has reduced the budget request therefor by \$5,000,000 in cash and \$8,200,000 in contract authority. It may be of interest to note from the testimony at page 306 of the hearings that for a number of years the committee has appropriated,

unwittingly appropriated, money with which to purchase gasoline and oil for operation of airplanes which are not going to be operated until the fiscal year 1952—practically 3 years away. Why and how such an item could be included in the bill I do not know. Two or three years from now gasoline may not be the fuel used in airplanes, and goodness knows what the price of gasoline may be.

This same outfit made a request for an appropriation of \$111,430 for a very high-frequency link with overseas communications stations to be installed at Barnegat, N. J. They have been paying around \$67,000 per year in rent to a private company and stated that if we would allow them the \$111,000 they would be able to save the \$67,000 a year rent being paid to a private communications company.

When they were asked how long this had been going on, how long they had been paying rent, they stated that it had been going on for some 6 or 8 years. They were then asked whether or not this very high-frequency link is a new invention. They answered that it was not, that there was nothing new to it by way of invention, that it is at least 4 years old. The committee then wanted to know why it took at least 4 years to find out that, by spending \$111,000, 4 years' rent at \$67,000 a year could be saved?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I take it the gentleman is complimenting the new Administrator for finding ways to save money?

Mr. ROONEY. I have no fault to find with the new Administrator. Mr. Rentzel has not been there long enough to find fault with him. I expect he might do a good job if he is let alone by a lot of people, including your favorite air lines.

I would be remiss in my duties if I did not make a comment with reference to a very beneficent organization that we have in this Government known as the Civil Aeronautics Board. I would like to read to you from page 22 of the committee report, which shows in no uncertain terms what the committee thinks of some of the actions of the Civil Aeronautics Board:

Although the committee has suggested year after year that the air lines should pay part of the cost of maintaining the Federal airways, both Civil Aeronautics Board and Civil Aeronautics Administration make annual fervent pleas in behalf of the companies, insisting that they are not self-supporting. Since many of the executives of these air lines are paid six-figure salaries for directing companies which are subsidized to the great extent they are by the Federal Government, the committee strongly feels that the day has arrived when steps must be taken to more carefully scrutinize the finances of these companies.

In this connection, the members of the committee were utterly amazed to learn of the decision of Civil Aeronautics Board on Friday, February 25, 1949, granting an \$8,000,000 gift of the taxpayers' money to the "Big Four" air lines for transportation of air mail, a single pound of which they never actually carried. In making such decision under the guise of air-mail subsidy, it would seem an expensive gesture of sympathy to

these air lines for supposititious business lost due to the grounding of a number of their Constellations and DC-6's which they had previously been operating with defective and dangerous equipment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have also read the language that the gentleman placed in the Record, and while, of course, I do not criticize the gentleman's report at all, I would like to call attention to the fact that the mail pay rates established by the Civil Aeronautics Board to which the gentleman refers were what is called temporary rates and were established in the hope that the transportation might be furnished at that price. It was found, however, it could not be furnished at that price; hence, in establishing the permanent rates for the same period of time, I believe the gentleman will find that the Civil Aeronautics Board increased the temporary rate by the amount necessary to that figure he has stated.

Mr. ROONEY. The testimony before the committee, I must say to the gentleman from California, is quite clear that the only reason they allowed this \$8,000,000 under the guise of air-mail rates was to recompense these companies for the period of time when their Lockheed Constellations and DC-6's were grounded. Why had they been grounded? Because they were manufactured with a defective smoke-detective device, and when these planes were in operation there were a couple of serious accidents as a result of fire due to the defective smoke-detective device. CAA came along and said, "We ground these planes; we revoke your certificate of airworthiness." Now the planes are on the ground for about 6 weeks while the smoke-detective devices are being taken out of them or disconnected. What do you think CAB did? They gave them \$8,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for the period of time the airplanes were grounded so as to be put in safe condition so that the public could ride in them.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am concerned with the fact that this \$8,000,000 the gentleman speaks of is funneled into them through the medium of the Post Office Department, and then they come in here and say they have a big postal deficit.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The gentleman from New York knows that I have before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a bill separating subsidy from compensation for carrying mail. Does the gentleman not think that if we do separate them, that the situation that he just mentioned would not happen?

Mr. ROONEY. I certainly think it would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to point out that the airplanes which were grounded had been approved and certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and nobody could find anything wrong with them at the time they were certificated. The fact that they were grounded was deplored by the Administration as having been unnecessary in certain instances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Well, that may have been so, but you cannot fool with airplanes; you cannot take chances with airplanes, and the gentleman from California, who is very well versed in aviation, knows that.

Mr. HINSHAW. I know that, and they tried to make them as best they could, but it is not infrequent that even in military aircraft they find something wrong with them after they have been in the air a while.

Mr. ROONEY. I posed the question to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board why it was that the Lockheed Company, the manufacturer of the Constellations, should not reimburse these air lines such as TWA and the others for their loss of business during the time they were grounded. Incidentally the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] spoke to me this morning and stated that he had a communication from the president of Eastern Air Lines, Mr. Rickenbacker. There seems to be a question of who are the Big Four. The committee in its report mentions that this \$8,000,000 was paid to the Big Four. Mr. Rickenbacker insists that his company did not and is not to receive any part of this money. But he further insists that they are one of the Big Four. I have before me a paper, summary of orders issued to implement Civil Aeronautic Board's statement of policy, February 25, 1949, mail-rate section, and it says: "America, United, and TWA (Big Four)". I do not know the answer, but this committee in its report had no desire to include Eastern Air Lines if they did not or are not to receive any part of that huge air-mail subsidy payment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Only TWA, among those air lines mentioned, have flown Constellations; the other ones fly DC-6's. Of course, the subject of whether or not they were grounded is a very important one. In the case of the DC-6's, they were grounded voluntarily by the air lines themselves. If the gentleman will read the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, he will find that it is the duty of the Board to foster a sound aeronautics system in the United States and to pay rates compensatory as well as subsidizing for that purpose.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman think the time has arrived when

these air lines should start to pay for the use of the huge concrete strips built with Uncle Sam's money, for the use of the huge Federal airways, communications, weather, signals, beacons—

Mr. HINSHAW. My dear friend, they do.

Mr. ROONEY. Landing aids, lights, and everything else? Does not the gentleman think the time has arrived for that?

Mr. HINSHAW. They pay every airport in the United States a landing fee.

Mr. ROONEY. Sure, they pay a landing fee, which comparatively is just like dropping a nickel in the slot in the subway.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman ought to look over the list of fees they pay.

Mr. ROONEY. I am thoroughly familiar with them, I may say to the gentleman. I think we know a little bit about this subject, too.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman realize how much the Congress appropriates for the inland waterways and the rivers and harbors every year without any gripe at all?

Mr. ROONEY. I understand all that. I have heard that argument before, I may say to the gentleman from California, and, if I am not mistaken, from him.

I have just one further observation to make. In the Eightieth Congress a gentleman named Colonel Oxholm came around to most of the Members of the House, and I suppose later to the Members of the Senate, and told how his heart bled for the people of the Virgin Islands. Many of you may remember the colonel. He was a very convincing speaker. He told us that the one hope for the good people of the Virgin Islands was an economic survey so that they would be able to change their economy and make progress. As a result of traveling to many of the offices in the House Office Buildings, the colonel prevailed upon a Member in the first session of the Eightieth Congress to offer an amendment from the floor to this very bill, and the amendment carried. As the result, there was appropriated to the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce without any request whatever from them, the amount of \$15,000 for such a survey. Taxpayers' money to the tune of \$30,000 has since been paid for such a survey; and, lo and behold, who has been making that survey for the past 2 years but our friend, Colonel Oxholm.

The following colloquy took place during the hearings of the committee. The committee asked whether or not any money was requested for this purpose for another year, and Mr. Hayward, the Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, said:

I do not believe that any further study is necessary.

Mr. ROONEY. Who made the study? Incidentally, Colonel Oxholm didn't have anything to do with it, did he?

Mr. HAYWARD. Yes, sir; he is the man who is still down there.

Mr. ROONEY. On the pay roll of the Government?

Mr. HAYWARD. On the pay roll of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. ROONEY. How did that come about?

Mr. HAYWARD. We were pretty well pressured into that one, I guess.

Mr. ROONEY. What concrete results have been achieved as a result of the expenditure of this \$30,000?

Mr. HAYWARD. I think you can boil that down to a few words, Mr. Chairman. It is the consensus, I think, of Mr. Oxholm's last annual report and the interim reports we have gotten since, that the only way to get the Virgin Islands on a proper economic basis is for the people to go to work and to stop sending money down there from the United States for them to live on relief. That is the sum and substance of all of his reports.

Mr. ROONEY. And you spent \$30,000 to find that out at the direction of the Eightieth Congress?

Mr. HAYWARD. That is true.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at the point in his remarks where the gentleman from New York yielded to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, again we bring to you a very important bill making the annual appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Judiciary.

Before I go into the bill proper, I want to take this opportunity to commend the other four members of this committee, especially Mr. JOHN ROONEY, of New York, the chairman, for his unusual courtesy and consideration and his ability and knowledge of the many items contained in this bill. I commend Mr. CLEVENGER, of Ohio, who is a great economist, a merchant, and farmer. He has traveled extensively over the world, and also has knowledge of the items contained in this bill. Also I wish to commend Mr. DANIEL FLOOD, an attorney with a wide knowledge of foreign affairs. He contributed much to our deliberations. I commend Mr. PRESTON, of Georgia, also an eminent lawyer who is also widely traveled, and whose unusual knowledge of many of the items in this bill helped us to come to fair decisions. I commend Mr. Jay B. Howe, executive secretary of the committee. Those of you who have had anything to do with the Committee on Appropriations know what the job of executive secretary really is.

You have just listened to about an hour's discussion on this bill by the very distinguished chairman. I wish to again congratulate him on the excellent job he has just done in explaining in detail the many important items in this bill. We were able to cut the number of pages of hearings down somewhat as compared with previous years. But there are approximately 2,000 pages of hearings in these four volumes. There are approximately 104 items affecting foreign relations and domestic affairs; matters having to do with the State Department and the Foreign Service; the fast-growing Department of Commerce; the Department of Justice; and our Federal courts.

Few Members of the Congress realize how many items must be handled before a bill is brought to you in finished form. As stated by the chairman, we have been working since early last January. We only recently completed the hearings. Then we marked up the bill, which is a tremendous task. Then we wrote up our report and then presented it to the full committee. We now present it to you as a finished product. What are some of these 100 or more items which call for an expenditure of nearly \$700,000,000? In the Department of State alone some of the items include salaries and expenses of the Office of the Secretary; legal adviser; geographical offices; Assistant Secretary for occupied areas; economic officers; research intelligence officers; office of the United Nations; public affairs officers; administrative officers, Passport Division, Visa Division, Division of Directive Services; Division of Security; Division of Foreign Service; buildings fund; our participation in many international organizations. These are too numerous to enumerate here. All appear in the printed hearings which are available to all Members.

In the Justice Department we have salaries of the Attorney General and his activities, Administration Division, Tax Division, Criminal Division, Claims Division, Federal Court of Claims, Customs Division, Antitrust Division, Examiner of Judicial Offices, Land Division, district attorneys, special attorneys, marshals, Alien Custodian, Immigration and Naturalization, and many other activities.

The Department of Commerce includes the export control; Weather Bureau; technical and scientific services; the Census Bureau and its various divisions, foreign-census service, Seventeenth Decennial Census, for which we are appropriating now and which will go into effect July 1, 1950, which involves more than \$70,000,000. We are already going into the census of manufactures.

Then we have the Civil Aeronautics, which takes up most of the appropriation in the Department of Commerce. Air navigation facilities, technical development, Federal airport program. The Washington Airport, which is the only civilian airport paid for and operated by the United States Government; the field officers; the Bureau of Standards, the administration of it: research, testing, radio propagation, and many activities which are done by the Testing Division of the Bureau of Standards.

In our Federal courts we have the Supreme Court of the United States; the Hawaiian courts; the salaries of the judges there; the salaries of our judges; the probation system; fees of jurors; Supreme Court reports, court reporters, Supreme Court referees in bankruptcy.

This committee only a year ago took the referees in bankruptcy out of the commission basis and put them on a salary; made them officials of the court. I am happy to report to you that the operation is about self-sustaining.

Mr. Chairman, I will now go into many of the other details of this bill detailing more especially some outstanding matters in the Departments of State and Commerce.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Our hearings on the 1950 appropriations for the Department of State have indicated to me that there is a noticeable effort in progress within the Department to promote efficiency, economy, and improved public service. I have in mind especially the forthright testimony of Assistant Secretary of State for Administration John E. Peurifoy, wherein he advised the committee of his efforts toward the consolidation and streamlining of functions under his supervision which are resulting in the elimination of certain overlapping and duplication scored so bitterly by this committee in the Eightieth Congress.

Many of Mr. Peurifoy's suggestions have been incorporated in the Hoover Commission's recommendations for the reorganization of the Department; and while undoubtedly there remains unlimited room for improvement, I have the feeling that at long last we are making some headway toward correcting the maladministration which so deteriorated the Department's effectiveness and reputation.

Last year we held extensive hearings on the functions and administration of the Department of State. With the assistance of a professional investigative staff, which was promptly eliminated this year by the Democratic leadership, we uncovered appalling extravagance and waste in personnel, supplies, and services, protected by a raft of red tape which only a Houdini could untangle. We pulled no punches. We itemized our findings, and made some specific and sound recommendations. But, more important, we called public attention to criminal laxness and inefficiency in the handling of our international affairs. Do not underestimate the value of last year's exposure of suspicious and undesirable employees. Our subsequent demand for a complete overhauling of the Department has had a direct bearing on such changed attitudes as expressed by Secretary of State Dean Acheson when he recently testified that "in the coming year we plan to cooperate in simplifying the structure of international organizations through improving working relations among the various organizations and by eliminating those individual agencies whose programs can be absorbed by larger organizations." That is precisely what we recommended last year.

It is no accident that Mr. Peurifoy, in whom every member of this committee has the utmost confidence and great respect, states that "all doubts in a security case should be resolved in favor of the Government." He further assures us that he believes it to be "a privilege to work for the Government of the United States and not a right." My reaction is that Department officials are beginning to see the light and to interpret their jobs and the policy of the Department in terms of service to and protection of the American people, instead of indulging in some theoretical double talk which straddles every issue, including that of loyalty to this country.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVENGER. As I recall, last year the Appropriations Committee investigative staff produced the employment histories of 108 individuals who were either employed by the State Department or were prospective employees. A large percentage of these were obviously poor security risks because of their associations and activities.

I am curious to know what, if anything, has been done to boot these individuals off the Federal pay roll.

Mr. STEFAN. I am glad to answer that question, which was discussed in our recent hearings. Our committee was informed by Mr. Samuel Boykin, who is Director of the Office of Controls—and he is an outstanding and efficient official—that there had been a number of resignations, 12, in the loyalty-case group and, I believe, about 14 among the security cases.

QUESTION NO. 2

Mr. CLEVENGER. Undoubtedly there were other resignations for reasons which do not fit into those categories. It is my understanding that, after due investigation, 62 other cases were dismissed or asked to resign. What protection is there against them getting onto the Federal pay roll via another agency?

Mr. STEFAN. Theoretically their records are flagged at the Civil Service Commission as well as in the employment office of the State Department. But there is no guaranty that another department will make a thorough check of an individual's past history. Some of these characters we exposed are apparently part of a network which reaches into the administration's left-wing core, because an invisible hand seems to guide them from one strategic job to another. It is a fact that certain individuals on the now famous list of 108 which we exposed last year are at this moment employed by other Government agencies.

For instance, one former State Department employee whose record revealed an overwhelming amount of derogatory information as a security risk was eased out of a policy-making position only to be hired, according to the Civil Service Commission, for a similar post with the War Department.

Another former State Department employee whose record was flagged because of numerous affiliations with fellow travelers and Communist-front organizations is now in a policy-making position with the United States Army in Germany.

It was recently revealed that UNESCO has become a haven for Communists and their sympathizers booted out of United States Government jobs. Apparently, they are received with open arms into that international agency which American taxpayers are supporting to the tune of \$2,928,773 annually.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has investigated over 13,000 employees in the Department's domestic and foreign service, and there is now in effect a program of continuing investigation which would seem to assure a certain amount of vigilance within the agency. Let me say, here and now, that despite all the irre-

sponsible abuse heaped upon the Eightieth Congress, if it had done nothing else but bring about this salutary housecleaning in the Department of State, it performed a public service of immeasurable magnitude.

I am more than happy to applaud the improvements which have been made; however, I do wish to call attention to what I consider a gross lack of judgment in the Department's appointment of an employee to its selection board, which reviews and determines the selection of Foreign Service officers. Specifically, I have in mind the appointment of a Foreign Service officer, who, after intensive investigation by the FBI, was arrested and charged with transmitting classified official documents to unauthorized persons. The FBI does not charge and arrest persons without due cause. Despite the fact that a grand jury did not indict this individual, it is difficult to condone the Department's appointment of him to an important post on its selection board. If for no other reason than that of public and employee relations, this was a misguided and unfortunate appointment.

The security of our country is not to be trifled with, and it would be the better part of valor to err on the side of national security than to bend over backward to vindicate a wearer of the old school tie.

The continuing investigation of State Department personnel is essential. I was not amused several months ago when a romance between an Embassy code clerk and Russian girl culminated in the clerk's resignation and tirade against this Government. The code clerk left the Embassy, but apparently so did the code books and other official documents. Just how can this sort of thing happen if we have the high-caliber surveillance for which we annually appropriate substantial funds? Is it too much to ask in these serious and fateful days that the State Department personnel be selected with the same care and inspection used on defense supplies and war materials?

Vigilant as we must be respecting the patriotic dependability of departmental employees in all positions of trust and critical as we should be of those—fortunately of relatively small number—that betray that trust, let it not be doubted that the great preponderance of people in the Department are honest, trustworthy, industrious, and loyal. This is all the more reason why the good work of so many should not be polluted by the machinations of so few.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I include a newspaper article which I earlier today was granted permission to include in my remarks:

PROBE OF UN UNIT AS HAVEN FOR FIRED REDS
WILL BE ASKED

(By Edward K. Nellor)

A congressional investigation of UNESCO as a dumping ground for Communists booted out of the State Department and other Federal agencies will be demanded soon in the Senate, this newspaper learned last night.

Proof is in the hands of at least two Senators confirming reports the United Nations cultural set-up functions as a haven for security-tagged Kremlinites.

Two red-hot espionage suspects, in fact, are on the UNESCO pay roll at the present time. Especially galling to United States officials is the fact that this Government can do nothing about getting rid of the Reds.

Under the UN charter, a quota of employees was set up for each member country. There was a clause added to the charter, however, which gave the Assistant Secretary General authority to select personnel.

The assistant secretary generalship of UN is rotated. At present a Muscovite, A. Sobolev, holds the post. Sobolev hired most of the domestic Reds for the UN after they had been eased out of the State Department one jump ahead of an FBI or House Un-American Activities Committee expose.

Senator MUNDT (Republican), of South Dakota, has data ready for Senate delivery which will reveal details of the Reds hired for UNESCO.

MUNDT is irked about the job placement clause in the General Assembly and Charter regulations. When the time arrives for an American to rotate into the Assistant Secretary General's job MUNDT suggests that prominent anti-Communists be appointed to vacancies in the United States quota. He added:

"We appreciate Sobolev's hiring American Communists for the UN about as much as the Russians would appreciate it if we hired Whittaker Chambers, Elizabeth Bentley, Louis Budenz, Victor Krevchenko, and other known anti-Communists for UN jobs where they had to come into contact with Soviet officials."

Senator MCCARRAN (Democrat), of Nevada, also is disturbed over the UNESCO situation and is about ready to air his discoveries about the Red nest in the global organization.

One \$8,000-a-year UNESCO woman aide hired by Sobolev is listed in almost every Government security agency as a Communist. The House Un-American Activities Committee is about to lower the boom on her. She was one of the busiest Reds in the State Department at one time. She is credited, in fact, with having persuaded more Government girls to run more espionage errands than any other Kremlin courier on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the gentleman a few questions with respect to the UNESCO program? Surely most of us are in deep sympathy with the stated objectives of UNESCO, with the aim to promote world peace by educational activities and cultural, scientific, and social exchange. Surely also we want to maintain a watchful eye over these activities to make sure that these objectives are being conscientiously and effectively implemented.

I notice that among the members of UNESCO are Czechoslovakia, which contributes 1.8 percent to the budget of UNESCO; Hungary, which contributes seventeen one-hundredths of 1 percent; and Poland, which contributes 1.13 percent. The United States contributes 38.47 percent.

My question is this: These three countries are known to be satellites of the Soviet Union. Have they expressed their approval of the manner in which the educational, social, scientific, and cultural aspects of this program are developing?

Mr. STEFAN. In answer to that question, the gentleman from Connecticut

knows as well as I do what happened to the great republic of Czechoslovakia, which was founded by the late Thomas Masaryk. The gentleman knows what happened to his son, Jan Masaryk. The gentleman knows as well as I do that that republic, fashioned after our own, is no more. It is entirely a Communist-controlled country, in which people are living in fear, and from which over 10,000 patriots, followers of Thomas Masaryk, have escaped from their Russian-controlled masters. Naturally the Czechoslovakian Government today would approve of UNESCO, if the statement contained in this newspaper article is true, that it is infested with Communists and Communist-controlled employees.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I think that is very disturbing information because, if that is shown to be true, then UNESCO is attempting to accomplish precisely the opposite of what it is dedicated to accomplish. It would be assisting the forces of slavery which are our self-made enemies rather than the freedom which we are resolved to protect. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there might be some difficulty in reconciling the point of view—the ideology—of the United States, which contributes 38.47 percent, with the point of view—the ideology—of Hungary, which contributes 0.17 percent, and which has been guilty of the heinous crime against Cardinal Mindszenty which has shocked the entire civilized world. I should like to know how those two nations, our own Nation and Communist-dominated Hungary, are able to reach an understanding on cultural, scientific, educational, and social matters.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. If the gentleman will read the record, he will find that the gentleman from Nebraska who is now addressing him fought against all legislation which would give Communists control of American taxpayer money. Bills passed out of the committee of which the gentleman is a member—the Committee on Foreign Affairs—call for appropriations, and that committee is duty bound to implement with funds the authorization legislation passed by Congress.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I was not a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee at the time that the authorizing legislation was considered. Furthermore, one can agree with an objective without flinching that that objective is being pursued.

As the gentleman from Nebraska knows, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland were also represented at the Communist-controlled Congress of World Intellectuals which recently held a meeting at the Waldorf-Astoria. Has the gentleman any information as to what was the attitude of the UNESCO, of which these countries are members, toward this meeting in New York City?

Mr. STEFAN. I do not have information about that. Our duty is to appropriate money to implement the laws. That information certainly could

be obtained in your committee, which authorized this kind of legislation.

Mr. LODGE. Does it not seem to the gentleman that it is important to know what the attitude of UNESCO is toward such matters?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; and I should think that your committee, which reported out these bills, which eventually became laws, should make that investigation. I call your attention to page 628 of the hearings. You will find that UNESCO has on its pay roll about 700 employees, and, strange as it may seem, among them there are only 48 Americans.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. With respect to what the gentleman has just said, I notice that of the 427 who are not internationally recruited there are no Americans at all, and that there are only 48 Americans among the internationally recruited employees, which number 262.

Mr. STEFAN. You will find that the committee not only this year, but last year, went into these matters very carefully and called attention to and pointed with alarm at the small percentage of Americans employed in this international organization and other international organizations to which we contribute the lion's share of the expense.

Mr. LODGE. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. On page 277 of the hearings on the Department of Commerce there is a list at the bottom of the page of 38 instrument-landing systems in the continental United States. As I understand it, the committee has authorized these instrument-landing stations?

Mr. STEFAN. That is right.

Mr. HOLMES. Does that mean that money will be provided for these 38 instrument-landing systems?

Mr. STEFAN. So far as the money allowed to the Department would go; yes.

Mr. HOLMES. Who has the final determination as to the actual positions? Does the Department have that authority?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes, indeed. These are similar to the cases of the control towers. We have about 151 control towers now in operation. Eighteen new ones are to be put into operation during the present fiscal year, and beginning July 1 of the next fiscal year about 15 additional control towers will be put into operation.

Mr. HOLMES. They are authorized by the committee?

Mr. STEFAN. These are decided upon by the CAA Administrator. The funds for them are provided by the Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In that category of control towers, is it your understanding that the control tower in Lincoln, Nebr., is continued?

Mr. STEFAN. That is continued, with some improvements.

Mr. CURTIS. There is an appropriation made for the building and improving of airports; is there not?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes. As I said before, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has been very diligent about the continuation and development of landing areas in his district. He has three or four projects included in the tentative list. This is the result of the gentleman's diligence and also the result of the progress in aviation in his district.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, in receiving this money that the Congress appropriates, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has had to make justification as to what they would use it for, and those on the list are their justification?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes, but the list is tentative. It all depends on the appropriation that will finally come out of this bill. But the money for Federal airport development, which is in cooperation with the funds raised by communities and States, is included in the bill.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Insofar as the question of control towers is concerned, I would like to call attention to the fact that on page 296 of the hearings for the Department of Commerce you raised some question concerning the operation of the control tower at Hilo, Hawaii.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I wish to thank the gentleman for his interest in that particular control tower. I note, however, that no funds are appropriated for the operation of that tower, and I want to point out that that was recommended by the Ninth Region of the CAA, in view of the fact that towers on the island of Maui and those on the island of Hawaii, at Hilo, were designated as long-range international civil alternate airports, by the Provisional International Civil Aviation Conference held at Melbourne, Australia. I do not see in the hearings any information that that was brought to the attention of the committee. The Territory of Hawaii is at present financing the operation of that airport, and we feel very strongly, in view of this commitment, that its operation should be financed by the Federal Government. I would appreciate any comment the gentleman would care to make on that subject.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Hawaii has spoken to me about various CAA installations and activities in the Hawaiian Islands many, many times, and I know of his concern about it. I know the gentleman has talked to me many times about it and we have discussed it. It was for that reason that I interrogated the Administration in connection with the operation of the control tower at Hilo. Something will perhaps have to be done eventually to decide whether or not the operation of the Hilo tower will have similar status as the towers in the United States. Perhaps when the Hawaiian Islands receive statehood for which the gentleman has battled so long, we can clear that up.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, with the gen-

tleman's permission, that I may extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the United States Government entered into an agreement at the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization Conference at Melbourne, Australia in February 1947, designating the Hilo, Hawaii and Maui airports as long-range international civil alternate airports.

These two airports are situated on the north shore of the Island of Hawaii, some 200 miles southeast of Honolulu, and on the Island of Maui slightly less than 100 miles from Honolulu.

The importance of maintaining these two ports as alternate landings in the long flight necessary to reach Honolulu is apparent to anyone who will examine a map of the Hawaiian Islands.

According to figures supplied by the Civil Aeronautics Commission, there occurred at Hilo, for the period January 1 to October 1, 1948, a total of 35,640 operations. Based on a 12-hour day, this gives 130.8 operations per day or a take-off or landing every 5.5 minutes. For Maui, the Civil Aeronautics Administration figures show for the same period a total of 20,416 operations, or on the basis of a 12-hour day, a take-off or landing every 9.6 minutes. Based on the type and volume of operations conducted at the Hilo and Maui airports, the local CAA office has classified both Hilo and Maui as class II airports on the scale used to determine whether or not the activity at a given airport justifies the operation of a control tower. There are three classes of airports which justify towers, namely, class I, II, and III, so that the Hilo and Maui airports are well above the minimum requirements and exceed a number of mainland airports where traffic towers are operated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Despite the international agreement covering the Hilo and Maui airports, the operation of the former is now being sustained by funds allocated by the Hawaii Aeronautics Commission for the period November 1, 1948 until June 30, 1949, the towers being operated by personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The Hawaii Aeronautics Commission should not be expected to allocate funds for the operation of this tower beyond this period. It is our view that not only is it the function of the Civil Aeronautics Commission to operate control towers with Federal funds at locations where control towers are considered necessary but mandatory that the Federal Government make funds available for the operation of facilities endorsed at an international conference.

The inclusion, therefore, of funds for the operation of these airports is important to the protection of the traveling public and in fulfillment of our international obligations as well.

The Ninth Regional Office of the Civil Aeronautics Administration at Honolulu recommended CAA operation of the control towers at Hilo and Kahului during fiscal year 1950. Due to fiscal limitations imposed by the Budget Bureau, this program was curtailed and neither Hilo,

Kahului nor numerous other proposed locations appeared in the final tower program submitted for approval.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I cannot find a statement in the bill, but the gentleman will recognize it. I noticed somewhere it said that we could spend this money for agricultural experiment stations in other countries.

Mr. STEFAN. I believe the gentleman is referring to the item: Institute of American Affairs.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Could the gentleman explain it briefly? Because some of us in the rural areas have had a great deal of difficulty in getting money for experiment stations in the United States.

Mr. STEFAN. There are many many items dealt in by the Institute of American Affairs. Agriculture, education, commerce, public health, city improvements, and many other things. I should like to say to my colleague from California that this agency is launching upon an ambitious program of constructing hospitals, increasing the number of beds in hospitals in Central and South America, and this at a time when we here in the United States refuse appropriations for the Veterans' Administration to build 20 additional hospitals in this country and provide additional beds for our own veterans. The agriculture item is just one item in the entire program. I have always been against the duplication of effort. We have today in Central and South America this Institute of American Affairs. In this bill money is appropriated for the cultural program for Central America, the cultural Latin-American program. We also have extended the information service to Latin America. These three agencies have duplicating functions, and should be eventually brought under one head.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Could the gentleman tell me about how much money is involved in that? I do not want to trespass too far on the gentleman's time, but if he has it handy I should appreciate it.

Mr. STEFAN. I believe it is over a million for agriculture and over four million for our share of the program.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

FBI APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address my colleagues briefly concerning certain portions of the appropriation bill presently before us for consideration. I am hopeful that you will all be able to carefully read and digest the testimony given to your committee during its hearings in connection with the bill in question. I particularly commend to your attention the testimony given your committee by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, covering the work of that Bureau.

I was very much concerned during the hearings to learn that Mr. Hoover's original request for funds for the fiscal year 1950 had been cut by an amount of \$1,598,141. Mr. Hoover's original re-

quest for the fiscal year 1949 totaled \$52,585,141, the Bureau of the Budget approving an amount of \$50,987,000 for the next fiscal year for this Bureau. Your committee felt, and decided unanimously, after hearing the testimony of Mr. Hoover, that the full amount originally requested by him, over and above the budget estimates, should be approved for his agency's activities during the coming fiscal year. The internal security of the United States must be preserved. The period in which we now live is too volcanic to allow the crippling of the FBI. We cannot afford to be remiss in our unrelenting efforts aimed at the dissipation of our internal enemies. I know my colleagues are aware of those to whom I refer; the spies, the saboteurs, and other groups whose desires are aimed at the subversion of our Government. Neither can we forget the dangers so inherent in the artifices of the Communist Party and its fellow travelers, a most despicable group. An organization which through its sinister deceit has profited from its years of boring from within. An organization which has spread its cancerous growth to the very heart of the Nation.

In considering the appropriation of the FBI, we, of course, fully appreciate the record of accomplishments of this organization under Mr. Hoover's able and efficient leadership. It has been particularly reassuring to the members of the committee and to the Congress to observe that Mr. Hoover, through careful administration, has repeatedly effected savings in his appropriations. During three of the last peak war years, when Government expenditures were unparalleled in the history of this country, an amount of approximately \$10,000,000 was voluntarily returned to the Treasury by this Bureau. I know that we can be assured in the future, as we have in the past, that through such efficient management the expenditures of the FBI will be maintained at an absolute minimum.

During the critical war period, the FBI shouldered heavy responsibilities. Contrary to popular belief, the cessation of hostilities has not curtailed such heavy investigative burdens during the postwar period. Investigative operations of the FBI reached an all-time high during 1948, attaining an unprecedented volume in excess of one-half million investigative matters—the highest ever recorded in the history of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This unparalleled growth exceeds all workloads experienced during any of the peak war years.

We must remember that during the past decade, succeeding sessions of Congress, through legislation, have greatly augmented the investigative jurisdiction of this agency. Originally, FBI jurisdiction encompassed some 20 or 30 Federal statutes. Today, this jurisdiction has expanded to such an extent that it now embraces approximately 120 major Federal statutes. During the past year alone, the Congress has seen fit to place in the statute books no less than seven new public laws vesting increased responsibilities in this organization.

In addition, under presidential directives, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been designated as the agency of the Federal Government charged with the coordination of all internal security matters affecting the civilian population. During September of 1939, and again on January 8, 1943, the President directed the attention of all law enforcement officers to FBI jurisdiction in the field of espionage, sabotage, treason, and related security violations. These directives are still in full force and effect.

The printed testimony will reveal, further, that the FBI had pending more than 63,000 investigative matters on January 1, 1949—a volume approaching three times that experienced during 1939, the last normal prewar year. Today, each special agent in the field is carrying an average work-load of 16 cases—yet 10 is regarded as the maximum for efficient productive capacity.

Although the workweek has now been reduced, the investigative staff of the FBI must continue to perform duties far in excess of a minimum 40-hour week. The exigencies of the service require prolonged and extended periods of application. They demand the availability of FBI personnel 24 hours daily, 7 days a week. Security investigations, and serious crimes such as kidnaping and bank robbery, cannot be successfully concluded on a time schedule.

The FBI has demonstrated it is equal to the task at hand. The prestige and traditions of the organization rest in a large measure on the sympathy and understanding with which this challenge has been met. During the 1948 fiscal year, 12,915 days' annual leave was forfeited. Voluntary overtime in excess of 1,000,000 hours—for which no compensation was received—was performed by FBI agents. This represented the equivalent investigative work of 527 men on a full year basis—or a salary savings to the Government, and its taxpayers, of \$3,186,431. I believe this is most significant, since I feel we need have no fear concerning the efficacy of Mr. Hoover's administration and the esprit de corps of its members.

Mr. Hoover advised your committee, during the hearings on this bill, that the backlog of work is increasing rather than decreasing. I inquired of him at that time as to whether the budget cut in the 1950 appropriation estimate would handicap the Bureau in its work. I was advised that the cut suffered by this Bureau in its appropriation estimate would handicap it in its work since the original request as submitted by Mr. Hoover had been reduced to the lowest possible figure which would permit the Bureau to properly discharge its obligations. I was very much disturbed by this cut since I feel that the FBI, in the trying days ahead, must have a sufficient appropriation to handle its work as it is received and to reduce the backlog of work which presently exists.

At the present time Mr. Hoover finds it necessary to take his special agents off regular investigative work, which includes investigation of bank robbery, kidnaping, antitrust cases, and many other such activities, and place them on

special investigations which necessarily must be completed within a set number of days. This is highly undesirable and this fact, which is brought about by continued increased responsibility, has, as your committee was advised during the hearings, increased the present backlog rather than decreased it. This backlog must be given continued attention and reduced at the earliest possible date. So long as it is necessary for Mr. Hoover to take his men off regular investigative work to handle these specialized investigations, this cannot be accomplished. The backlog in work is also reflected in the Bureau's Identification Division, which has received great numbers of fingerprint records under the loyalty and atomic-energy programs. Every effort is being made by the Bureau to bring this work up to date. I feel that by allowing the FBI the funds requested by it for the next fiscal year, Mr. Hoover will be able to materially reduce the backlogs which are present in pending work at this time.

Director Hoover testified at length before the committee of the many diverse problems confronting his organization. Problems which, in many instances, directly affect the security of the Nation. Problems that are symptomatic of the high-level and ever-broadening investigative scope of operations encountered during the postwar readjustment period.

Many of the reasons for these problems are apparent: The tense international crisis; the militant aggressive foreign policy of the Soviet Union, the intensification of espionage activities on the part of Soviet Russia and its satellites; the exploitation of every conceivable sphere of endeavor through the guise of Communist-front organizations; and the awakening of public opinion toward a full realization of the Communist menace.

Through unremitting efforts, the FBI has discharged its investigative operations with momentous success. The prestige it now enjoys, and rightfully so, has no equal in the annals of law enforcement. Nevertheless, a changing world, and the turn of events in international relationships, has encouraged increased recognition of the need for comprehensive and affirmative domestic intelligence coverage. A coverage that will render ineffectual the fiendish proclivities of such individuals and organizations which aim at the subversion of our Government. This need is manifestly paramount in controlling the sinister tactics of the Communist Party, so readily apparent during the postwar period. Its strategy, deceit, and trickery have taxed the facilities and FBI personnel to a degree unprecedented in law enforcement—far beyond that inherent in the fifth-column menace of Nazism and the now defunct German-American Bund.

The Communist Party is today organized in some 600 cities, towns, and rural communities of the United States. In 1917, when the Communists overthrew the Russian Government, there was one Communist for every 2,277 inhabitants of Russia. In the United States today, there is 1 Communist for every 2,463

inhabitants. And what is more significant are the avowed assurances of the Communists themselves: That for every party member there are 10 others—ready, willing, and able to do the party's work. What are its implications? Just this: The cancerous growth of a potential fifth-column strength in excess of 590,000, operating under the control of the party itself.

During the last war, the Communists, ostensibly, were devoting their efforts toward winning the war. But the American Communist, like the leopard, cannot change his spots. Since the fall of Germany, they have, with increased fury, sought to convert the party into a more revolutionary exponent of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. As such, it stands for the destruction of American democracy and for ultimate world revolution. Through years of expedient maneuvering, calculated to further intensify party objectives, they have profited by this boring from within. Disastrous consequences, both real and potential, would have been inevitable had it not been for the overwhelming effectiveness of our Federal Bureau of Investigation in properly controlling such dangers.

Let us not forget, also, that a growing antipathy of the public toward communism has, likewise, awakened a spirit of civic consciousness and public alertness. That this vigilance has not descended into vigilantism bespeaks of public confidence and esteem for the FBI. There has developed, in consequence, a highly efficient and thoroughly integrated law enforcement and counter-intelligence program which stands in happy contrast to the diffusion of investigative activity that characterized a comparable period some 30 years ago. The results have been all the more encouraging, since such investigative aims are being achieved by Mr. Hoover coincident with the absence of vigilante tactics and the mob hysteria so prevalent during World War I.

This enthusiastic response in reporting alleged acts of subversion and threats to our security has been most helpful, indeed. But it, too, has been productive of sharp increases in work. Increases that are notably pronounced in the field of foreign-inspired espionage. Such complaints must, of necessity, be handled with dispatch—and in the American way.

As public opinion responds to this menace, fifth columnists in our midst exercise increased caution. Espionage operations become increasingly complex. And untapped sources of information, having worked themselves into positions of seeming respect, are enlisted as the wanton tools of those designed to further the foreign-inspired espionage apparatus.

Nor must we judge the effectiveness of security objectives in terms of arrests and convictions. In any intelligence operation, security of information must be our prime concern. I recall in the prewar years that the FBI was criticized on the ill-founded premise that nothing was being done to meet the Nazi-Fascist-Japanism challenge to our internal security. The real facts are now a matter

of record. What was being done, and done successfully, could not then be publicized. Investigative accomplishments are not evident until and unless an acute emergency arises. It is at that time, and that time only, that the cumulative endeavors—hitherto conspicuously dormant—are fully realized and appreciated. It is at that time, also, that our enemies are made fully cognizant of the tremendous impact of the investigating arm of the FBI. An arm, which, through its relentless and inexhaustible labors, has rendered ineffectual the diabolical machinations of the saboteur and spy.

In other words, the preventive aspect is of paramount importance. The most effective way of counteracting espionage is counter-espionage—spying on the spy. But this is no simple accomplishment. It demands extended and heavy assignments of investigative personnel. It is productive of fruitful results only when foreign agents are placed under prolonged surveillance; their contacts identified; their methods of communication established; and, through such fortuitous efforts, gradually encircling their every movement.

Nevertheless, I have always regarded the consummation of an adequate security program, a program designed to control the ever-present dangers inherent in the widening duplicity of the foreign inspired espionage networks, as one of sound financial expedience. It is none the less warranted, since investigative energies expended in this direction will be remunerative of untold dividends in the event the trend of international relationships is further deteriorated.

The great bulk of high-priority commitments being experienced in the internal security field, while of the utmost importance, represents but a single phase of FBI operations. Mr. Hoover, in his testimony before our committee, furnished alarming statistics evidencing dangerous increases in general criminal activities. They are but a continued reflection of the high crime rates prevailing during the postwar readjustment period. During 1948 more than a million and a half major crimes were committed in the United States. Of all arrest records examined by the FBI, 53 percent represented criminal repeaters. Can we, through callous indifference and utter disregard for our responsibilities of citizenship, allow this menace to flourish? The criminal element must be served with notice that we, the Members of Congress, intend to insure a continued virile law enforcement aimed at the dissipation of its heinous proclivities. It is in this way only that we can afford our children, and our children's children, the heritage of a free and unfettered life.

I earnestly recommend that my colleagues carefully review the hearings on this appropriation, in order that they may, individually, evaluate the outstanding accomplishments of this Bureau, and the heavy responsibilities being encountered, in the discharge of its duties under this broad over-all criminal program. The record speaks for itself. It will reveal, for example, that during 1948 the Federal Bureau of Investigation returned to the taxpayers in fines, savings,

recoveries, and claims adjusted in favor of the Government, an amount of \$54,327,283—or nearly \$5,000,000 in excess of the total cost of operations. It will reveal, further, that there were 9,966 convictions in FBI cases—representing 97.1 percent of all persons brought before court—with the imposition of sentences totaling 24,671 years, and others involving 6 death and 10 life sentences. Through the efforts of its investigative staff, 5,250 dangerous fugitives were located—criminal parasites who, otherwise, would have been free to continue their depredations upon an innocent and unsuspecting law-abiding public.

In deliberating this appropriation, I feel that the Members of this body should be apprised, briefly, of the increases in certain types of Federal criminal activities. The list is not all-inclusive. But we have been informed by Mr. Hoover that crimes of violence, such as kidnaping and bank robbery, are on the increase. There has been a corresponding upward surge in major criminal violations pertaining to desertion, Veterans' Administration matters, thefts from interstate shipments, crimes on Government reservations, unlawful flight cases, and a host of others.

Activities of organized white-slave rings, interstate hijacking gangs, professional jewel thieves, and confidence men—operating under efficiently directed supervision and on a Nation-wide basis—have become predominantly promiscuous.

Consequently, I feel we would be remiss were we to relax our energies in the criminal field. You will recall that during the early and middle thirties this country experienced a criminal impasse of utmost gravity. In many communities, the underworld, glaring in its drunken power, openly succeeded in its defiance of organized law enforcement.

The Congress, recognizing this threat, passed legislation designed to curb the notorious interstate activities of such mobsters. During this period of transition, the Federal Government was thus enabled to bulwark the efforts of municipal, county, and State law-enforcement authorities. As a result, organized gangs were broken up. Their criminal operations were no longer profitable. And the inexorable wheels of justice brought to an inglorious and ignominious close the infamous deeds of its members. We cannot afford to lose what strides we have made in the suppression of crime. But such gains can only be maintained coincident with the application of vigorous and unrelenting investigative labors. Therefore, a sufficient staff of investigators must be made available to handle such responsibilities as they arise.

Mr. Hoover, in his administration of the FBI, has had an enviable career. A career which, through the years, has been synonymous with the progress made in the field of law enforcement. A career that has merited the confidence, respect, and esteem of the public. And a career that has been instrumental in bringing our country through one of its most perilous periods on the home front. Through his efforts, the FBI, with its rigorously maintained standards of proficiency, has continued its preeminence

as a model of efficient and sound financial administration. His capacity for achievement has provided the firm foundation upon which a country-wide, harmonious, and cooperative law-enforcement structure rests. A law enforcement which, in its establishment of a united front against the law violator, has been ever alert to avoid the stigmatism of a national police.

THE LIGHT AIRPLANE AND THE BLIZZARD OF 1949

Mr. Chairman, a large portion of the funds called for in this appropriation bill are for the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The hearings will disclose that the committee gave unusual consideration to this very important bureau. The hearings on the airport-construction program will disclose that the larger airports are being given considerable consideration. It appears to me that the small airports, the training of pilots and mechanics in small communities are very important and should not be entirely forgotten when we appropriate huge funds for large airports, technical developments, and so forth.

I have frequently taken the floor to discuss the importance of further development of the light airplane and the importance of pilot training. The value of the light airplane and of the operators of small airports and their students was brought out graphically in the Nebraska blizzard of 1949. The story of this blizzard and the service and heroism of the small-airport operators and their students and graduates should never be forgotten. To them we owe a great debt of gratitude.

The snow rolled into Nebraska and surrounding States like a soft, thick, cotton blanket. Strong gales laid it in long windrows, behind every fillet and windbreak, closing roads and halting trains. There was not a lot of snow at first—only about 4 inches—but after 4 days it amounted in most sections to more than 8 inches and in many places was piled 10 times that deep.

This was the situation in Nebraska as early as November 18, 1948. It was the real beginning of the blizzard of '49 for the eastern part of Nebraska—the beginning of the fight waged by man and his machines against the elements. This also was to be a test for the light airplane to prove its usefulness and its practicability. When all roads became blocked, trains stalled, and travel on foot was almost impossible, the light airplane flew serenely above it all, bringing food, medicine, fuel oil and coal to farmers and ranchers. Stranded motorists were rescued from their stalled cars, lost ranchers were found, doctors were flown in and patients brought out. Had it not been for the light plane, more than 200 persons would have perished in the storms and thousands more would have suffered untold hardships, because the rancher or farmer of today does not lay in a 3-month supply of food and fuel as his father or grandfather did.

Many stories have been written extolling the accomplishments of the "haylift," the Red Cross, the Army and its equipment during the past winter, and all of these agencies, of course, deserve all the credit given them. The light

plane, however, was in the air relieving human suffering long before the gravity of the situation was fully realized, and before outside assistance could be brought in to help the overburdened pilot and his light plane.

The November 18 storm was only the beginning of one of the worst winters ever experienced in Nebraska. On December 5, the weather station at Norfolk, Nebr., recorded 2.7 inches of snow; on the 8th, 1.6 inches; the 23d, 4.6 inches; the 24th, 2.5 inches; and the 28th, 2.2 inches. All this time the temperature remained cold so that very little of the snow melted. The weather station listed a total of 11 inches remaining on December 31. The big snow of January 1 in the western part of the State came to northeast Nebraska in the form of 1.27 inches of rain in the immediate vicinity of Norfolk with snow on top. This meant there now was ice to be moved along with the snow.

All winter there were extremely high winds which not only added to everyone's discomfort but also made it impossible to keep any road or railroad track open. In January, Norfolk had various small amounts of snow, but the final straw came on January 27 when a total of 4 inches fell, followed by another 1.3 inches on the 28th. Now everything was tied up, the temperature was falling and the wind whistled across the mounds of snow, moving them first to one place and then to another. Ground blizzards which cut visibility to zero were an almost everyday occurrence.

The total snowfall in this immediate area amounted to 33.9 inches. Farther west as much as 70 inches was reported. By itself, the snow would not have been such a problem, but the almost daily high winds kept all manner of ground travel at a standstill. Road-opening crews finally were brought face to face with the futility of their job. Each time a cut was blown shut it became packed that much tighter and that much deeper than before.

For 22 consecutive nights the temperature ranged from 1 to 17 degrees below zero, with the exception of a single night when it reached 9 above. The cries for help began to come in. Fuel was running low, food supplies gone, and the need for medical aid was great.

It was then that the operators of small airplanes again demonstrated what they could do. The utility of the light plane was remarkable, surprising even the most optimistic. It was landed in every kind of field, cross wind if the snow lay in rivulets which were against it, on ridges if the terrain was rough. It carried food, fuel oil, coal, and even brought in the sick for medical attention. Regular patrols were flown daily over miles of territory where all telephone lines were down. The farmer and the rancher knew they were not forgotten in all this white mass. Signals to be used were broadcast at daily intervals by radio stations, but it proved simpler just to wave the airship down in many cases.

In parts of Antelope, Wheeler, and Holt Counties, light planes were used almost from the very beginning of the storms in November because ranch roads

were not opened, and they continued to be used there throughout the winter.

Here is a story which was told me by Mr. John Younghein, an exceptionally fine pilot and operator of the Norfolk Municipal Airport, regarding his experiences as the pilot of a light plane:

Two boys working for the Nebraska Game Commission in and around the old Jules Sandoz ranch, about 35 miles south of Gordon, had not been heard from for 3 weeks and their folks here were frantic. The father of one of the boys engaged me to fly him up to locate them. Much to the relief of their parents, we found both boys safe and happy at the Sandoz ranch. Stopping at Gordon, I found the people there also in need of help. There had not been a train or a truck into Gordon for 3 weeks. The light plane had been transporting mail and the sick in and out of Gordon. The town was running out of bread because of a shortage of yeast, there was no baby food and medical supplies were very low. After making two attempts and flying through freezing rain, I finally delivered about 600 pounds of emergency supplies on January 12, including yeast, baby food, penicillin, and newspapers. The next day trucks got into town—thank God.

As we had the largest ship in this territory on skis and it was quite easily converted to handle a stretcher, we made many calls for emergency cases when weather conditions were at their very worst. One day at 7 a. m., with the thermometer reading 20 below zero, I took off for Meadow Grove to pick up a girl with a ruptured appendix. The field in which I had to land was very small and was bounded by 30- to 40-foot poles for lighting a football field on one side, by trees on another, with a few steel-fence posts sticking up in the center of the field, although the wire was gone. Both the inside and outside of my windshield were frosted over and I could see only by slipping. I shuddered when I recalled that I had almost been persuaded to land there after dark the night before.

It took 4 husky men about 20 minutes to carry the patient 200 yards to the airplane. A few minutes later the young girl and her doctor were entering a hospital in Norfolk. Forty to 50 men had shoveled most of the night to open a half-mile of road in a wasteful effort to get the girl's parents into town from their farm home about 5 miles south, as the doctor was concerned about the girl's chances unless they could get her to a hospital. I went right back to that community, landed on their farm and had the parents at the hospital 45 minutes after we had brought the girl there.

This was to be the beginning—

Mr. Younghein continues—

of many emergency flights I made in winds up to 65 miles per hour with the visibility practically zero. When the wind blew over 25 miles per hour we had a ground blizzard. One day I was sent out by the Red Cross to pick up a stretcher case at Meadow Grove. About 2 miles from the farm where I was supposed to stop, I saw a man waving. I landed and he told me about a terrible pain in his side. I suggested he get in the plane and I would take him to a doctor in Meadow Grove. He refused, so later in the afternoon I took Dr. Robert Barr out to see him. It did not take the doctor long to convince him that he should get in the plane. Dr. Barr had him in surgery that night and he recovered nicely.

I shall never forget the look on the face of one old gentleman and the tears in his eyes as I brought him oil, nor the people who were burning the dining room furniture to keep warm, nor the lady who had both legs badly frozen and whose little boy insisted

on putting his dog and cats in the airplane. I told him we'd have to leave the cats.

During the height of our emergency here, I repeatedly had been called to bring the large ship to Atkinson where it was badly needed. After the situation had eased somewhat here, I went on up to try to help the folks in the Atkinson vicinity and was sent on to O'Neill where I did some rescue work. From there I took Mr. Glenn Custer, Red Cross representative, on a tour of various county headquarters throughout the north and western parts of the State.

Many would be the interesting stories coming out of this storm if they all were available—

Mr. Younghein noted. He concluded:

The flying was among the roughest that pilots have ever been called upon to do. As Andy Risser said: "It was not Fourth of July flying."

Andy Risser, of the Risser Flying Service at Norfolk, Nebr., is one of the oldest pilots in years of service in my part of the country. He is known as the grandfather of flying in the Middle West. He was one of the first pilots in the United States to cross the mountains to the Pacific coast in a light plane from a cow pasture at Wisner, Nebr., making many landings by lantern light.

During the blizzard emergency, Mr. Risser alone carried coal, food, and medicine to isolated, snowbound citizens. He transported numerous expectant mothers to and from hospitals in the teeth of 50 to 70 mile-per-hour gales, landing and taking off in hazardous locations.

The Clinch Flying Service, of North Dakota, Nebr., flew throughout most of the western part of the State, with a total of 237 emergency flights. Private pilots who did an outstanding job in that area during the emergency include Everett Beber, Gus Powers, Bill Albin, John Marks, Harold Griffiths, and Earl Broeder.

The Orr Flying Service, of Rushville, Nebr., flew in Sheridan County and parts of Cherry and Box Butte Counties, making a total of 232 missions.

The Doran Flying Service, of Elgin, Nebr., operated throughout Antelope, Boone, Wheeler, Garfield, and Holt Counties.

The Crete Flying Service, of Crete, Nebr., went to Ord, Ericson, and Bartlett to aid in the emergency.

The Wayne Flying Service, of Wayne, Nebr., operated in Wayne, Cedar, Dixon, Cuming, and Dakota Counties, flying approximately 62 missions. Private pilots in that area who aided to a great extent were Lloyd Hogleman, Milfred Barelman, and Roy Sultzer.

The Taylor Flying Service, of Bridgeport, Nebr., flew approximately 175 missions and operated two planes. Its operators report several interesting experiences, including the finding and feeding of 20 Indians for several days, flying out a 75-year-old rancher who was snow-bound for 26 days, and taking a sick girl from a snow-buried ranch.

The Van-Jensen Flying Service, of Creighton, Nebr., reported flying 160 missions in Holt County. The emergency did not arise there until January 28. Private pilots assisting there were Aage Nelsen, George Thompson, Quentin York, John Scrivner, and Ed. Butterfield.

The Turner Flying Service, of Broken Bow, Nebr., made 50 flights and was aided there by two private pilots whose names were not mentioned.

The Antelope Flying Service, of Neligh, Nebr., flew 350 missions, starting during the first storm in November. Only one ship was used. During one very high wind and ground blizzard, the pilot was called to rush insulin to a critical case. He was forced to fly around for fully 30 minutes before being able to spot the place and had some difficulty bringing his ship back in for a landing because of the high winds. Cloyd Kilpatrick, of Neligh helped to a great extent during the emergency.

Central Aircraft, Inc., of Grand Island, Nebr., flew approximately 80 hours in the O'Neill area, using two aircraft.

Central States Aircraft, Inc., of Ogallala, Nebr., flew missions at Ogallala, Grant, Brandon, Arthur, Paxton, Hyannis, and Gordon, using five aircraft and making 234 missions. This firm cites two interesting stories. A call was received at night to pick up a baby that had swallowed a safety pin, the family living in the sand-hill area north of Keystone. The landing was made with the aid of a lantern. This meant taking quite a chance as the fellow who set out the lantern had no idea how much room was necessary for a plane to land or what condition the field should be in. The pick-up, however, was safely made.

The other incident concerns a rather elderly man who went to this airport to inquire about flying out to see his mother who was 85 years old, as he was quite anxious regarding her welfare. Just as he was about to get into the plane, he said to the pilot: "Son, I have never ridden in one of these things before and never want to again. Scare me if you have to, but for God's sake, don't do it on purpose."

Private pilots in that area who did an outstanding job were Frank Peters and Shirley Franklin, of Roscoe, Max Schelburne and John Berry, of Ogallala.

The Beran Flying Service, of Lexington, Nebr., made a few missions but was south of the real emergency area.

The Blair Flying Service, of Blair, Nebr., flew in Rock County, making approximately 300 missions and using four aircraft. These pilots headquartered at Bassett during the emergency.

Undoubtedly there are many other pilots of small planes whose exploits I have not enumerated here and who should be given full credit for their humanitarian efforts during this emergency. These exploits of pilots of small aircraft are sufficient reasons why more importance should be attached to the development of small airplanes and small airports.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. In connection with the International Refugee Organization, I am wondering if the gentleman went into any details on that subject as to what their actual expenditures have been, say down to the first of January, so that we

might get a check on what they are doing.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes, we did. There are about 100 pages in references to the International Refugee Organization in the hearings. We are not entirely satisfied with their operation. Our share toward that organization is approximately \$70,000,000.

After my interrogation of witnesses in committee and in my investigation of the IRO in Europe I have come to the conclusion that many of the employees of IRO are institutionalized and are not anxious to liquidate the program which should be liquidated by the end of the next fiscal year.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact there seems to be in the evidence that the gentleman had before him a spirit more of prolonging the agony rather than getting the camps cleaned out and getting the people out of there?

Mr. STEFAN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that as a result of the work of this committee we have been able to break at least one bottleneck which will result, I feel, in bringing people who are entitled to come under the law into the United States or to other countries at a more rapid rate. The bottleneck was in interrogations and investigations, which lasted from 20 days to several months, in processing one disabled person. This committee was able to get assurances this bottleneck was going to be cut down to a minimum.

Then there is section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act where you had a certain percentage of people of German ethnic origin in the 202,000 entitled to come in, but it seemed that the various agencies were unable to define the words "German ethnic origin." After many days of interrogation we finally learn they have now decided upon a definition of what a person of "German ethnic" origin is. We hope the situation will be corrected.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVELANDER].

Mr. CLEVELANDER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am not going to go into a lot of detail on this bill. I want to add my word of praise to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who on many occasions, to exact a little information of some of these people, had to pretty near turn himself into Mr. District Attorney. I remember after 2 hours of pursuit with one fellow he finally said to him, just to put a little humor into this tragedy, "It would take a bird dog to figure out his activities and just what he was not doing." The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is pretty good, too, especially if you get him aroused, and I recommend to all of you that do not know that Georgia peach, Mr. PRESTON, to get acquainted with him. He is a wonderful fellow. As to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], words from me are just a waste of time.

I want to leave just a little thought with you, because after all, many people have an exaggerated idea of the power of the Committee on Appropriations and what they may do. Our troubles are made in this Committee of the Whole

House, and we have no choice but to activate and appropriate for the many activities that this House authorizes. There is considerable concern on the part of the head of our Committee on Appropriations as to the great strain on the national economy, and on the credit of Government itself, and I want to say that I share it with him.

I want to lower my sights on a single target for a few minutes with the hope that I may direct your attention toward the great sprawling supergovernment which has been superimposed upon the Federal Government of the United States. I want to analyze briefly the Department of State and its ever-widening, ever-growing activities which today costs the American taxpayer 16 times as much as they did in 1930 and 12 times as much as they did in 1940. The Department's capacity for consuming tax dollars has grown and grown and grown, until it threatens the financial solvency of the Treasury itself. It is in the way of undermining the standard of living in America. It has spread out until it projected itself into every international activity of almost every country in the world. It makes the troubles of the world our troubles and the problems of world politics and politicians our problems.

The State Department is operating in more than 250 international boards and commissions, overlapping and duplicating each other, manned by a species of hyperthyroid internationalists who are intent upon keeping us embroiled in every conceivable foreign situation. So far this year over 150 of these international commissions have scheduled meetings at a cost of \$3,600,000 and this is just the beginning. International obligations have increased from \$5,018,505 in 1940 to \$100,810,498 in 1950. We are up to our necks in conferences on dairies, grass, the cinema; on insects, pulp, rice; on physical education, police, penal systems; mine safety, neurology, sanitation, roads, seed testing, tariffs, sugar, tin—well you name it—and we are in it.

The cost of these international gab fests has gone completely out of hand. The total annual legislative costs of the Capitol—and I cite these official figures—the Senate costs \$11,033,275; the House costs \$17,943,665; half the cost of the Government Printing Office—and I might say that is more than a generous proportion for the printing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—comes to \$8,303,500 plus miscellaneous legislative costs of \$239,800; and the Library of Congress—which has also been flexing its muscles in the past few years—now costs \$6,888,171. Thus the annual legislative costs of the Government of the United States comes to about \$44,500,000—or less than half the cost of the State Department's international adventuring.

It is sad, but true, that every time the State Department negotiates on behalf of the American people, it comes back home not only minus its shirt but sans striped pants as well. For example, in exchange for billions of American lend-lease dollars, the Department has acquired a collection of oversized white-elephant structures all over the world

which other nations have disregarded as impractical.

We have a palace in Rome, another in Munich; castles in Prague and Vienna; a sumptuous estate in Bermuda; Shangri-las all over South America; a 16-story air-conditioned office building in Rio. Ordinarily our diplomats would rattle around in such spaciousness, but never underestimate the ability of the State Department to expand without the slightest provocation. In no time flat these structures will be filled to overflowing. Appropriations for the upkeep of Foreign Service buildings increased from \$750,000 in 1940 to \$25,000,000 in 1950.

Here at home the Department asks for \$46,900,000 for the expansion of a structure which is practically new—not yet broken in properly as far as buildings go. What an outside Pandora's box such expansion would create.

Practically every item in the State Department's budget calls for an increase. Printing, binding, contractual services, travel, communications, equipment, supplies, materials—even the emergency fund—that confidential kitty which in 1940 amounted to \$675,000 has grown to \$11,500,000 in 1950.

A statement of these increases follows:

Department of State	
Appropriations, 1930.....	\$15,528,902
Appropriations, 1940.....	22,923,038
Estimates submitted to Congress in the 1950 budget.....	281,453,196
1950 estimates are increased over 1940 appropriations by.....	
	258,530,158
This increase may be analyzed as follows:	
Department and Foreign Service operations.....	\$63,309,567
(Pay-increase laws, the act reorganizing the Foreign Service, matters dealing with security, the absorption of certain residual functions of war agencies, backstopping for certain international organizations in which United States participation has been approved by Congress, such as UN and UNESCO, are all factors which contribute to this increase.)	
Foreign Service buildings (increased from \$750,000 in 1940 to \$25,000,000 in 1950).....	24,250,000
Emergency fund (increased from \$675,000 in 1940 to \$11,500,000 in 1950 for confidential purposes).....	10,825,000
International obligations (increased from \$5,018,505 in 1940 to \$100,810,498 in 1950, main items of increase being for UN, UNESCO, and IRO).....	\$103,979,193
Philippine rehabilitation (a program authorized by Congress subsequent to 1940).....	20,166,393
International information and educational activities (authorized by Congress subsequent to 1940).....	36,000,000
Total.....	258,530,158

And it is not only the State Department. I use it today as a convenient example of the pattern of government. Consider the Department of Commerce,

The 1940 appropriations totaled \$43,-264,499. In 1945 this increased to \$88,-246,151. And in 1949 it spent \$229,940,-000, and for 1950 it requests \$295,373,500.

And you can break this down any way you wish and the pattern is the same. In 1940 the Office of the Secretary received \$617,230, and for 1950 it requests \$1,019,000. The Civil Aeronautics Board got \$100,000 in 1940, and asks for \$3,600,-000 for 1950. The Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce got along on \$2,-188,744 in 1940, and now needs \$5,000,000. The Weather Bureau received \$6,880,900 in 1941, went up to \$13,120,000 in 1945, and now it wants \$24,000,000.

And that is the story of uncontrolled spending. I say "uncontrolled" advisedly, because there are just a handful of men in Government today who are sincere advocates of economy. The administration depends on public lethargy, lack of understanding, and lack of facilities to get at the facts. The administration's publicity agents, costing the taxpayers over \$75,000,000 per year in salaries alone, whoop up the programs and projects and experiments, and that is the sort of reading matter that clutters up most of the newspaper offices today.

Let us once and for all realize that the Appropriations Committee can only manure these outlays once the Congress authorizes an activity. Let us have the courage to defeat them before they reach the authorization stage. Last year there were many instances where the Appropriations Committee made salutary cuts but supplementals wiped them out. In some instances the total outlay was increased. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I have sat through many hours of testimony by bureaucrats who have used every conceivable trick and argument to justify the spending of huge sums of money on expansion, experiments, on impractical projects of every kind and description, on inexcusable waste and inefficiency.

Sometimes we trip them up with questions designed to expose the true character of their operations. Sometimes we even manage to get lip service toward economy and efficiency. But in the final analysis the departments and agencies appearing before us, year after year, have increased their spending, increased their scope of activities, loaded up their pay rolls, and resorted to confusing the public with such double-talk and propaganda that we, who are sickened at the wanton waste of the taxpayers' money, are left talking to ourselves or to that very, very small minority of citizens who are aware of the financial chaos ahead of us.

These days the reward for patriotic alertness and concern for our national welfare is abuse and ridicule. Frankly, I have passed the stage of pounding desks, trying to alert my colleagues to the significance of the fantastic and unrestrained spending of the Federal bureaucrats.

I personally experience a sense of guilt at being a part—albeit unwilling, opposed, and highly critical—of that relentless machinery which today is forging the shackles and chains which will keep future Americans forever tax-ridden

and oppressed by a tyrannical Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill that is before us today is undoubtedly a very important one. Before I proceed to discuss the provisions and the merits of the legislation itself, I wish to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the members of this subcommittee with whom I have had the honor and the pleasure of serving during this session of the Congress. I want to take this opportunity as well to express to them my thanks and appreciation for the cooperation they have extended to me, to the chairman, and to each other, and for the assistance each member of the subcommittee has given to me in my attempts to understand and to be of assistance to them and to the great work this subcommittee has been called upon to do.

I say without any reservation whatsoever, Mr. Chairman, that I have never worked with a group of men more sincere, more earnest, more capable to do a task than these gentlemen of the subcommittee. Not only do I make this statement with reference to my service in the Congress, but in other walks of life as well. I repeat, I have never served with such a capable, distinguished, and understanding group of men. Another significant factor about these gentlemen was the manner in which they continued in their attendance at the daily meetings of this subcommittee all during the many long weeks of these important hearings. I have never served on any kind of a committee, in any organization any place, where the attendance was so faithful as exhibited by the members of the subcommittee. Mr. Chairman, I refer to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Representative JOHN ROONEY, of New York. Mr. Chairman, I refer to the distinguished Representative from the State of Georgia, PRINCE PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I refer to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, formerly chairman of this subcommittee and now the ranking minority member, Representative KARL STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I refer to the distinguished Representative from the State of Ohio, Mr. CLIFF CLEVENGER.

I must take this moment to especially present my compliments and to pay a tribute to Representative JOHN ROONEY, of New York, the chairman of this vitally important subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from New York, Representative ROONEY, is as fair and as impartial a chairman as it would be possible to discover, a courteous gentleman at every moment during his presiding over the affairs of the committee. His long experience as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, especially his service during the last session when he gained special and particular knowledge of the widespread and ramified jurisdiction of this subcommittee stood us all on this committee in good stead during this session of the Congress. No only do I con-

gratulate the gentleman from New York, Representative ROONEY, upon the brilliant job he has done as chairman of this subcommittee, but I congratulate the full committee and the House of Representatives upon being so fortunate as to have the distinguished gentleman from New York acting in the capacity of chairman of this subcommittee. I wish as well to compliment the secretary of the committee, Mr. Howe, for his great service and efficient aid to the committee.

In the few minutes left there is not much point in my attempting to "paint the lily" of the provisions of this bill, after listening to the careful analysis by our chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. There is little left to be said, and it would be largely repetitious. Certainly, when the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] added his words in analyzing the various sections of the four subdivisions of our bill, I need not burden the committee much longer with particularizing the law and the appropriations based upon the authorizations sent to us.

There are perhaps three or four generalities that I would like to observe. I feel in talking to the other members of the full Committee on Appropriations, and probably these observations as well might apply to members of all committees, I feel I speak the feelings of my subcommittee when I make these remarks: First of all, I object most vehemently when administrative officials of any branch of this Government send back to the committee transcripts of the testimony taken before that committee at official hearings and have the transcripts changed completely out of content. I consider that a deliberate fraud, not only upon the Committee on Appropriations but upon this House. It constitutes a deliberate subterfuge and fraud. Neither this committee nor the House itself should permit any administrative official to so mark up transcripts and send them back to committees of this House as to destroy in many cases the entire purpose and meaning.

In this testimony coming back to us from some of the departments I have seen questions which, before the committee after searching examination were answered "Yes" deliberately marked "No." If that is not a crime it should be made one.

In addition to that, we found time and time again various bureau and departmental chiefs would appear for the purpose of testifying before our subcommittee, and they would come in with a battery of advisers and an array of talent which, if it were not for the support of my colleagues, I think I would be overawed by this majesty when they were ready to present their justifications.

Let me assure you that I was not overawed and neither was the committee. In addition to that, we would be presented with a lengthy narrative style of justification; and in many cases O. Henry at his best could not provide the punch lines that we saw in some of these written justifications. I believe, speaking for the Appropriations Committee, that we are not interested in all of these why's and wherefore's that in many

cases are important only to the legislative committee; we want simply to know the facts; we want these things boiled right down to the very essence; we want the facts, the figures: How much is it going to cost? Do you need that many, and why? Period. We need no orations and no prepared documents.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I may add to the gentleman's observations about the changes in answers made in the testimony before his Subcommittee on Appropriations that we had the same experience on ours. Did the gentleman's subcommittee permit those changes to remain in the record?

Mr. FLOOD. I will yield for the answer to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. The answer is that I have read every word of the testimony given before the committee. I spent many, many nights until midnight and 1 o'clock in the morning, and used dozens and dozens of erasers and lead pencils in order to put it back the way it was originally.

Mr. SCRIVNER. We had the same experience.

Mr. FLOOD. I repeat, for the purpose of emphasis, that the report of this committee and the testimony taken before this subcommittee is exactly the testimony that was given before the subcommittee.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I notice in the appropriations for the Attorney General's office the amount of \$845,000, and the statement in the report that this will provide for the salaries of two additional members of the Parole Board.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. Is it contemplated that a part of that appropriation may be used for the payment of the salaries of secretaries for the new members of the board?

Mr. FLOOD. If the Department of Justice from the general appropriations in an administrative way can take that up, the committee, of course, has no objection, as far as I know; that would be an entirely administrative function. It is inconceivable that the Department would not provide by assignment sufficient secretarial help. But we made no direct appropriation for the salaries of those secretaries, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is an authority on the Parole Board and the entire Department of Justice.

My final observation as a generality has to do, if I may use a vulgarism or a slang phrase, with "my pet gripe." During the course of these hearings, after we had been sitting for hours, and days, and months in these sessions, we would go out on the plaza in front of the Capitol Building and find there extending two blocks long shiny Government limousines with chauffeurs, and in some cases foot-

men, waiting to take back these "brain trusters" to whom we had been listening, take them back to their various offices or country estates, or wherever these people go to at the end of a day's work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, the worst offenders, of course, were from the armed services, but they are not the only offenders. I know of no bureau or agency appearing here that was not an offender 1 day this week. After a roll-call vote the members of my subcommittee, six of us—like in a Mack Sennett comedy—jumped into a taxi to go down to witness the great historic signing of the North Atlantic Pact. Arriving at the hall, we waited in line 10 minutes while this long array of Government limousines, while these bureaucrats and their gracious ladies got out to go to this ceremony, and the peasants from the House of Representatives stood around trying to get out of the cab. I do not think we should have limousines here. I have been using shanks' mare for a long time. I use cabs or somebody else's automobile, busses, and streetcars, and I am sure my colleagues will do the same as we have been doing happily.

I have no objection to dignity and protocol and to the representatives of our great Government being in proper decorum at all these meetings at all times. I would be the first to hold a brief for them, to see that they are properly accoutred and that their entourage is the equal, if not greater than, of any country in the world. I come here only to protest the abuses, because many times I have gone with my colleagues to Government affairs and receptions or what have you, and the Senators and we Members of the House have had to jump behind poles or behind trees or up on the curbstone so that some bureau chief with his limousine and chauffeur would not knock our heads off throwing dust and gravel in our eyes.

I am not presuming to be facetious in this very sacred forum, but enough is enough. Let me assure you that my subcommittee refused day after day and dozen after dozen of requests for replacement of motor vehicles and for new cars.

The bill before us makes appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary for the fiscal year 1950.

The amount recommended in the bill for 1950 for the State Department is \$271,405,656; for the Justice Department, \$132,579,141; for the Commerce Department, \$259,927,605; and for the Federal Judiciary, \$20,703,700. This is a total of \$684,616,102.

There is as well contract authorizations in the following amounts: For the Department of State, \$2,900,000; for the Department of Justice, \$900,000; for the Department of Commerce, \$58,800,000. This is a total for contract authorizations of \$62,600,000. This gives us a total in

appropriations and contract authority of \$747,216,102. I have always felt that it is a good practice for the Appropriations Committee, in dealing with particular departments, and perhaps more so in dealing with the so-called old-line departments, to grant contract authority in lieu of outright appropriations, because I feel this practice will result eventually in considerable savings. I say this because of the fact that when actual cash is available for expenditure the chances are it can be expended much more readily. This is true, by all means, if the moneys present and at hand are to be utilized for the purchase of equipment and matériel.

The State Department, during these troubled times, occupies an important position in the Government service with relation not only to our own economy, but with relation to all the Nations of the world. The duty of maintaining the prestige and to point the leadership of our Nation in world affairs to a great extent depends upon the manner in which the Department of State functions. There is no doubt that the activities of this Department have been greatly increased during the war years and since, and this is the result as well of marked changes in our foreign policy. I think it is especially important to observe the manner in which a nonpartisan foreign policy has been maintained during these troubled times, and I trust that this great Nation will ever be able to keep our foreign affairs free of political strife. While it is true that I concur in a policy of economy with reference to expenditures in the Federal Government, it is important to observe that caution must be the watchword when we have in mind reducing appropriations of the State Department during these troubled times. Just this week there took place in the Capital City of Washington, and say what you will, Washington, D. C., today is not only the Capital of the United States of America, but it is the capital of the world, and here in this city the dramatic and historic event—the signing of the Atlantic Pact was an event marked importantly in the consideration of this committee. Because once more an aggressor nation is moving. The cast of characters may be a little different. Their philosophy of government and the way of life may change, but the object and the goal of world domination is clearly identical.

With the ideas of force and fear and terror as the weapons of dictatorship, we must remain on guard and aware of these problems. The State Department today is facing the most complicated and difficult of international problems. Perhaps the most diversified and complicated in the history of our country.

We are indeed fortunate that at the helm of the Department of State during these times is that distinguished American statesman, the Honorable Dean Acheson. May God spare him and may God be with him as he speaks for the United States of America.

Year after year the Congress has before it discussions having to do with the reorganization of the Department of State. We now hope that with the reorganization that is now taking place, and a great

deal of which has been put into effect, that we are confronted with a reorganization to end all reorganizations.

Certainly I am convinced the action of this committee in providing the ways and means for the Secretary of State to work with greater flexibility insofar as jurisdiction over and the administration of both the Foreign Service and the Civil Service personnel of the State Department is concerned in both departmental and field assignments will work for the greatest good of the greatest number of all the personnel and undoubtedly for a more efficient service.

The policy decision in the Department of State, operating very effectively now, that we should try to release foreign-service officers and staff employees for duty in the field, wherever possible, rather than using them in departmental jobs is a change with great efficiency and great merit, and it is important as well to bring these people back to the United States for re-Americanization and we should there try to give them not only experience in the Department of State, but experience out in the country as well. It is necessary to keep in mind when we bring back these foreign-service officers, who, say, come back 3 years out of their first 15 years of service, as provided in the Foreign Service Act, that these people do not have the proper chance to become fully reacquainted with the customs and traditions of what is now America, if they only serve in the Department in the Capital City—America is also out among the people of the separate States—North, South, East, and West.

One problem dealing with the State Department which, of course, has been of some concern to the members of the committee is that of security.

But I believe that the Department is doing everything possible to maintain proper security, and I believe that careful examination is being made of these security cases. Because of the fact that the members of the Foreign Service are separated from the Department and from this country by great distances, the Department has indicated that it is working on a constructive program for indoctrinating the employees on the importance of security in both the civil service with the Department and the Foreign Service.

It is clear in the past several months that the Department is doing an excellent job and I think they can be well proud of the fact that of the 19,000 employees in the Department of State, only a fractional percentage had any information whatsoever develop against them by these security checks. As of February 1, 1949, the names and the personal histories of 13,149 employees of the civil-service lists of the Department of State and of the Foreign Service lists had been submitted to the FBI for security checking in accordance with the provisions in the loyalty program. Practically all of these cases in which any questions had been raised were fully investigated by the FBI, and processed by the Department of State Loyalty and Security Board. Within the last 7 months, a most intensive reindoctrination program of

the security officers and of all employees of the Department have been completed. The purpose of this program was to promote the security consciousness among the departmental employees. Security inspections and surveys are being continually conducted in the most difficult areas and the most sensitive offices in the Department, so that the highest degree of security can be maintained and insured at all times. I must mention the large program under the heading "Buildings fund," where a recommendation of \$20,000,000 is discovered. I emphasize this fact to make it clear that this is not an actual appropriation, but is merely a bookkeeping transaction reflecting the value of foreign credits which the State Department has utilized by the acquisition of real estate and improvements for the Foreign Service. The chief problem as has been indicated is not so much in the actual acquisition of land and buildings for the proper functioning of this section of the Department, but rather because of the facility in which we have now been able to acquire these establishments, we are confronted with the considerable problem of future costs and maintenance and the upkeep of these properties. For that reason we are repeating the admonition of caution that we have directed to this section of the Department dealing with that phase of work.

One of the best known and current activities of the Department of State has to do with the participation of the United States in the various international organizations. Many of us have felt that there were too many such organizations in which the United States was participating, and in this opinion the State Department itself, at the hearings, indicated its agreement. We also feel that one of the important factors with reference to this phase of the State Department work is the determining factor in the allocation of amounts which the United States is expected to pay or contribute to the maintenance and operation of these various international organizations. Certainly it was the unanimous opinion of this committee that these percentages, in some instances, were much too high and that the United States of America has been called upon to contribute in excess of what the circumstances might warrant. We are certain, however, that the Department is in agreement with this opinion of the committee and that substantial reductions in such percentages are to be made and in the future this phase of allocation of United States contributions is to receive much closer attention.

It must be remembered that in these allocations of funds and these appropriations for the Department of State that we are concerned not only with the functions of the Department in one building in the city of Washington, or alone with the wide-spread jurisdiction of the great Foreign Service, but there are many other bureaus and missions and organizations coming within the purview of the Department of State, and included under this appropriation bill. I refer, for instance, to the United Nations, to that part of the United Nations which is the

educational, scientific, and cultural organization of such vast importance to our whole theory of life among the nations of the world. Then there is as well the International Refugee Organization, and we must not forget that part of the work of this vast Department which deals with the Philippine rehabilitation program, and with the various international boundary and water commissions, with Canada and with the United States, and as well the large field of international relations dealing with inter-American affairs.

I wish to take this opportunity of emphasizing that, as a member of this committee, and I feel it is the opinion of the committee itself, I do not voice any disapproval of the purposes and the objectives of the international information and educational program. We speak only under the circumstances of the necessity for too rapid an expansion of the organization, which by that mere fact alone might produce waste and inefficiency. The history of this organization and of similar organizations in the past indicate that whatever loss results can be traced in most instances to rapid growth. Of the many activities and one which is considered of importance in this field is that activity in the overseas theater calling for an extension of the exchange of educational and technical information.

I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that in dealing with the Department of State the committee has been aware at all times of the importance of this great arm of our Government, and we felt that we have dealt with this appropriation, keeping in mind the taxpayer of the United States, and we have so dealt without injuring the efficiency of this Department or its various divisions and agencies.

Mr. Chairman, in our consideration of the appropriation for the Department of Justice you will discover that there is an increase of \$14,923,441 over the current year appropriation. You will find however, Mr. Chairman, that nearly \$9,000,000 of this amount is for the employees' pay increases in accordance with Public Law 900.

The committee as well was unanimous in its conclusion that increases should be allowed to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, and we, therefore, authorized additional increases of \$1,593,141 and \$100,000, respectively, and in this way met the reductions made by the Bureau of the Budget in those two items. I am satisfied from listening to the testimony as presented to our committee by the Antitrust Division that the committee can be satisfied this very important provision will speed its already advanced work in the field of antitrust investigations and prosecutions, and I emphasize here, as was pointed out in the testimony of the committee and by my fellow members of the committee, the particular interest of the committee in the antitrust work in the fields of food and clothing and housing. It is entirely possible that there are other phases of the antitrust work that some of my colleagues feel should receive attention, perhaps because of flagrant examples of

violation of the various antitrust statutes, and I am sure the Division with this increased appropriation and its fine work in the whole field of antitrust investigations and prosecutions will now be able to give attention to these other fields in the broad program. However, we do emphasize the importance, first, of the food and clothing and housing problems.

Mr. Chairman, there is not too much need at this time, after what has been said, for me to take the time of the committee in dealing with the appropriations for the Department of Justice and for the Federal judiciary. It is evident that these appropriations should not and cannot otherwise, as has been indicated by the chairman, be cut further, even with the Ramspeck promotions and the statutory increases that are mandatory, certain increases were necessary, but other than the FBI and the Antitrust Section, this committee did not exceed the budget allocations and allowances in any case.

The record of the highly respected Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in dealing with appropriations and the confidence of the Congress, is well established for expending only such funds as he feels are absolutely needed, and I have every confidence that this would be his practice again. There is no evidence that the FBI spends money merely for the purpose of spending money, and their policy seems to always be to use only those funds necessary to cover their operations and only the absolutely essential requirements, and the unexpended funds being returned to the Treasury.

Under no circumstances, however, Mr. Chairman, am I willing to jeopardize the internal security of this country by substituting my judgment for the FBI where I feel there has been no abuse of judgment one way or the other. If I err in this case in agreeing to the substantial increase over the budget estimate for the appropriation for the FBI as part of the Department of Justice, then I prefer to err with a margin of safety in favor of the national security of my Nation.

Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Department of Commerce and the appropriations of this subcommittee dealing with that Department, there is not too much that I wish to add at this time to what has been set forth in considerable detail in the report filed on behalf of the subcommittee in connection with the presentation of this bill to the House.

While some comment may be made on the fact that there is an increase in the appropriation this year over that of the fiscal year of 1949, the important thing to note is that of this increase, \$43,000,000 is for taking of the very important seventeenth decennial census. There is no doubt in my mind that the Director and his staff of this constitutional function do this job as expeditiously and as economically as the circumstances will permit. I am convinced they will do the job certainly to the satisfaction of this committee and of the House. It is important to keep in mind that this is a constitutional provision, and therefore, other than the determination of the funds by dollars itself, there is no question as to the allocation of funds and

the appropriation of dollars for this purpose. We are anxious that there be no delay in the work of taking and compiling of the census, and we are anxious to indicate that, in no way, do we anticipate any increase in the over-all cost of the seventeenth decennial census. Personally, I am satisfied that every possible effort will be made, and of course, should be made to work any savings in order to reduce the estimated total cost that was presented by the budget and by the Bureau people to this subcommittee. In the current census statistics, which has to do with the compilation of the business-industrial census, I am of the opinion that the service that will be rendered for the appropriation made is necessary and of vital importance to the economy and its proper administration. Certainly the small-business man stands to gain a great deal by the abundant information that will be made available to him for his business purposes—a vast storehouse and library of important and vital material, which the average small-business man could not afford to obtain in any other way than through this Government business census.

Keeping in mind that 62 percent of the total appropriation for the Department of Commerce is included in the bill for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and having before me the comprehensive report of the subcommittee filed with the bill dealing with the entire Department of Commerce, as well as the CAA, I can repeat only for the purpose of emphasis my concern, in which I join with the committee, over the rapidly pyramiding costs in this particular agency, resulting largely from the manner in which these services are being supplied to the private air lines, and the failure on our part to be able to discover why the Federal Government must be called upon repeatedly to continue to furnish additional service upon additional service in this area of operation with little in return being supplied of the same nature by the air lines who seem to be the chief beneficiaries. By the same token, as a member of the subcommittee, I was shocked when the Civil Aeronautics Board, on Friday, February 25, 1949, granted an \$8,000,000 gift of the taxpayers' funds to the Big Four private air lines for the transportation of their air mail, in which case not a single pound had ever as a matter of fact been carried. This was an outright gratuity because of the grounding of the Constellations and the DC-6's, both of which aircraft had been operating with defective and dangerous equipment; clearly the result of faulty construction and in no way could the Government or any agency of the Government be remotely held responsible. The committee has no reason to believe that the great backlog of work before the CAB is going to be solved by merely increasing the appropriation. The fault obviously lies with the supervision and the administration within the Board itself, and until this evil is corrected, increased appropriations are in no way going to solve anything. The same thing seems to be true of the major air lines themselves. Certainly if one of these air lines can operate at a profit, and the others cannot,

all things being equal with the exception of a change in routing here or there, which is not a material differential, then the fault with the lines that are not making a profit lies within the faulty administration or supervision of the non-profit-making lines, and I cannot see sensibly whether it could be any other reason.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a privilege to be permitted to make these observations as a member of the subcommittee dealing with this very important appropriation bill.

There are two general comments that I would like to make. The first has to do with the manner in which various Government administrators—the heads of various Government bureaus and Government departments—make use of limousines and liveried chauffeurs for the purpose of having themselves conducted hither and yon, not always, I am sorry to relate, on Government service. Now, I am, as well as I am sure are all of my colleagues, concerned that proper dignity and decorum and protocol be observed by the official representatives of the Government of the United States, and no one is more anxious than I am to see that the dignity of the representatives of my Nation is of the highest standard. However, department after department, bureau after bureau, came before this subcommittee and, almost without exception, requested appropriations for the purchase of new motor vehicles or the supplanting of used motor vehicles. In most of these cases these cars had not been run a sufficient number of miles to merit the purchase of another car in its place, and certainly the services being rendered by many of these bureau chiefs and department heads did not merit or warrant the purchasing of additional new motorcars. I have walked outside of this Capitol day after day during the several weeks these Appropriations Committee hearings have been going on, and out there on that plaza I see a line of Government limousines a block or two long with chauffeurs and footmen standing there waiting to take the witnesses who have just appeared before my committee back to their offices or to their homes, or to wherever they are going. I would think that in general principles these Government officials would have more sense than to parade this exhibition of their opulence and success before the committee. Certainly the armed forces are flagrant in their exhibitions of limousines, chauffeurs, footmen, and so forth, but the other agencies are just as bad.

In my opinion, I do not think one is any worse than the other. They are all to blame, at least the ones with which I have any acquaintance. I went to the signing of the Atlantic Pact the other day and there were five Congressmen from these important committees who were invited to this great, historic ceremony, piled into one cab—dashed madly down there from a roll call in order to be present at this great event in world history, and we had to wait in line at least 10 or 15 minutes while rows of sleek, shiny limousines, bearing United States Government license tags, driven by chauffeurs, pulled

up and unloaded its group of bureaucrats and their ladies. Now certainly I have no objection to riding busses and streetcars and taxicabs or using shanks' mare. I have been doing it all my life, and certainly I do not think for a moment that the Government of the United States should provide Congressmen or Senators with limousines and chauffeurs and footmen, but I merely wish to place upon the record my strenuous objection to the manner in which these Government officials abuse the use of Government motorcars.

The second general observation I have to make, Mr. Chairman, has to do with the manner in which the transcripts of the testimony of the hearings before this subcommittee have been returned by the various agencies and departments for correction before printing. In my judgment, it constitutes contempt of the committee when some agent of one of the Government departments or bureaus that appeared before this committee to give testimony is impertinent and presumptuous enough to change that testimony in such a manner as to convey an entirely different impression and to distort it completely out of context. That constitutes a deliberate subterfuge and that constitutes an absolute fraud upon the Appropriations Committee and upon this Congress, and in my judgment, some action should be taken by the committee as a whole or by the Congress itself to make it absolutely an offense for any witness to change in any way testimony which he gives before one of our hearings. Perhaps, at the very most, the mere changing or correcting for the purpose of rectifying obvious errors or grammatical construction might be permitted, but under no circumstances should any other kind of insertions, corrections, or changes be allowed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in looking over the list of projects, I find one in here for the airport at Moline. In order to get a proper understanding of the matter with the committee, you will recall I had some discussion with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] a year ago when he was chairman of the subcommittee having jurisdiction of this matter.

At that time we reached an agreement between the CAA officials and all parties concerned for Moline and the Mount Joy airport site at Davenport. The appearance of the item in this year's appropriation causes me to renew my inquiry, as we came to an understanding last year.

I have asked for this time to review briefly the procedure with reference to the funds included in the appropriation bill, H. R. 4016, now under consideration with special reference to the item for Federal-aid airport program on page 49.

It is my understanding that the appropriation of \$14,500,000 and the contract authorization of \$36,500,000 is intended to provide enough funds to cover

the CAA tentative Federal airport program for the fiscal year 1950, dated February 1, 1949, and submitted by CAA to the Committee on Appropriations for their information. I have carefully read the hearings and the committee report, House Report 386, to accompany H. R. 4016, and nowhere do I find any discussion of the individual projects listed in the CAA tentative Federal airport program.

The CAA tentative Federal airport program includes a Federal allocation of \$160,000 for the Moline-Quad Cities airport and this airport is listed as a class 3 airport to be enlarged to a class 4 airport. There was considerable controversy over the use of Federal funds for the expansion of the Moline airport to class 4 size, which controversy last year resulted in the statement by Mr. William C. Foster, Acting Secretary of Commerce, to Hon. Joseph H. Ball, February 2, 1948, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 2, 1948.
The Honorable JOSEPH H. BALL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BALL: I have discussed with the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics the matter of a class 4 airport to serve the Quad Cities area of Davenport, Iowa, and Moline, Rock Island, and East Moline, Ill. As you state in your letter of January 13, 1948, Federal funds would not be available to expand the Moline airport from its present class 3 dimensions to class 4 proportions. The national airport plan does not contemplate expansion of the Moline airport beyond class 3 and, since section 9 (a) of the Federal Airport Act states: "No project application shall propose airport development other than that included in the then current revision of the national airport plan formulated by the Administrator under this act," we could not participate in expansion to class 4 proportions.

As you have stated, it is the judgment of the Civil Aeronautics Administration that the best interests of aviation would be served if the class 4 airport to serve the Quad Cities area were to be located at the Mount Joy site in Iowa. Furthermore, it is the considered opinion of the Civil Aeronautics Administration that two class 4 airports will not be needed in that metropolitan area within the next 10 years, although there is a foreseeable need for one class 4 airport, one class 3 airport, and several smaller airports.

If the State of Illinois and the Illinois cities concerned do actually convert the Moline airport to a class 4 airport with their own funds, the Civil Aeronautics Administration would advise the city of Davenport against providing a second class 4 airport at the Mount Joy site now. The city of Davenport does, however, have a demonstrated need for an airport to augment the virtually saturated facilities at the existing class 1 (Cram) airport, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration would advise the city of Davenport to proceed with construction of a class 2 (perhaps even a class 3) airport at Mount Joy and would allocate Federal funds to share the costs of such construction.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Foster's letter was accepted by all parties interested as the established policy of CAA. Now the listing of this Moline Airport leads me to inquire again whether or not the Committee on Appropriations considers the making of this

appropriation as a mandate to CAA to earmark the funds for the specific project and to expend them on this project whether or not the terms of Mr. Foster's letter of February 2 are complied with.

From my discussion during general debate with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] March 4, 1948, I understood that the Appropriations Committee does not exercise any jurisdiction over the allocation of the funds appropriated for the Federal-aid program to the extent of directing CAA as to what specific projects CAA shall allocate the funds. While I understand that the Committee on Appropriations takes great interest in the pattern that is being followed by CAA in order that the funds appropriated by Congress are spent judiciously and properly but that the location and selection of airports is a matter between the Administrator of CAA and the municipal locality or the State or the group that is planning to build airports. My purpose in discussing this matter further is to make sure that the inclusion of this item for the Moline Airport in the funds provided in this bill now before us is not in any way to be considered as a congressional mandate overriding the understanding and agreement made between CAA officials and the parties interested in the Moline and Mount Joy, Iowa, airports, and that at most the inclusion of this item gives the CAA officials stand-by funds for their use only when and if the terms set out in Mr. Foster's letter of February 2, 1948, are complied with and then only if the CAA officials determine that such expenditure of these funds is a justifiable and proper expenditure of Federal funds entrusted to their care.

That, I believe, is a résumé of our discussion, and I ask the gentleman from Nebraska if that conforms with his views.

Mr. STEFAN. That conforms with the program of the CAA, of course. This committee cannot take responsibility as to where an airport is to be built. That is absolutely a contract responsibility between the CAA and the local communities of the State. This is only a tentative list. Moline is in the program for \$160,000 of Federal funds, and the sponsor's matching share is \$180,000. While I cannot find anything for Davenport here, I understand they were given some funds last year.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, Davenport has funds.

Mr. STEFAN. So the position of the committee is, of course, that we cannot administer this airport program, which is all-inclusive, and covers every State in the Union and many, many communities. It is a matter of administrative function. We have nothing to do with that at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is the point I wanted to make. I did not want the appropriation made in this bill considered as a congressional mandate overriding any agreement or discussions we have had with the CAA officials.

Mr. STEFAN. That is entirely up to the CAA and the municipalities.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Exactly, and we will continue our negotiations with them.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman and colleagues: Having listened intently and throughout this important debate, I find reason to find pleasure in complimenting the distinguished chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations, and all of the members thereof, on what appears to me as a pretty thorough-going consideration and report. I take pleasure in complimenting the committee. It is refreshing to have a unanimous report on such important matters. It is good to hear the members state that they have met every day for 8 weeks, from 10 until noon, on this important matter, for such matters as the appropriations for the Department of State, Justice Department, Commerce Department and the judiciary of our Nation are as important as any departments under our form of government, except possibly the executive and legislative departments.

In the reading of the hearings, of over 2,000 pages, there is revealed a determination by the committee of ascertaining the facts, and we cannot legislate intelligently unless we know the facts. It is good to read the thoroughness of the cross-examination of the witnesses by the committee members.

Regarding the committee's treatment of the United Nations program, I note that it is treated without criticism and that the funds needed have been given as our share of the total costs. This world-wide cooperative organization continues to be our first hope for enduring peace, and we must keep it strong and virile.

UNESCO is likewise treated soundly, and I am glad to see that it is. For to the extent that the peoples of the nations of the world come closer together in matters of common understanding on educational, scientific, and cultural subjects and problems, is an earlier assurance of enduring world peace.

In the fair treatment of the Department of Justice, I am pleased to note that the Antitrust Division thereof is again made stronger by necessary appropriation of funds, for, Mr. Chairman, if we are to perpetuate promptly, adequately, and fully, our free competitive-enterprise system—and I believe that we must—there must be prompt, adequate, but always fair prosecution of antitrust violation. Corporations or individuals must not be allowed to cripple or choke free competitive enterprise.

Violation of law is never to be respected, and it is clear that violation of law, when it results in choking the life out of free competitive enterprise, is most destructive of human welfare, the economic security of millions of people, and the very fundamentals of our democracy. The security of small business means the security of big business and vice versa. It is good to know that prompt investigation and prosecution of violations of our antitrust or antimonopoly statutory provisions will now be purposed.

The FBI is also strengthened. That is good. It is always essential that we keep strong and able to hit home runs amongst those who would destroy our American way of life. It is good to feel increasingly the improvement we are making in the detection of crime and its prompt

prosecution in the interest of the great American program. We must never let down on the need of protecting our form of Government, nor permit spies to destroy our American freedom.

The Civil Aeronautics Board will also keep strong with the recognition of the needs of prompt, adequate functioning and the Federal aid to airport program, under the Federal Airport Act, is duly recognized as worthy.

However, the statement by the distinguished committee chairman, with reference to what the committee report says on page 22 thereof to the effect that the committee was utterly amazed to learn that on February 25, 1949, there was a grant of \$8,000,000 to the "Big Four" airlines, for transportation of air mail, but which the committee says, not a single pound of which mail they actually carried. This worries me—it more than worries me, because from the distinguished chairman's statement, I understand that this amount was virtually given to cover up losses of these air lines. How soon will big business understand that it cannot continue to ask that taxpayers of the Nation cover up operating losses, unless big business expects to have increases in Federal taxes and in Federal bureaus. It is mighty inconsistent, in my judgment, for businesses having capitalization of millions of dollars, to be the ones who chiefly complain against the activities of the Federal Government, and then they themselves come to the taxpayers of the nation and ask that we pay their operating losses in forms of fictitious mail-carrying subsidies. I grant that we must keep the air lines strong and we must keep the shipping lines strong.

It is not good, in my judgment, that indirectly the taxpayers of the Nation are asked to see that they get an operating profit by reason of the payment to them of alleged mail subsidies, or of any other subsidies. It might be a far better policy if we were to face the fact that it is essential that the privately operated air lines and that the privately operated manufacturers of airplanes be taken care of, and that it is absolutely necessary in the interest of national defense and the taxpayers of the Nation, that the ships of the air and the ships of the sea be kept in good condition, both adequately and sufficiently, in the event of a national emergency involving aggression against world peace.

I strongly feel that the justification of keeping air lines and airplane factories, together with our shipping lines, occupied with proficient functioning know-how and material, is that America will never be an aggressor but that we must keep strong enough to protect and preserve world peace until the world settle down to settle up and to come to its knees with the realization that there must not be another world conflagration in terms of tests between military arms. God forbid that this volcanic eruption shall ever again occur. You and I must do our fullest duty to see that it never does.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, when the rule was under discussion, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] thought I must have had a pet peeve against Dillon Myer. I got my inspiration from the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. On page 960 of the hearings on this bill, after listening to Mr. Myer for 55 pages, the gentleman from New York said:

Doctor, you can imagine how much impression that must make over here on this side. We hear general statements such as that about the adoption of new procedures, but are given no information whatever as to what they are. We do not know how many schools are visited; we do not get any other information. I am not going to take any more time on this at the moment.

I just want to call attention to one or two things in connection with this bill. If the chairman will turn to pages 23 and 24 of the hearings on the State Department he will see that the present number of employees in the State Department is 4,726, and that the number that the committee allowed them in the Department is 5,129. It does not seem as though it is necessary to have an increase of 400 employees in the State Department. From what I know of the operations of the State Department, they are overstaffed at present rather than understaffed. I wonder why they could not cut from the bill 400 employees, at an average rate of pay of say \$3,000, or \$1,200,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is speaking only of domestic positions, not of positions for aliens in foreign countries in connection with information and educational program?

Mr. TABER. That is just what I am talking about.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is incorrect when he says there is to be an increase of 400 employees in the State Department.

Mr. TABER. Does not the table show that?

Mr. ROONEY. The table can be considered misleading because it is not set up in man-years. The figures come out the way they do, as the gentleman should know, because, due to the Ramspeck Act within-grade promotions, under Public Law 900, the employees' salary increases have to be taken into consideration.

Mr. TABER. Yes, but there are 4,726 employees now and the estimated positions in the department are 5,129. That is a difference of 403, according to the arithmetic I was brought up on, and that indicates that increase. There is a reduction, I will admit, in the number overseas that the Department and the Budget have set up, but it would seem as if there really should be a reduction in this appropriation of that \$1,200,000, and \$3,000 a head is a very low average.

Mr. ROONEY. The figure in man-years is not 400 but 268.6.

Mr. TABER. I know, but that would mean a difference of only a small number. The number of positions at the present time is 4,726 and the number

authorized is 4,847, so that they really have 121 less than the number authorized. It would seem as if the number that has been allowed is excessive, and that we ought to be able to save money. I hope that when we get to reading the bill for amendment we take advantage of that saving.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

WEATHER STATION, SCOTTSBLUFF, NEBR.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

On page 59, line 8, after the words, 24 million, strike the semicolon and insert "Provided, That not to exceed \$35,000 to establish a first-class weather station in western Nebraska."

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because at the present time western Nebraska and eastern Wyoming are without adequate first-class weather forecasting.

The storms this past winter have focused attention upon the need for adequate weather-forecasting facilities for this area. This last winter, due to inadequate weather reporting in this area, 17 human lives were lost, plus six or seven thousand head of livestock, and agricultural products of undetermined value. The loss was large. The civic, farming, and ranching interests in this region have been urging the establishment of adequate weather-forecasting facilities for several years.

The hearings before this committee will show that Dr. Reichelderfer, Chief of the United States Weather Bureau, has indicated that the Scottsbluff area is among the top 10 areas that need additional weather-forecasting facilities. The hearings further indicate that a request was in last year's budget to establish such a station in western Nebraska.

At the present time this area is served out of Kansas City, Mo., which is about 512 air miles to the southeast. It does not seem possible that a station this far away could give adequate weather reporting to an area so close to the mountain regions. The weather forecasts out of Kansas City have not been accurate. There seems to be definitely a blind spot in the area around Scottsbluff of approximately 100 miles, which is not being properly served. This is an irrigation area. There are approximately 140,000 people living in this area. There is no local weather-bureau station within the radius of about 100 miles from Scottsbluff. Severe storms frequently strike, for which no previous warning has been given. This great agricultural and stock-raising country is without any accurate or dependable weather-forecasting facilities.

I have before me three letters, which I desire to quote briefly, in part.

One from the Nebraska-Wyoming Potato Shippers Association, refers to the storm of January 2, as follows:

Had our growers known of the severity, we could have prepared our storage houses to withstand the blizzards. However, as we all know, none of us were fully informed.

Another letter from the American Red Cross Chapter at Scottsbluff, dated January 17, 1949, reads as follows:

This chapter feels that if more accurate and up-to-date weather information had been available, the people of this community and those living in ranching areas surrounding this community, would have had opportunity to prepare for the recent blizzard in this area. No advance information was received as to the intensity of this storm.

A letter from the Great Western Sugar Co., reads as follows:

This area seems to be a blind spot to which forecasts from neither Denver, nor Kansas City, apply. There are so many faulty predictions that people lose confidence in all of them, with the result that the service as now set up is not of much value to us.

I have been in consultation with the Chief of the Weather Bureau and I believe the hearings will indicate that he does not feel that the area can be properly served from Kansas City, more than 500 miles away.

The cost involved in the construction of a first-class weather station is moderate when compared to the losses during this last winter.

I trust that the committee will give this amendment favorable attention. The money saved to the farming and ranching interests will be far more than the cost of the station.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] mentioned my name in connection with the Inter-American affairs item in this bill. An explanation must be made in order to keep the record straight. I have before me Public Law 268, covering the Government corporations appropriation bill for the first session of the Eightieth Congress, and also Public Law 860, for the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

In the first session of the Eightieth Congress, I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Corporation Appropriations. The budget request for the fiscal year 1948 for the Institute of Inter-American Affairs in that session was \$7,000,000, which was the balance left of the authorization which was made originally. The committee appropriated the full amount, the Senate concurred, and it was made public law. That exhausted all the funds which had originally been authorized by the Congress for this purpose.

The administrative expense requested by the budget was \$788,000. This was reduced by the committee and by the Congress to \$550,000. The Inter-American Affairs Educational Foundation Corporation asked that year for \$1,115,000. The committee gave them the full amount and the Congress approved. For that purpose the budget asked administrative expenses in the amount of \$400,000. The committee recommended \$250,000, Congress agreed, and it became law.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the purpose of the gentleman's presentation? Is it to show that the committee of which the gentleman was chairman in the Eightieth Congress gave more money for this purpose than this committee reports today?

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, no. The gentleman knows that is not the purpose. I simply want to keep the record straight.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that more money was appropriated last year and the year before than the amount appropriated this year by this committee?

Mr. JENSEN. Sure, for the simple reason that this program was to be liquidated when the charter ran out.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman knows that the charter does not run out until August 5, 1950.

Mr. JENSEN. The charter did run out and we extended it.

Mr. ROONEY. It does not run out until August 5, 1950.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that the original charter ran out on June 30, 1947. It was extended August 5, 1947, for 3 years. I want to bring the gentleman up to date if he will only listen.

Mr. ROONEY. The period was 3 years from August 7, 1947. That is August 7, 1950.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman sit down and let me educate him on this subject at least.

Mr. ROONEY. You are biting off more than you can chew. The difficulty is that nobody understands the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. JENSEN. If you will just listen, I will give you an explanation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall give the gentleman 1 minute additional time if he can explain it any better than he has up to now.

Mr. JENSEN. I am trying to straighten the gentleman out so he will know what is going on. If the gentleman will just sit down and listen to me the minute he gave me I will try to enlighten him.

Mr. ROONEY. Would not my good and distinguished friend from Iowa give me one-quarter of the minute which I just gave him so as to ask a question which he might be able to answer?

Mr. JENSEN. All right; Mr. Chairman please hold the watch on my good friend.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that this Corporation's life having been extended to August 7, 1950, that the time of expiration comes within a fiscal year which is beyond the fiscal year for which appropriations are being made in this bill?

Mr. JENSEN. And that is exactly what I was trying to explain.

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, now, now.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman's time is surely up. We extended this act on August 5, 1947, for the period of 3 years, and a supplemental estimate was requested at that time in the sum of \$3,848,500. The committee allowed \$2,500,000. That amount was allowed by the

Congress and is public law. I am sorry the gentleman did not see fit to let me explain this in full, but I think the other Members listening will understand, but I will read the figures:

	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Law
FISCAL 1948			
Institute of Inter-American Affairs:			
Appropriation.....	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000
Administrative expenses.....	788,000	550,000	550,000
Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc.:			
Appropriation.....	1,115,000	1,115,000	1,115,000
Administrative expenses.....	400,000	250,000	250,000
FISCAL 1949			
Institute of Inter-American Affairs:			
Appropriation.....	\$3,848,500	2,500,000	2,500,000
Administrative expenses.....	980,000	490,000	490,000

¹ Represents estimate submitted as a 1948 supplemental (H. Doc. 502) for program authorized by Public Law 369 of Aug. 5, 1947, but since the funds are intended for use principally in 1949 the committee has considered the amount as a 1949 estimate. Also, budget requested contract authorization for 1949 in amount of \$5,000,000. This was not approved by the committee and was not enacted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I am, to a considerable degree, gratified by the treatment that the members of this committee have given to two of the agencies with which my own legislative committee deals. One of these agencies with which we deal in a legislative way is the Department of Commerce and its agency, the Civil Aeronautics Administration. But I note on page 22 of the committee's report on this bill two paragraphs which were quoted by the distinguished chairman, my good friend the chairman of the subcommittee of the full Committee on Appropriations, in which he makes some statements which I believe he might perhaps like to retract. In the first place, on page 22 the committee report states:

Although the committee has suggested year after year that the air lines should pay part of the cost of maintaining the Federal airways, both Civil Aeronautics Board and Civil Aeronautics Administration make annual fervent pleas in behalf of the companies, insisting that they are not self-supporting. Since many of the executives of these air lines are paid six-figure salaries for directing companies which are subsidized to the great extent they are by the Federal Government, the committee strongly feels that the day has arrived when steps must be taken to more carefully scrutinize the finances of these companies.

I should like to know from the gentleman from New York why he has not included the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in his request. The item concerns the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Admin-

istration. We have legislative jurisdiction of the subject in our committee, and if we had thought it was the right thing to do we unquestionably would have brought in a bill to the House of Representatives that had to do with this subject.

The next thing I should like to know from the chairman of the subcommittee is where he gets the idea that air-line presidents are paid six-figure salaries.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman want to reduce it to five?

Mr. HINSHAW. I just want to know.

Mr. ROONEY. The committee does not have any factual information on that. Evidently making it six instead of five makes it more forceful so far as the air lines are concerned.

Mr. HINSHAW. It makes it more forceful to the ignorant but more untrue. Actually, the gentleman himself and the other Members of the Congress receive a five-figure salary, and it is my understanding, having inquired into this matter after reading his report that there is no air-line president who has a six-figure salary; that the highest salary paid to any air-line president is about the same salary as the Alien Property Custodian allows to be paid to the president of the General Aniline Chemical and Dye Corp.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the learned gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder whether or not that is so, and I also wonder—

Mr. HINSHAW. Just look up the record.

Mr. ROONEY. When we take into consideration the amount of expenses, the amount that is allowed by way of such expenses to the presidents of these Big Four air lines, whether or not the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. By way of observation, a little while ago we allowed \$50,000 as an expense account to the President in addition to \$165,000 for maintenance of the White House and grounds. All things considered, I do not think there is any kick coming.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman has some real information I should like the gentleman to give it to us.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yield me the extra time needed in which to do it.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall gladly give the gentleman the time taken by this colloquy.

There are today at least 15 air-line officials who receive in salary more than \$25,000 a year and one goes as high as \$68,000 a year.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is probably more correct.

Mr. ROONEY. When you add the amount for expenses to that, you will get over \$100,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, I think that probably is a little exaggerated. Of course, the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from California and all the rest of the gentlemen here are also allowed some funds for expenses, and, on committee work we all are allowed a full expense account, so I do not

know that we can holler too loud about that.

Mr. ROONEY. I would gladly change my expense account with the presidents of the air lines.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman gets one of those jobs. He will be a very capable executive I am sure.

Mr. ROONEY. I accept the nomination.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman was going to yield me the time consumed in this colloquy.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, all of these statements should be factual. I hate to see any unfactual statements used to put over an argument, because that is not the right way to win arguments. The way to win arguments is first to find out the facts, and then base your arguments on those facts.

Insofar as the Federal Airways and Civil Aeronautics Board and Civil Aeronautics Administration are concerned, I would like to know how many Members of the House would start out and make charges for the use of our rivers and harbors and inland waterways in the United States. Yet just the other day, I may say to the gentleman from New York, we appropriated approximately \$150,000,000 without a quibble, for the operation, maintenance and construction of inland waterway projects and rivers and harbors, except flood-control work, which ran into several hundred million dollars more. In other words, here is an institution which has been in existence in the United States so long that \$4,000,000,000 of Federal money have been invested in the inland waterway system and the rivers and harbors of the United States without a question raised on the part of anyone here as to repayment through charges for their use in commerce; yet they start talking about repayment immediately on the airway systems of the United States. Actually the airway systems of the United States are built not solely for the benefit of commercial air lines or even private flyers but, as every man here knows who knows anything about the flying business, they are built by the Government principally so that they will be in position and ready to serve the armed forces of the United States in the event of war. If they had not been so built prior to this last war we would have been in a very sorry position in the United States because aids to air navigation and landing and airports are essential to the national defense. During that war period approximately 90 percent of all of the flights made on instruments and otherwise in the United States were made either by the air arms of the national defense forces themselves or subject to priorities and the control of the Air Force. Everybody ought to know that and to know why we do these things.

In conjunction with the Federal Airway Service we are working out a system of communications and a radar air traffic aid system which will cooperate with and become a part of the national defense system of our country in the event

of war. Aviation is one of the most potent defense weapons we have in the United States, as everyone knows, and I refer to our air arms, both military and civil, and any time we start to think about why we are appropriating this money, let us take a look at the value of it to our country. There is a great deal more defense value in it right now than there is in rivers and harbors work, I can assure you, because while that serves a useful purpose, and I am not one to complain about it, nevertheless this serves a vital aspect of the defense of our country against air attack and I am sure that the gentleman would not want to quibble on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I am most grateful for the complimentary remarks that have been said about me as member of this subcommittee, and I can certainly return them to the other members twofold with equal sincerity.

It has been very enlightening to serve on this committee. I think it would be wonderful if every Member of Congress could serve one term on the Committee on Appropriations and become more familiar with the fiscal affairs of this Nation, and then I think they could legislate more intelligently on all matters. I have enjoyed the fellowship and the friendship of the members, and I have been particularly impressed with the sincerity of the chairman and his sincere desire to cut down these appropriations, to make them realistic and sensible. And, I believe we have done so. In almost every instance we have been able to reduce the budget estimate about 10 percent, except in the two instances previously mentioned here in the course of debate.

Obviously at this late hour and with the short length of time allotted me I could not discuss the bill in its broad phases at all. It has been well presented to you by the other members of the committee, but I would like to discuss one feature of the bill or perhaps, I should say, one matter that came before our committee during the hearings which should concern us all, and I am sure that it will concern one of our legislative committees. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has indicated that he has an interest in it. That concern takes us back to the subject of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

On Friday, before the Civil Aeronautics Board appeared before our subcommittee, a press release was handed out by the CAB. In this release a new policy was established by the Civil Aeronautics Board, a policy never heretofore considered by the Board. This policy, according to the press release, said in effect that from now on when any plane is grounded for any cause, and the company does not have the use of that plane for any number of days with which to bring in revenue into the treasury of the company, it shall be the policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board to take funds from the

Post Office Department and place them in the treasury of the air lines. Now then, they issued orders contemporaneous with the press release and donated to three air lines over \$6,000,000. They said in this press release that this money is being given, or it is justified as part of the development cost of aircraft. But, when they testified before the committee and they were questioned about this, they charged this donation of \$6,000,000 to the air mail pay and specifically said that it was air mail pay. Now, I happen to know that National Air Lines was paid \$337,000, or they were awarded that much to be paid over a period of years, and these people have not even asked for the money. Yet right out of a clear sky they were awarded \$337,000. In that connection I would like to make it crystal clear here today that it was not the intention of the committee in using the language in the report "The Big Four" to include the Eastern Air Lines. The press release to which I have referred mentioned American, United, and TWA, and then in parentheses put "Big Four," and that is how the language got in the report. It is generally known that Eastern Air Lines operates without any subsidy from the United States Government. It receives absolutely none.

I would like to call the attention of the committee to a communication which was sent, I suppose, to the membership of this House—at least, I received one—addressed to the stockholders of their company, in which they complain about the air-mail subsidy and the competition that they have to face in trying to operate in the black. It is a most enlightening document. I shall include it in the RECORD along with my remarks, having obtained permission previously in the House to do so:

EASTERN AIR LINES, INC.,
New York, N. Y., April 4, 1949.

COMMENTS ON AIR-MAIL SUBSIDY AND COMPETITION

To the Stockholders of Our Company:

Many of you have asked me to explain why Eastern Air Lines is the one certificated air carrier which operates without subsidy while the more than 20 others receive substantial subsidies from the taxpayers' pocketbooks.

You are entitled to an answer. Since it is impossible to reply separately to each inquiry, I am using this form letter to give the requested information.

The explanation is that Eastern conducts its business at the highest level of efficiency and economy. This has been achieved over a period of 20 years through intelligent teamwork by Eastern's management and employees.

Subsidy is supposed to be granted only where there is financial need.

A fine brand of pride has been developed in Eastern Air Lines—pride that drives all 8,000 of us to high endeavor out on the line—pride that would not tolerate the suggestion that the easiest way to make money is to be subsidized by the Public Treasury at the taxpayers' expense.

In a recent order the Civil Aeronautics Board explained that Eastern's route pattern and location probably provide less opportunity for profitable operation than do the route patterns and locations of other large air carriers. Eastern has succeeded in spite of natural handicaps.

Some of you have also asked how the economic regulation of air transportation has been administered, whether aviation is being promoted on the basis of efficiency and economy, and whether achievement has been rewarded and failure penalized or eliminated.

The attached copy of an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal of March 7, 1949, is in point.

The air carriers which have done the best jobs have received relatively the least from the CAB in grants of new routes and mail pay—and the air carriers demonstrating least ability have been recipients of generous grants of new routes and subsidy. Carriers showing deficits have been in favorable positions in new-route and mail-pay proceedings, and Eastern, which has insisted upon conducting its operations on a business-like basis, has been at a distinct disadvantage. The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 stresses public needs in new-route proceedings, but the CAB often has lost sight of public needs and has stressed carrier needs instead—even though such carrier needs have resulted from wasteful and inefficient operations and management. The parable of the talents has often been overruled and reversed in the economic regulation of air transportation.

As a result of Eastern's hard-earned success, Eastern has had imposed on its routes and services the most sweeping network of competitive duplication of any air carrier in this country. This has been damaging to Eastern and discouraging to Eastern's personnel—and it generally has been harmful to the carriers whose applications have been granted, because operating deficits necessarily are increased when uneconomical carriers are permitted to establish duplicative competition over the routes of an efficient and economical carrier.

Had Eastern been an operator showing a large deficit, much of the competition which has been imposed upon Eastern would not have been authorized and Eastern itself would have been the recipient of subsidy.

You will be interested in some comparative revenue and expense figures for the year 1947 (the latest calendar year for which figures are available).

The following table compares the actual operating losses or profits of the domestic trunk-line carriers with the \$41,000,000 favorable change in operating results which they would have achieved if they had operated at Eastern's level of costs:

	Total 1947 operating expense in cents per revenue ton-mile	Reported operating (loss) or profit in 1947 before subsequent mail subsidy adjustments	Net operating profit or (loss) for 1947 if each carrier had operated at Eastern Air Lines' cost per revenue ton-mile
Eastern Air Lines.....	48.19	\$2,859,703	\$2,859,703
American.....	51.05	(4,159,124)	455,624
Braniff.....	57.05	(1,177,795)	725,303
Chicago & Southern.....	63.04	(726,193)	1,124,296
Colonial.....	94.32	(778,916)	1,050,393
Continental.....	69.80	118,988	1,458,135
Delta.....	53.87	(707,758)	539,318
Inland.....	71.13	50,500	715,657
Mid-Continent.....	63.48	151,578	1,456,595
National.....	59.71	(1,028,271)	1,004,990
Northeast.....	94.87	(1,285,038)	1,446,123
Northwest.....	56.13	(1,627,374)	1,394,461
PCA-Capital.....	65.16	(1,951,239)	3,563,775
Transcontinental & Western Air.....	55.32	(4,747,068)	2,215,044
United.....	51.04	(5,203,690)	(1,214,810)
Western.....	60.93	(688,366)	1,603,536
Total excluding Eastern Air Lines.....		(23,759,805)	17,537,440

Figures in parentheses indicate losses.

The above comparison is incomplete unless the picture is presented in reverse. In the following table are listed the operating losses which Eastern would have sustained if Eastern had operated its system in 1947 at the cost level of each of the carriers listed:

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as American, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$20,763.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as Braniff, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$6,062,676.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as C. & S., Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$12,094,520.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as Colonial, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$43,593,030.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as Continental, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$18,901,743.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as Delta, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$2,860,462.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as Inland, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$20,241,034.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as Mid-Continent, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$12,537,594.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as National, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$8,741,258.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as Northeast, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$44,146,872.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as Northwest, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$5,136,250.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as PCA-Capital, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$14,229,330.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as TWA, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$4,320,591.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as United, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$10,693.

If Eastern had operated at the same cost level as Western, Eastern's 1947 (losses) would have been \$9,969,781.

Eastern's achievement as an efficient and economical operator ironically has constituted a serious handicap for Eastern in new-route and mail-pay proceedings before the CAB.

As a result of CAB indulgence of so-called needy applicants, over 95 percent of Eastern's services now have been subjected to duplicative competition by other carriers. In some instances two or three additional carriers have been franchised to come in and appropriate the traffic which Eastern pioneered and developed over the years.

All of the newcomers which have been franchised to take away Eastern's business have been highly subsidized to do so—while Eastern continues to keep its books balanced without drawing on the taxpayers.

Eastern receives mail pay at a minimum nonsubsidy rate that amounts to about 6 cents per plane-mile, and Eastern has at all times been ready, able, and willing to carry all the mail on its routes at the nonsubsidy rate. Despite Eastern's frequent schedules and ample space available, the CAB in many instances has certificated new applicants between points already served by Eastern and has diverted part of the mail from Eastern to the newly authorized competitor, with the result that Government cost for transportation of the identical mail has been multiplied. This has injured the taxpayers and Eastern Air Lines and likewise the newly authorized carriers which usually have experienced increasing deficits (before subsidy) in their duplication of Eastern's efficiently operated services.

The CAB is, among other things, the Government's purchasing agent for air-mail

transportation. I have always understood that purchasing agents are expected to buy the best products at the lowest cost.

Eastern's stockholders are entitled to the facts on this.

The following tabulation will illustrate:

Subsidy mail rates being paid domestic carriers recently certificated to compete directly with Eastern Air Lines over Eastern's pioneer routes	Competitive segments	Eastern's non-subsidy mail rate per plane mile
National: 18 cents.....	New York-Miami.	6
Delta: Approximately 18 cents.	Chicago-Atlanta-Miami-New Orleans-Atlanta	6
Capital (PCA): 18 cents....	New York-Atlanta-New York-Birmingham-New Orleans.	6
All-American: 54.7 cents....	Other segments: Philadelphia-Washington.	6
Piedmont: 50 cents.....	Various segments.	6
Trans-Texas: 55 cents.....	Houston-San Antonio. Houston-Beaumont.	6

In my opinion, competition which requires subsidy is wholly unjustified. Subsidized competition is unfair to the unsubsidized pioneer. It violates the principles of private enterprise because in effect it puts the Government in competition with the individual. And it is unfair to the taxpayers who must foot the bill to cover the waste.

The tax Eastern Air Lines pays on its business profitably conducted on the basis of efficiency and economy is turned over to Eastern's newly authorized competitors to help them take away Eastern's business.

Not only have uneconomical applicants been permitted to come in and appropriate Eastern's unsubsidized business and receive Government subsidy in doing so, but in numerous instances where service over a new route was needed and the only question was the selection of the carrier which best measured up to the statutory requirement of fitness, willingness, and ability, the CAB has chosen the uneconomical carrier, rather than Eastern, to provide the service on the mistaken assumption that it was more important to consider the need of the applicant than the public need.

The following are examples:

Subsidy mail rates being paid domestic carriers chosen to provide service in preference to Eastern Air Lines

Carrier chosen in preference to Eastern	Currently effective subsidy mail rate per plane-mile	Route awarded
National.....	18	Miami-New Orleans.
Chicago & Southern.....	21	Memphis-Kansas City. Memphis-Detroit. Cincinnati-Norfolk.
Piedmont.....	50	Washington-Montreal and Quebec.
Colonial.....	35	

¹ Approximate.

Eastern offered to provide all these services at the nonsubsidy mail rate which now averages 6 cents per plane-mile.

The foregoing tabulations indicate that frequently the efficient and economical carrier has not been recognized and rewarded

in new route and mail pay proceedings, and that the taxpayers have suffered the burdens of underwriting the large subsidies reflected in the above-charted rate differentials.

This is indeed a gloomy and discouraging picture. But there are some hopeful signs.

The President is said to be making inquiry into air-line economy; the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is instituting an investigation; the Postmaster General has expressed his desire to see better business principles applied to the transportation of air mail; the CAB lately has instituted investigations designed to develop essential information regarding air-line efficiency and economy; measures have been introduced in the Congress calling for a clearly stated separation of compensation and subsidy in respect to air transportation of mail, and providing that as between two identical points a new competitor may not receive air-mail pay at a higher rate than that received by the existing carrier.

The chairman of the CAB in an address on March 23 soberly observed: "I might say that my chief concern over mail pay is whether or not it leads air-line management to behave like businessmen and to make their decisions as businessmen normally do." He continued: "Let us take the case of routes—another instance of the effect of subsidy on air-line management. Under the act and our present concept of establishing mail rates, a carrier is virtually assured that the Government will make up any losses involved in operating a given route pattern, provided there is not flagrant overscheduling. My question is: What incentives are provided either in the act or by the mail-rate action which would lead the carrier now and in the future to be sure that its routes were laid out in the best possible manner, that highly uneconomical points were eliminated, and that its operations over a given route make good economic or business sense? So far as I know, there are no such incentives." He added: "In large part * * * incentive has been removed because the present act tends to operate as a shield between the air carriers and the ultimate in economic penalties—bankruptcy."

The chairman on the same occasion also made this timely statement: "I believe that the advantages of separating the subsidy outweigh the disadvantages and dangers. From the standpoint of a sound air-transportation system these advantages would be to hold constantly before the carriers and the Board the dollar amount of the subsidy. This would provide a considerable incentive to the carriers to put themselves in a sound economic position and it would make it far easier for the Board to determine those areas where service being performed by the carriers was uneconomical."

Correcting errors made in the granting of permanent new route certificates will not be an easy task. A start should be made by withdrawing subsidy from routes which the CAB was persuaded to grant without economic justification. Certainly the innocent pioneer should not be called upon to curtail its service in order to make room for the newcomer.

But there is nothing wrong with air transportation which straight thinking and hard work cannot cure.

I would sincerely appreciate receiving your comment.

Respectfully yours,
EDDIE V. RICKENBACKER.

[From the Wall Street Journal of March 7, 1949]

REVISING AIR POLICY

The Civil Aeronautics Board has awarded an additional \$8,500,000 to seven airlines to make good all or part of their losses in 1948.

This award, like previous mail pay increases to offset airline deficits, was based on the Board's interpretation of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. This act requires that air carriers be kept sufficiently strong to maintain adequate service.

But let us look at what has happened. The carriers with the poorest records as business enterprises have received the most mail pay from the Federal Government. Those with the best records get the least pay.

Now part of this logical anomaly stems from mistakes by the Board itself in awarding too many competing routes, from a leveling off in traffic, and from increases in costs and other circumstances beyond the control of management.

Nevertheless, there has been in the Board's mail awards a curious treatment of the efficient. The size of an airline's deficit seems to be a major factor in the size of the subsidy.

The Board awarded a total of \$5,750,000 to two air lines because they had great needs. Another, which is in the midst of a cost-cutting program to reduce its deficit, got very little. A fourth, which has no deficit, got nothing.

Under the law's interpretation this fourth is not eligible for a second helping of pie simply because it has made money right along.

The end product of this philosophy is discouragement of initiative and efficiency. Further, this approach is obstructing the Board's own announced objective of fostering mergers between carriers. As long as a management expects its deficits, from whatever cause, to be made good by the Government, why should it be interested in a merger?

Chairman JOHNSON, of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, is sponsoring a bill to separate money paid air lines for mail service from the money paid as subsidies for national defense reasons. Whether this method will better the situation can only be gauged by further examination. But it can be a useful bill if it serves as a wedge to reopen congressional study of the whole airline situation in relation to the taxpayer's pocketbook.

Ten years ago, when the present law was passed, air transportation was still experimental, a little unsure of its footing. Today it is an established industry. Measures suitable for an expansion era may now need retalloring.

I would like to refer to the schedules set up in this document where it says that Eastern Air Lines is competing with National, Delta, Capital, All-American, Piedmont, and Trans-Texas on the same routes, carrying air mail, Eastern receiving 6 cents per plane-mile, while the other companies, for instance National from New York to Miami, receive 18 cents.

Eastern is having to compete with this unjust situation while the taxpayers pay the bill. Their complaint needs our careful consideration.

I think it is about time we should look into the functioning of the Civil Aeronautics Board. When an agency of Government uses Treasury funds to establish policy in the civilian field, we should have greater control over it. I have always said that the Department of Commerce should have control over the Civil Aeronautics Board. The only appeal from these people is to the President. The Secretary of Commerce has no say-so over this board, but they are using millions of dollars—I believe the sum for the last year was \$55,000,000

given to the air companies to establish civilian air policy.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. With regard to the air lines, irrespective of what subsidy is being given to the lines that compete with Eastern, for instance, I do not know whether the gentleman is familiar with the fact but Eastern Air Lines has the most choice routes on the entire eastern seaboard of the United States. There is no air line in the United States that has had the consideration from its inception to date that Eastern Air Lines has had. I honestly believe that no other air line can make that statement.

Mr. PRESTON. That question was raised in our committee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] quizzed one of the witnesses on that very point. The Assistant Secretary for Air, Mr. Allison, mentioned the fact that they might have a preference in the routes, but he did admit it was only a contributory factor in their operation and he conceded that Eastern Air Lines operates with a greater degree of efficiency than any other line.

Mr. RIVERS. That may be well, but there is no air line in the Nation that can compete with Eastern today for that very reason. I honestly believe that.

Mr. PRESTON. There is another air line whose gross passenger receipts are larger than those of Eastern Air Lines. I do not think it is fair, and it is not right. I hold no brief for Eastern Air Lines, I never have, and I hold no stock in that company. I am not familiar with any of the officers. I have never met Captain Rickenbacker, a man whom I admire greatly from what I have read and heard about him. But I do not think it is fair for us to use Government funds in this manner to compete with a company which has proven its ability and who is eager to operate efficiently and economically. I suspect that they keep their salaries down more in line with what they should be.

There are many things in this bill in addition to the CAB that I wish I had time to talk about.

We took special pride in the fact that we gave the Federal Bureau of Investigation \$1,598,000 above the budget request. The committee felt that the money spent by our Government in this field was better spent than in any other field. This country has become a sanctuary, through legitimate and illegitimate methods of entry, for many peoples of the world, and they have gathered here in organizations of intrigue and deception. It is only through the Federal Bureau of Investigation that we can expect to keep account of them, to ferret them out, and ultimately to deport them when we catch those who have entered in an illegal manner. The action of the committee in giving J. Edgar Hoover this larger amount, more than the budget estimate, is a tribute to him. I think it will encourage him to do an even still better job. Mr. Hoover has the respect and admiration of every right-thinking Member of this body. He has organized

the most efficient investigative agency in the world.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Department of State not otherwise provided for, including personal services in the District of Columbia; salary of the Under Secretary of State, \$12,000; expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 801-1158) not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 2870, 287q, 287r); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; purchase (two for Chiefs of Missions at not to exceed \$3,000 each) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of aircraft outside the continental United States; printing and binding, including printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); newspapers for departmental use (not to exceed \$15,000); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55 a); not to exceed \$1,000 for payment of claims pursuant to law (28 U. S. C. 2672); health service program as authorized by law; purchase of uniforms; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by contract, for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; establishment, maintenance, and operation of passport and despatch agencies; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; ice and drinking water for use abroad; excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; loss by exchange; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; relief, protection, and burial of American seamen, and alien seamen in foreign countries and in the United States territories and possessions; expenses incurred in acknowledging services of officers and crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing American seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or other catastrophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining in Egypt, Ethiopia, Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court, and care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 659), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) stenographic reporting, (2) translating, (3) analysis and tabulation of technical information, (4) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids, (5) maintenance, improvement, and repair of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries, including minor construction on Government-owned properties, (6) not to exceed \$200,000 for maintenance and operation of commissary and mess services, (7) fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad, (8) rental or lease, for periods not exceeding 10 years, of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for the use of

the Foreign Service, for which payments may be made in advance, (9) electrical appliances, motor-driven equipment (other than motor vehicles), and household furniture and furnishings not otherwise provided for, for use abroad, and (10) household equipment to be loaned pursuant to law (22 U. S. C. 1437); \$76,652,100: *Provided*, That pursuant to section 8 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 118d-1), passenger motor vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available without fiscal year limitation for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not exceed \$3,000 in the case of the Chief of Mission automobile at each diplomatic mission and \$1,400 in the case of all other such vehicles except station wagons, and such replacements shall not be charged against the numerical limitation hereinbefore set forth: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated herein, not to exceed \$30,000 shall be expended for carrying out the provisions of the Act of July 31, 1945 (5 U. S. C. 168d).

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 4, line 17, strike out the sum "\$76,652,100" and insert "\$75,452,100."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am rather of the opinion that this appropriation would take a larger cut than the figure that I have suggested. I have aimed only at the domestic service, and that appears in tabular form on pages 23 and 24 of the hearings for the Department of State. The estimated number of positions is 5,129, and the present employment is 4,726, or 400 above the present employment. We all know that this local office of the State Department is overstaffed, rather than understaffed, and it would seem they could take this very moderate cut which I based upon a salary roll of \$3,000, when the actual figure in the estimate is somewhere around \$4,000. The increase from the number allowed for this year is 282. On the other hand, the increase in the number of positions that are actually filled is 403. I really think the other items would show a figure where anyone could reduce this appropriation a great deal more, but it would seem as if it would be possible at this time to cut off \$1,200,000. There has been no cut on the personnel items, and only some of the small expense items have been cut in this appropriation. I hope this amendment will be agreed to, and that we will be permitted to save \$1,200,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I must rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the very matter which I discussed a while ago with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. It concerns the gentleman's reading of a table which is in the committee hearings and from which one does not get an accurate picture of the number of department employees. The gentleman from New York insists that the number is over 400. This committee insists that the proper figure is 257.4 man-years.

Insofar as this particular item of the bill is concerned, the entire membership of this subcommittee is in agreement on

the amount allowed. We are now having a reorganization of the State Department. We are abiding by the recommendations of the so-called Hoover Commission. It is the considered judgment of the committee that we have cut sufficient from these funds to enable them to proceed with their reorganization, so that they will come back and convince us a year from now that they have saved so much money for the taxpayers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that the Hoover report estimates that they can save a very large sum of money in this connection?

Mr. ROONEY. That is so, but only after the reorganization plan has been put into effect. That is the reason this committee is proceeding as it is in this regard. I respectfully suggest that the gentleman from New York discuss this matter with the able gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] who has served on this committee for a great many years and who has very, very mature and competent judgment with regard to these appropriations. There is nobody in this House who knows more about this bill than the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. The gentleman from Nebraska is certainly not a Member who goes along with extravagance in considering appropriation bills. I feel that if this matter is left to the members of the subcommittee it will turn out to the better advantage, in the end, to the American taxpayer.

I respectfully urge that the Committee vote down the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 27, noes 37.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67]

Arends	Doughton	O'Brien, Mich.
Auchincloss	Douglas	Pace
Bailey	Fernandez	Pfeifer,
Barden	Gathings	Joseph L.
Bentsen	Gilmer	Powell
Bland	Gross	Price
Blatnik	Hall	Quinn
Bonner	Leonard W.	Ramsay
Buckley, N. Y.	Harrison	Rankin
Bulwinkle	Havener	Redden
Burdick	Heffernan	Scott, Hardie
Burnside	Kirwan	Shafer
Byrne, N. Y.	Klein	Simpson, Pa.
Carlyle	Lane	Smith, Ohio
Case, S. Dak.	Latham	Stockman
Celler	Lovre	Taylor
Clemente	Lyle	Thomas, N. J.
Cooley	Lynch	Towe
Coudert	McConnell	Walsh
Crosser	Macy	Welch, Calif.
Davenport	Madden	Whitaker
Davis, Tenn.	Marshall	White, Idaho
Dawson	Morton	Wood
Dingell	Murphy	Zablocki

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4016, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 361 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: On page 20, line 7, after the word "appropriation" strike out the balance of line 7, all of lines 8 and 9, and the first five words in line 10.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, in order that you may understand the amendment, it strikes out of the bill those words which would permit the spending of money for agricultural experiment stations in other countries.

I do not yet say that I am opposed to the spending of money for them, but I am quoting you my authority for this amendment, which is no less than the distinguished Member of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] who said, at page 756 of the hearings:

I think the record should contain some details of this item.

That is my entire argument. I contend that the gentleman from New York knew exactly what he was saying when he said that in the hearings, that there should be some details of this great expenditure in the record, or he will have put every Representative of an agricultural district in the House of Representatives on the spot today. This should be stricken out in our House and should be sent to the Senate with the request that further information be obtained regarding the expenditure of the money, and that if we are to spend \$2,000,000 for agricultural experimental work in other countries, and I quote the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], that the amount involved is \$2,000,000, we should certainly know what we are spending it for. As I look around the room I see the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, who unquestionably has an experiment station in his district. He will be asked when he goes home how he authorized \$2,000,000 for experiment stations in South America when there were inadequate funds for those in his district. Or the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON], who has in his district at La Jolla a little experiment station. It will be given \$18,000 for its operation expenses next year, which is hardly enough to pay the salaries of the

men who are employed there, and will allow nothing whatever for the necessary improvements of the building nor for the work itself. Or the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], who represents the district in which Madison is located, which has the great laboratory there for wood fiber and wood-products experiments and which was cut down about one-third under the budget request as I recall.

In my own district the farmers gathered \$100,000 together and bought land for an experiment station. The Appropriations Committee was splendid about the matter and put into the bill \$100,000 which will build about two-thirds of the laboratory building. So when you see a place in my district with two-thirds of a building built, that will be the sea-level experiment station. My farmers would ask me how I came to vote for \$2,000,000 for experiment stations in South America and not for the other one-third of this building.

Or the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WHITE] who represents the city of Fresno, who has a very fine grape-experiment station in his district: I think his grape growers will ask him how he came to vote for \$2,000,000 for experiment stations in agriculture in South America and not for the necessary funds for the experiment station in his district.

So my question is simply, Why can we not, in the words of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], say, "I think the record should contain some details of this item"?

I ask that it be stricken out until it can be taken to the Senate and those details inserted.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell us whether this item is to be transferred to some other division of the State Department? I notice further down on that same page the statement that \$2,700,000 can be transferred to some other division. It certainly is not an appropriate item under the Informational Service.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman has expressed what I am thinking. The record is not clear on it. It does not indicate whether or not the money is to be transferred. If we are going to vote \$2,000,000 for experimental stations in South America in the field of agriculture, let us not have the money transferred to some other section and used for some other purpose. So I hope the gentleman from New York, my friend from Brooklyn, will accept the amendment and let the Senate put in the information which was not put in in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the distinguished gentleman from California, who originally came from the coal-mine area of Pennsylvania and is now an educated farmer in California, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] get together and read these hearings. They

would then find that the reason this appropriation is in this bill and at this particular point of the bill is because of the action of their Congress, the Eightieth Congress, in passing what is known as the Smith-Mundt bill. They would learn, furthermore, if they were to read the hearings, that the Information and Educational Activities Division of the Department of State does not actually use these funds at all; they are turned over to the Department of Agriculture by transfer. The gentlemen would also learn that the actual amount of money transferred for this purpose is not the sum mentioned by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. I am very sorry to hear him make such an inaccurate statement as he made today, because he is usually much better informed.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. This very matter has already been considered by the House today. It was one of the two arguments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] against the rule which was granted this morning on a roll-call vote. This language was not proposed by the committee. This did not originate in the mind of any single member of this committee. I may say further to the gentleman that if he would read the questions and answers appearing in the hearings—

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. At what page?

Mr. ROONEY. He would read the following:

Mr. ROONEY. What have you to say about insertion of the language "advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the revised statutes as amended"?

Mr. HALL. This proviso permits advances to exchange grantees such as students, teachers, and trainees, and to permit advances under contract to private nonprofit organizations and rental advances in areas where required and travel advances to alien operators of mobile motion-picture units overseas.

This new language is included in the International Information and Educational Activities appropriation this year as the result of the consolidation in that appropriation of the separate appropriation for cooperation with the American Republics made in previous years. Since similar language was contained in the Appropriation Act for Cooperation with the American Republics, with which I am sure the gentleman from California is familiar as a member of the great Committee on Appropriations, this new language in the appropriation for International Information and Educational Activities does not contemplate any new authorities.

The provision authorizing advance of funds is necessary for the purpose of allowing advances to students, professors, and other technical personnel participating in the Educational Exchange Program. The provision relative to the establishment and operation of agricultural and other experimental stations is necessary to enable the Department of Agriculture to establish and operate such stations. There is some question as to whether or not the general authority of the Department of

Agriculture is sufficiently broad to cover this type of activity which is essential to the cooperation program.

Now I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. My figure was given to me by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and the gentleman has not given us a different figure.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will refer to page 755 of the hearings under the title "Activities under the scientific and technical cooperation program for 1950" he will find the very first item there is "Agriculture—American Republics—\$771,490."

That money is not only to establish experimental stations in South America but also for the program of bringing trainees to this country and educating them in our know-how with regard to agriculture.

Mr. O'TOOLE. The gentleman from California is using the book of 10 years ago.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. What page?

Mr. ROONEY. It may not appear so but the gentleman from California has a book more recent than that. I refer to page 755.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I appreciate the gentleman's commendation of the last Congress.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a lot of confusing statements made here this afternoon in connection with this matter. Does anyone imagine it would be necessary to have a rule waiving points of order on this if the Smith-Mundt bill had authorized it? It would not be necessary.

As the gentleman from California very aptly stated, this is a proposal to set up experimental stations throughout the American Republics without giving any detail or anything of that kind on which anyone can base an opinion. The authority to transfer funds of this character runs to another appropriation in the State Department and not to other departments, so there would be naturally no authority to transfer it to the Agricultural Department. As the gentleman from California so well stated, it is absolutely ridiculous for us to carry this fund and expect that anything such as the gentleman from New York has suggested would happen.

Let us throw this thing out, as the gentleman from California suggests, then let somebody consider it so that we will know what it is and what we are doing.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I have found the figures to which the gentleman from New York referred and they show that the amount intended for agri-

culture is \$1,376,456, which would be quite a bit in the districts in this country which need more money for their experimental stations.

Mr. TABER. That is true. We do not know where we are on this.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Just as a matter of explanation, is not the work in connection with the development of the agricultural stations and progress through technological assistance a job for the Institute for Inter-American Affairs, for which an appropriation is made on page 25?

Mr. TABER. That is true and if they were going to have anything of that kind that is the place that it should be.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS of California) there were—ayes 88, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California: Page 20, line 10, after the word "thereon" and the semicolon, insert "Provided, That no money shall be spent on agricultural stations or experiments in other countries until the Secretary of Agriculture certifies that such expenditure is a necessity and that experimental work of a similar nature in the United States is adequately financed."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proposed amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I contend that it is a limitation upon the expenditure of funds because it requires that the necessity for them and the limitation for them be provided and certified to before the money is expended.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire further to be heard?

Mr. ROONEY. The statement that no money shall be spent is clearly legislation; and it imposes additional duties on the Department, which makes it legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] introduces certain language requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain findings. The Chair construes that language to be legislation on an appropriation bill in that it imposes additional duties upon the agency involved. So, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire some information from the committee. I was here during general debate and heard the comment of practically all members of the committee, which is summarized in

the words on page 3 of their fine report, in which they say:

The agencies represented in the bill should take steps to improve the justifications submitted to the committee.

In the next paragraph, they say:

The committee is dissatisfied with the condition of much of the transcript of the hearings upon its return by the departments.

On further, they say:

Some of the testimony when returned contained statements so changed that they bore little resemblance to the actual testimony given.

I have the highest regard for the members of this subcommittee. I know how diligent they are. I am amazed that they should find it necessary to make these criticisms. However, I also note that in their zeal to have the hearings accurate they took 2,223 pages of testimony, and with the best of good will and diligence the rest of us are unable to follow through all of these cross-examinations.

This is the question I wanted to ask: How much of a staff does this subcommittee have? Can the chairman tell me?

Mr. ROONEY. The subcommittee has an executive secretary, Mr. Howe, the chairman has a clerk, Miss Caddigan, and we have the assistance of all the clerks of the full Committee on Appropriations. During the course of the hearings, so as to be able to get people up here from the departments downtown in a hurry, a man is assigned by the particular department to contact these people for us more expeditiously. We have not at all had the difficulty the gentleman from Ohio experiences from reading page 3 of this committee's report. This matter was quite fully discussed previously today during general debate on the bill.

Mr. VORYS. I was present when it was discussed.

Mr. ROONEY. The reporter makes a transcript of the testimony and that testimony is then forwarded to the witnesses from the departments, presumably to make editorial and grammatical corrections. We have found many changes in their answers. We will not stand for them and we did not stand for them. We found a number of instances, which caused the particular language to be inserted in the report as a warning to these departments, where answers which were given "Yes" read "No" when the transcript came back from downtown. None of such changes were permitted to stand in the volumes of testimony the gentleman now has. The printed testimony is correct as originally given by the witnesses.

Mr. VORYS. I thoroughly understand, and I commend the gentleman and his committee in bringing to us accurate statements, but the gentleman's subcommittee points out that the justifications need improvement and the testimony needs improvement. This is my point: A committee of Congress does more than conduct a judicial proceeding. They have to get information not only through cross-examination of the battery of witnesses sent up here but they

have to have their own staff to do some digging in order to get the narrative and generality on behalf of the committee. It is completely insufficient to have some department that wants money lend that committee a staff member for liaison during hearings.

What I want to know is this: What staff does the Committee on Appropriations have now compared with the staff it had last year? Can someone give me those numbers?

Mr. ROONEY. I believe that there is one man more than there was last year in the Eightieth Congress. We now have a more efficient and intelligent staff, interested in facts and not in politics.

Mr. VORYS. How many do they have this year?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I point out to the gentleman that the entire expert investigating staff of the Committee on Appropriations, which was so effective during the past 2 years, was abolished at the beginning of this year by a vote of the majority members of the committee.

Mr. VORYS. How many did that involve?

Mr. TABER. Last year we had as high as 50 people, including clerks. Of course, we had temporary people. We had the ablest public accountants in America working for us.

Mr. VORYS. How many were fired this year?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, prior to the last quorum call, there was a colloquy on the floor between the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], I believe, with respect to the activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which has an item in this bill for \$139,073,000. The discussion affected the Eastern Air Lines, Inc. Last evening I spent quite a bit of time analyzing the last annual report of the Eastern Air Lines Co., and I found this statement from Eddie Rickenbacker, president of the company. He says:

Many of you have asked me to explain why Eastern Air Lines is the one certificated air carrier which operates without subsidy while the more than 20 others receive substantial subsidies from the taxpayers' pocket-books. * * * The explanation is that Eastern conducts its business at the highest level of efficiency and economy. * * * In a recent order the Civil Aeronautics Board explained that Eastern's route pattern and location probably provide less opportunity for profitable operation than do the route patterns and locations of other large air carriers. Eastern has succeeded in spite of natural handicaps. * * * The air carriers which have done the best jobs have received relatively the least from the CAB in grants of new routes and mail pay—and the air carriers demonstrating least ability have been recipients of generous grants of new routes and subsidy. * * * The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 stresses public needs in new route proceedings, but the CAB often has lost sight of public needs and has stressed

carrier needs instead—even though such carrier needs have resulted from wasteful and inefficient operations and management. * * * Had Eastern been an operator showing a large deficit, much of the competition which has been imposed upon Eastern would not have been authorized, and Eastern itself would have been the recipient of subsidy.

Then Mr. Rickenbacker continues:

The CAB is, among other things, the Government's purchasing agent for airmail transportation. I have always understood that purchasing agents are expected to buy the best products at the lowest cost.

Eastern's stockholders are entitled to the facts on this.

Then he sets forth a table showing that National receives 18 cents; Delta, 18 cents; Capital, 18 cents; All-American, 54.7 cents; Piedmont, 50 cents; Trans Texas, 55 cents. That is on the New York-Miami runs, and the Philadelphia-Washington runs, and the Houston-San Antonio runs.

It also shows a table where National receives 18 cents for the Miami-New Orleans run; Chicago & Southern 21 cents; Piedmont, 50 cents; Colonial, 35 cents, where the tonnage was taken away from Eastern, which proposed and offered and stood ready to carry the cargo at 6 cents per plane mile. That gives you an illustration of what the CAB is doing under the 1938 act approved by the Congress. It also shows how utterly fantastic the CAB penalizes efficient companies, and how the taxpayers of this country subsidize, through appropriations, which we approve from time to time, inefficiency, and poor management, and subsidize those who do not operate except to get more money from the taxpayer.

I hope that the Committee on Appropriations of the House will deal more effectively in the future to see that the taxpayers are relieved from some of the burdens which they now have in paying these unjustified mail subsidies.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 5, line 11, strike out "\$650,000" and insert "\$300,000."

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered strikes out \$650,000 for representation allowance and inserts \$300,000. Even with this reduction, the amount remaining is too much, but I thought members of this committee might go along with me on a comparative small reduction. It does give you a chance to save \$350,000 that in my opinion would be otherwise wasted.

I think the Members of the House and the people of this country would be amazed to know how much of taxpayers' funds are being used to buy liquor of various kinds to entertain representatives in foreign countries. I think it is conceded and will not be denied that this item to which I have referred, almost all of it is spent for champagne and other kinds of drinks used by our representatives to entertain foreigners of other countries.

Do not forget that these representatives have hundreds of thousands of dollars in other allowances. This is in addition

to pretty liberal allowances already granted in this legislation.

This is not a question of whether you believe in the use of liquor. That is entirely beside the question. It is whether you think it is for the best interests of our country to use the money of the people of this country in this manner.

I should also add that this item of \$650,000 is not all of the money appropriated in this bill for entertainment and representation allowance. I understand the amount in this bill alone is more than \$1,000,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. In just a moment I will yield. I am quite sure the gentleman will tell us that there may be other items included in this expense, but I am sure he will also tell you that almost all of this expenditure amounting to more than \$1,000,000 in this bill will be used to pay for various kinds of liquor to be used by our representatives to entertain foreigners abroad.

You did not take the trouble to show the items in the hearings. You simply call it representation allowance. Representation of what? That you do not tell us. Last year and two years ago, the committee had supplementary items for which the funds were used. This year you say "representation allowance" and let it go at that.

As I said a moment ago, not only is there this item of \$650,000, but you have another item in another place in the bill for \$100,000 for the same purpose, and so, if you go through the bill, I think the committee will admit there is more than \$1,000,000 appropriated out of taxpayers' funds for this purpose. I am asking you to save about a third of it.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] spoke a few minutes ago on this subject matter. I would like to ask him, for the record, how much money in this bill is being spent for so-called representation allowance.

Mr. STEFAN. For Foreign Service alone, for representation allowance, \$650,000 is being requested in this bill. The same amount was provided last year. There are other agencies, of course. The Information Service have their special allowance. I assume that outside of the Marshall plan, around \$1,000,000 for representation allowances for all agencies is in this bill.

Mr. REES. The Marshall plan, or ECA, you know, has representation allowances in addition to these in the present bill. I realize you are in the habit of spending this money, but can we not save a part of the million dollars in this bill. This amendment will save \$350,000. I think it is fair. I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from New York to explain why he deems it necessary to spend \$650,000 of the taxpayers' funds, along with other items in this bill, for this purpose.

Mr. ROONEY. That is an invitation to make a speech, but I want to ask the gentleman one or two questions. Does the gentleman from Kansas realize that the amount requested of this committee for representation-allowance money was in the amount of \$700,000, and it was cut

by the committee to \$650,000. Does the gentleman realize that?

Mr. REES. Well, so far so good. But that is only a small part of it. I notice in your hearings where something over a million dollars was mentioned.

Mr. ROONEY. I am talking to the gentleman now about Foreign Service. My second question is this: If the Foreign Service has a diplomatic luncheon, does the gentleman object to the serving of a Martini or an old-fashioned with that luncheon?

Mr. REES. But is it going to take a million dollars to take care of those Martinis?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, the gentleman does not object; is that the point?

Mr. REES. I do not object to serving luncheons and dinners where necessary, but I think it is wholly unnecessary to serve high-powered liquor and then charge it up to the Federal Treasury. What you do with your own money is a different matter.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman object to the Martini?

Mr. REES. I am serious with the gentleman from New York, who thinks that this ought to be done. We ought not to use the money of the taxpayers of this country for that sort of thing. It is manifestly unfair. We ought not to do it.

Now, I see the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] rise. He has always opposed my amendments on other occasions. Whether he believes in the use of liquor or not is beside the question. I hope he will explain to this House why he thinks it is for the best interests of this country that we appropriate approximately a million dollars of the taxpayers' money, almost all of which will be used to buy liquor of various kinds to entertain foreigners of other countries. This is not a question as to whether you believe in the use of liquor; not at all. It is a question of whether you think there is justification in using the people's money in this manner. No one yet on the floor of this House has ever been able to tell us of any good that has been accomplished by reason of the spending of the millions of taxpayers' money in this manner during the past few years.

How you use your own money is your business, but how you use the taxpayers' money of this country is a different question.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment we are falling into a rather low ebb when this Congress deems it necessary to spend the people's funds in this manner in order to get along with representatives of other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, every year, for many years, the gentleman from Kansas who has just left this well, has made a similar request to the committee. I wonder when the gentleman from Kansas is going to realize the situation in his own State, and come to the conclusion that these addresses are no longer popular.

It remained for Time magazine, in its issue of September 9, 1946, to drag the

prohibition ghost out of the Kansas closet.

Kansas and a bone-dry liquor law had its ghost brought from the closet by this alert publication.

The article states:

Good whisky is easier to get in Topeka than in wet Kansas City, Mo., 67 miles away.

The article lambasts Kansas prohibition as a farce and calls enforcement officers shadows in a bootlegger's forest.

The voters themselves became disgusted with the hypocritical dry law and the unrest, finally gained the attention of the Republican-dominated machine, and leaders hurried to a Kansas hotel only to leave a job, and leaving, left a job for the cleaning crew the next morning—to remove a near truckload of empty whisky bottles from the bedrooms of the building. Bellhops rested after a strenuous day and night of toting sparkling water and ice and the Topeka bootleggers happily tallied up the receipts.

United States Treasury which takes revenue from legal and illegal liquor sellers alike reported 570 Kansans holding retail liquor licenses, and 17 more as holding wholesale licenses.

Why all this talk year in and year out? Take the ghost out of the closet and keep it off the floor of Congress.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. No. I cannot yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Very briefly; yes.

Mr. REES. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], who would not yield, that he has not said anything with respect to using the taxpayers' money for buying liquor for foreigners abroad, and has not indicated wherein that expenditure would help to cultivate our friendly relations with people abroad. All he is doing is talking from a magazine that is filled with advertisements of liquor concerns.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why, sure. Do they not have to have that advertising money to run their publications? They are financially interested in the liquor business. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] mistakes the issue entirely. Apparently some folks think it is necessary to get these people down there in South America a little bit under the influence of liquor because you can get along with certain people better when they are a little bit intoxicated and, why, runs their argument, should we not let them get a little bit under the influence so they may be more willing to take our money? That argument—the appropriation of tax money to accomplish that does not make sense. What drinking in Kansas has to do with the use of farmers' and other taxpayers' money to purchase liquor in South America, I do not know. There seems to be no connection.

Here is what I want to call to your attention, and it is along the lines suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. I read from page 3 of the committee report, and I would like to have the chairman of the committee answer me. I read:

The committee is dissatisfied with the condition of much of the transcript of the hearings upon its return by the departments. Instructions were attached to each day's testimony when submitted to the departments, stating specifically that editorial changes by witnesses were to be held to a minimum and limited to corrections of grammatical and other obvious errors. The instructions notwithstanding, some of the testimony when returned contained statements so changed that they bore little resemblance to the actual testimony given.

Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that the purpose of having witnesses come before committees to testify is to advise the committees and the Congress through the committees of the facts on which a bill is based. The printed hearings purport to give us the facts. The testimony of witnesses should not be accepted except as they yield to cross-examination, because then only will the testimony of the witness disclose the whole truth. How in the wide, wide world can anyone weigh the testimony of a witness or discover how much of it is conclusion or conjecture, or opinion, or fact if you send the testimony down to a department and then, according to the committee, have it changed? Who knows what the witnesses really meant or how much they really know?

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, what is the use of taking the testimony, having a witness cross-examined or examined by members of the committee, then sending the testimony down to a department and, as is said in the report, getting something back that the committee does not recognize?

Mr. ROONEY. I must say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that is exactly the committee's point, that is the reason we mentioned it in our report. This committee will not stand for such procedure.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did not the gentleman do it?

Mr. ROONEY. Most certainly not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is the gentleman squawking about then?

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman had been here during general debate on this bill he would know that the changes which were made in the witnesses' testimony required many, many hours of work by myself and other members of the committee in order to get it back into its original state when taken down by the reporters.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but the witnesses who made these changes and sent back the statements were not subsequently cross examined.

Mr. ROONEY. We will get to that in due time, I assure the gentleman. I thoroughly agree with him. I do not think a congressional committee should permit any witness or witnesses to change their testimony at all, and, as far as I am personally concerned, in next year's hearings none of these witnesses will be

permitted to correct even their grammatical errors.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What the gentleman did in this case apparently was to pile error upon error, because he sent the testimony down there, then the witnesses changed it and when they sent it back changed, the gentleman substituted his version of what he thought they said the first time.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the very learned gentleman understand that this very procedure was carried on by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] when he was chairman of the full committee, and that we followed the same practice in this regard with the departments which has been followed for the past 2 years?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who instituted the procedure is not the issue—the practice is unsound and misleading. The gentleman is squawking about it, if I may use such a word, and calls attention in his report to the fact they did change their testimony. Now, how does one who reads the record know whether the testimony in these hearings is the witness' testimony or the gentleman's version of their testimony?

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman understand that the original transcript was returned to us?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, sure.

Mr. ROONEY. And that we readily saw the corrections which were made on it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And the gentleman just wiped out all of those changes?

Mr. ROONEY. We certainly did.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then we have a record of what the gentleman thought was the witness' testimony as reported by the reporter. That is what you have.

Mr. ROONEY. Amen.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Right. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Page 59, line 8, after the semicolon, insert "Provided, That not more than \$35,000 be used for a first-class weather station in western Nebraska."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this does not call for additional appropriations. The Weather Bureau now has \$24,000,000 for use in weather reporting. I am suggesting in this amendment that \$35,000 be earmarked for a station in western Nebraska. Attention is focused upon this because of the storm of last year when 17 lives were lost in this area, as well as 6,000 to 7,000 head of livestock and untold amounts of vegetables were lost. This area, in a radius of 100 miles, serves about 150,000 people. They get their weather reports from Kansas City, 512 air-line miles away. The weather reporting just has not been accurate, and for that reason

I feel that a weather station should be established in this area.

If the committee will read the testimony on pages 552 to 563 relating to the Department of Commerce appropriations, they will find that the Chief of the Weather Bureau recognizes that this is a blind spot and in the past has recommended that a weather station be established in this area. By this amendment I am suggesting that the appropriation not be increased but that the Weather Bureau be instructed to establish a first-class station in Scottsbluff, Nebr.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is not proper to legislate from the floor of this House on an appropriation bill in the manner proposed. There is some merit and need for some kind of a weather station, whether class 1, or whatever class is adequate, at Scottsbluff, Nebr. However, this committee does not legislate station by station in the installation of these weather stations. That is administrative and is left for the Department of Commerce to determine where they are most needed. If it becomes necessary and proper to install a separate station at Scottsbluff, there is money contained in this bill sufficient to cover the cost of such a station. For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge that the pending amendment be defeated by the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 25, lines 12 to 15, strike out the entire proviso.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment knocks out the language repealing the provision of the appropriation act a couple of years ago which said that all of the funds which were appropriated to the Institute of Inter-American Affairs should expire on the 30th of June. Now this would make them continuously available and available until expended. The fellow who is running the Institute of Inter-American Affairs is Dillon Myer. After they finished the hearings on this bill, or practically finished them, on Mr. Meyer, on page 968, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] said:

Well, I must say that up to now the presentation of this agency has been quite below the standard expected of the other agencies that have appeared before the committee. I would say it is the worst we have had since we started these hearings about a month ago.

And here we have them inserting language which would make available to this agency \$700,000 or more of funds that would expire on the 30th of June, after they have made that kind of a justification. I wonder if the House of Representatives wants to go along with providing additional funds for an outfit that the chairman of the subcommittee himself has that opinion of, after having

listened to their justifications for 63 pages.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, and at this time ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the very same matter which was discussed earlier today just previous to the vote on the rule. It was thoroughly explored at that time. The same presentation, word for word, now made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] was made by him at that time, and nevertheless the House adopted the rule.

What is the situation? The Institute of Inter-American Affairs, to which this language refers, is a Government corporation whose life was extended from the 5th of August 1947 to the 5th of August 1950. The termination of the life of this corporation, therefore, will come not in the fiscal year for which appropriation is being made but in the fiscal year 1951.

The corporation has made a number of agreements with South American countries which must be met. The sole purpose of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in offering this amendment is to defeat the carry-over of moneys which will be available at the end of the fiscal year. To do so now would result in a black eye insofar as the United States is concerned because we pay for merely a share of the activities of this program, much more is contributed by South American countries. This is exactly the same reply I made this morning in answer to the exact same presentation made then by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I know that the judgment of this Committee on this matter will be exactly the same as the expressed judgment of the House earlier today, and that the pending amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Do we correctly understand that this bill was reported out unanimously by the subcommittee?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. This provision was in the bill when it was reported out?

Mr. ROONEY. It certainly was.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 57, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 54, line 11, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$4,000,000."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offer would reduce the appropriation for export control from the sum recommended by the committee of \$5,000,000 to the sum of \$4,000,000, which is the identical amount made available originally for this activity during the current fiscal year.

We went into the operation of this activity in the deficiency subcommittee very carefully late last spring, during the month of June, I think, and as a result of the investigation which we made at that time, recommended an appropriation of \$4,000,000 for the activity.

At that time the activity had some 750 items to control, while at this time, if I am correctly advised, the number of items has decreased from 750 to 300.

I realize the importance of this work, but it seems to me, in the light of the decrease referred to, that the amount of \$4,000,000, which was made available originally for the current fiscal year, should suffice for the fiscal year 1950.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] should know when he makes the statement that \$4,000,000 is sufficient for export control this year, that he is not making a statement which is entirely accurate, because not only did the Committee on Appropriations allow \$4,000,000 a year ago for that purpose, but the gentleman and the gentleman's subcommittee on deficiencies only a few weeks ago reported to the House a deficiency bill, which the House passed, allowing an additional \$1,115,000 for that purpose. At that time, when the gentleman's committee allowed \$1,115,000 over the \$4,000,000 appropriation in order to continue export control for the remainder of the present fiscal year, he knew that there were a number of items decontrolled. That was all fully brought out in the testimony before the gentleman's committee.

This committee, in the pending instance, is very much concerned with proper enforcement of export control. We do not want to again hear statements about certain goods getting into the hands of countries behind the iron curtain. We do not again want to find that a quantity of steel or copper or something else has been transhipped so as to get into the hands of the Soviet Union, or Communist-dominated countries. For that reason this committee proceeds on the theory that the control of exports from this country should be as strong as it is possible to make it. For that reason, and also for the further reason that here again we have another item in this bill on which the committee has acted unanimously, I ask that the pending amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4016) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 180, he reported the bill back to the House without amendment.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am, like all rural Congressmen should be, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PHILLIPS of California moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 20, line 7, after the semicolon, strike out all down to and including the word "thereon" on line 10.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS of California) there were—ayes 62, noes 143.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Thirty-nine Members have risen; not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-nine Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MICHIGAN DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE MIGHT DO A LITTLE HOUSECLEANING

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the olden days, springtime always meant housecleaning time and, in many of the smaller communities of Michigan, it still means a raking of the lawn, a picking up and a piling at the curb of the rubbish which has collected since the preceding fall. Then around come the city collectors and haul it away to the dump.

Last year, in the national city cleanup contest, South Haven, Van Buren County, Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, won second place in its class, a New Jersey city winning first.

Evidently Hicks Griffiths, chairman of the Democratic State central committee of Michigan, has forgotten that it is springtime and that the Democratic Party of Michigan needs a little renovating and face-lifting, for, neglecting his home work, he criticizes my attempt to do a little political renovating and dis-infecting by sending out copies of a speech I made on the floor of the House on March 17, 1949—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2729.

Under date of April 2, the United Press quotes him as follows:

Representative HOFFMAN has flooded Michigan in the last few days with a Republican campaign leaflet privately reprinted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and mailed at Government expense.

This leaflet, for the distribution of which the taxpayers of the Nation must pay, bluntly calls on Michigan voters to vote Republican.

To use your money and mine to finance this sort of campaign may be legal, but it violates every American standard of decency and fair play.

Some Republicans remember with regret that, in last fall's campaign, a few corporations violated a Federal statute by making political contributions to a Republican political committee. Some individuals and some corporations were indicted by the Democratic law-enforcement officers. Some were acquitted. A few, I understand, entered pleas of guilty and paid the penalty.

Later, it was learned that one Franco, then chairman of the Democratic State central committee, had solicited and, if memory serves correctly, received political contributions from postmasters or postal employees in Michigan, such solicitations having been made to two postal officials in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

Franco, it later appeared, worked with a relative who received a percentage of the collections, which were made for the Democratic political campaign in Michigan.

Although a committee of the House held hearings and obtained evidence indicating a violation of the Hatch Act, to date I have been unable to learn of any criminal prosecutions.

I am wondering why it is that Mr. Griffiths, whom I do not know personally and who admits that my sending out of a speech made on the floor of the House and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was not a violation of any law, is so concerned and charges that the

franking out of that speech violates every American standard of decency and fair play, and, at the same time, overlooks the obviously and admittedly illegal acts of soliciting of campaign funds from postmasters by Democratic officials during the 1948 campaign.

I assume Mr. Griffiths has undoubtedly read that bit of Scripture which inquires:

And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye.

No charge, direct or indirect, is made that Mr. Griffiths is a hypocrite, for I have no knowledge of his activities except this one reported press statement.

But, as a matter of fact, the mote which he assumes to find in my procedure does not exist, for he admits that it was not illegal. In his opinion, it just violated the "American standard of decency and fair play."

But Democratic Congressmen from Michigan and the administration have for years been following the methods I used.

But what about the Democratic political allies in Michigan—the CIO, the UAW-CIO, the UE-CIO? August Scholle, president of the Michigan State CIO, recently publicly announced, according to the press:

Never again will the CIO support a Republican, regardless of his liberalism, ability, or honesty.

The UE-CIO has many officers who have refused, and still refuse, to deny under oath that they are affiliated with the Communist Party or with an organization which advocates the overthrow of this Government by force, but, during the spring campaign in Michigan, which involved the election of at least six State officials, the control of the State administrative board, the CIO organizations, according to Scholle, their State president, were political bedfellows of the Democratic State organization.

It may be that the Democratic organization in Michigan was not a voluntary bedfellow of the labor union officials who refused to deny that they were Communists. Let us be charitable and assume that it was not. Let us admit that it was just kidnapped. But, if so, during the campaign it remained a complacent captive.

It is matter of common report that some of the appointments of the Democratic Governor, "Soapy" Williams, elected last fall, have been dictated by the CIO. Some of those appointments were refused confirmation by a Republican senate, which may or may not mean something.

However, as to one appointment, the nine Democratic members of the Michigan State senate refused to confirm and, Republicans remaining silent, the appointment was rejected.

Democratic Governor Williams charged that the Democratic senators

refused to confirm the appointment because of some disagreement over patronage. This was denied by the Democratic senators and impartial observers seem to be justified in their conclusion that the Democratic Governor, "Soapy" Williams, in making his appointments, has listened to the CIO rather than to the tried and true members of his own party.

It was matter of common knowledge last fall that the CIO took over the organization and dictated the policies of the Democratic State convention. The CIO, without any very serious contradiction, claimed credit last fall for the election of the Democratic candidate for governor and for those on the Democratic ticket who were elected to State office.

Knowing, as I do, that the overwhelming majority of the rank and file of the CIO are patriotic, loyal, honest, sincere Americans, but realizing also that the Communists, as predicted by John L. Lewis away back in 1924, were attempting to take over the American labor movement and that a few had infiltrated into the CIO, and that many of the officers of that organization refused to sign anti-Communist affidavits, is it strange that I view with alarm and with apprehension the seizure of the Democratic organization in Michigan, which, whatever may have been its political philosophy, was always an organization working toward what its members believed was for the good of the State and the Nation?

To see the organization of the Democratic Party of Michigan, as has been the organization of the national Democratic Party, captured and prostituted by the CIO, which, until last fall, never officially denounced the Communists within its ranks, was heartbreaking.

Hence it was that I felt, and now feel, that it was my duty to the people of my State and to the Nation to do everything within my power to bring home to the people of Michigan the fact, for fact it was, that the CIO, forsaking the legitimate purposes of a labor union, was attempting, under the banner of the Democratic Party, to obtain political control of the State of Michigan.

My only regret is that I lacked the time, the ability and the funds to cover the State of Michigan with arguments which would defeat the CIO's program, the program of its officers who refuse to deny that they are Communists.

Mr. Griffiths, chairman of the Michigan State Democratic Committee, finding himself in the company he is, might well hang his head in shame, sit in sackcloth and ashes, instead of charging that my small contribution, which I hope helped the Republicans of Michigan win the April 4 election, violated any "American standard of decency and fair play."

I wonder if Mr. Griffiths has forgotten the December 1 raid of the CIO goon squads on the peaceful city of Kalamazoo. Surely he has read the papers. Surely he knows something of the facts.

Certainly he knows that, in that raid, big, strong men, in groups, unmercifully beat not only men but women. He knows that they maliciously destroyed personal property, injured real estate, defied police officers, drove needy workers

from their jobs, so depriving them of their pay checks.

Does he contend that those rioters—and there have been many other similar incidents in Michigan—were not violating "every American standard of decency and fair play"?

Yet, during the campaign preceding the April 4 election, he was working shoulder to shoulder, hand in glove, with the officers of an organization whose members were guilty of the most cowardly, reprehensible, and unlawful conduct.

During the 14 years which I have served in Congress, I have sat by and watched the Democratic administration send out tons of propaganda, spend millions of dollars, to influence elections. Yes; according to the report of two Senate committees—committees controlled by the Democratic organization itself—the administration spent money appropriated for relief to buy votes.

Only recently in the Capitol, I saw a room where was piled a part of the 83,000 separate and distinct publications put out by the Federal Government with the taxpayers' money, and many of them apparently having no legitimate purpose, except to perpetuate the administration in power.

I am all through sitting idly by, watching the Democratic administration use the taxpayers' money to perpetuate itself in office without any attempt on my part to meet that propaganda by every means which may be lawfully employed.

It is regrettable that so many Republicans have not waged a vigorous, persistent battle against the flood of propaganda, the tons of printed matter, written, printed, and sent out with the taxpayers' money, the main purpose of which was to perpetuate themselves in office and saddle upon the American people a socialistic program, as, for example, socialized medicine or the taking over of the steel industry by the Federal Government.

To my colleagues I say, "Let's be up and at 'em"; let us give those who have seized control of the Democratic Party a dose of their own medicine. Let us expose their hypocrisy, the unsoundness of their program, and the disaster at the end of the road which they are now following.

If we are to avoid state socialism, not only must Republicans, but Democrats as well, fight those who, under whatever banner, seek to change the form of government which has made us what we are, given to the individual here in the United States of America the prosperity, happiness, and freedom which he now enjoys, which he should cherish, and for which he should be willing to make a fight.

I am printing herewith a newspaper article, showing some of the tactics of the United Steel Workers, CIO, the present political ally of Mr. Griffiths' Democratic organization:

LOSS IS FIXED IN "GOON" RAID—WELL OVER MINIMUM FOR FELONY CHARGE

(By Merle Oliver)

KALAMAZOO, MICH., March 31.—Testimony at the examination of eight officials of the United Steelworkers (USW-CIO) charged with conspiracy to incite a riot at the Shake-

spear Co. plants here was completed at 12:30 a. m. today before Circuit Judge James R. Breakey, Jr., of Ann Arbor.

Arguments of attorneys will be heard next Wednesday.

Judge Breakey held a night session at the request of prosecution and defense counsel. Most of Wednesday evening was taken up with bickering as to whether "goon" raiders did more than \$50 damage to the Shakespeare buildings during the riot December 1, and whether personal-property damage exceeded that amount.

FIFTY DOLLARS MEANS FELONY

Among the 11 counts in the warrant are charges of conspiracy to damage personal property and conspiracy to damage the buildings. Loss of more than \$50 must be shown to constitute a felony.

After sending to the plants several times for cost-production records, Judge Breakey finally ruled that the company lost more than \$225 on 750 fishing-reel spool assemblies which, witnesses said, were damaged beyond repair by the raiders.

Company witnesses said 385 windows were broken, and a glazier testified that loss was more than \$50.

VIOLENCE IS TOLD

A truck burned during the riot, but it belonged to a dairy and the warrant refers only to Shakespeare Co. damage.

The testimony regarding financial losses followed accounts by victims of mob violence in the two plants during the riots.

Bernard E. Taffee, plant guard, testified that 15 men rushed through the main entrance hollering and yelling like animals.

"I heard them yell 'get the hell out of here, or we'll kill every damn one of you,'" he said. "Four of them jumped on James Norris, an employee who was sitting on a bench in the entrance hall."

He pointed to Harry Stefanick, a defendant, and said:

RETREATED FROM GUN

"I saw Stefanick pick up Norris and throw him down, striking his head on the floor. When I went to his assistance and pushed them away from him, the four ran on into the plant."

A crowd had gathered in front of the door and tried to burst in, Taffee related. He said he drew his gun and ordered them to stay out. The crowd retreated.

"After I'd driven them out they threw bricks, stones, coal, a box, and a shovel through the door," Taffee continued. "They tried to tear the door off its hinges. Behind me in the plant I could hear trays of fishing reel and auto parts being dumped on the floor."

HAD LIVE COALS

"I could hear the crowd outside shouting, 'Let's set the plant on fire and burn the damn thing down.' William Hall (of Kalamazoo), came to the door with a scoop shovel full of live coals. He shouted, 'We'll set it on fire.' A woman striker was egging them on, shouting at them to burn the building."

"William Bush, another former employee (strikers are described as former employees in court because the company claims the strike ended), came running with a can of oil. So many things were being thrown at me that I could not tell who did it."

Mrs. Judy Anne Smalley, of Bloomingdale, appeared in court with her right eye still discolored 4 months after the riot, and testified that one of the men who broke into the plant grabbed her hair and held her head back against the wall while a second struck her face, inflicting a cut over her eye. She said she still requires treatment for a nervous condition resulting from her experience.

POLICE STOOD BY

Virgil Sanford, assistant foreman, testified that members of the mob kicked him in the groin, slapped him and pushed him along the street away from the plant. He identified Glen E. Sigman, international representative, as one of the persons at Gate 3, where he tried to enter.

Patrolman Argyle Growder, of the Kalamazoo police, admitted under questioning by Judge Breaker and Special Prosecutor Clair S. Beebe that police merely stood and watched while the "goons" overturned automobiles and mauled plant employees.

"I was warned that I would find myself in the gutter if I interfered," Growder said.

He testified that while a truck burned, a "goon" told the policemen: "If you have any idea of using that fire hose, you had better change your mind." A policeman assured the raider "that is not our job," Growder said.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 132, providing for the consideration of and waiving certain points of order on H. R. 4046, a bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count again. [After counting.] Two hundred and five Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and there were—yeas 145, nays 212, answered "present" 1, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—145

Allen, Calif.	Cunningham	Hoeven
Allen, Ill.	Curtis	Hoffman, Ill.
Andersen,	Dague	Hoffman, Mich.
H. Carl	Davis, Wis.	Holmes
Anderson, Calif.	D'Ewart	Hope
Andresen,	Dolliver	Horan
August H.	Dondero	Hull
Angell	Ellsworth	Jackson, Calif.
Barrett, Wyo.	Engel, Mich.	James
Bates, Mass.	Fenton	Javits
Beall	Ford	Jenkins
Bennett, Mich.	Fulton	Jennings
Bishop	Gamble	Jensen
Blackney	Gavin	Johnson
Boggs, Del.	Golden	Jonas
Bolton, Ohio	Goodwin	Judd
Bramblett	Graham	Kean
Brehm	Gross	Kearns
Brown, Ohio	Gwinn	Keating
Burdick	Hagen	Keefe
Byrnes, Wis.	Hale	Kilburn
Canfield	Hall	Kunkel
Case, N. J.	Edwin Arthur	LeCompte
Chapfield	Halleck	LeFevre
Church	Hand	Lemke
Clevenger	Harden	Lichtenwalter
Cole, Kans.	Harvey	Lodge
Cole, N. Y.	Herter	McCulloch
Corbett	Heseltun	McDonough
Cotton	Hill	McGregor
Crawford	Hinshaw	McMillen, Ill.

Mack, Wash.	Phillips, Tenn.	Smith, Kans.
Martin, Iowa	Plumley	Smith, Wis.
Martin, Mass.	Potter	Stefan
Mason	Poulson	Stockman
Morrow	Rankin	Taber
Meyer	Reed, Ill.	Talle
Michener	Reed, N. Y.	Van Zandt
Miller, Md.	Rees	Velde
Miller, Nebr.	Rich	Vorys
Murray, Wis.	Riehlman	Vursell
Nelson	Rogers, Mass.	Wadsworth
Nicholson	Sadlak	Welch
Nixon	St. George	Welch, Calif.
Norblad	Sanborn	Werdell
O'Hara, Minn.	Scott	Wigglesworth
Patterson	Hugh D., Jr.	Wilson, Ind.
Pfeiffer	Scrivner	Withrow
William L.	Scudder	Wolcott
Phillips, Calif.	Simpson, Ill.	Wolverton

NAYS—212

Abbitt	Garmatz	O'Hara, Ill.
Abernethy	Gary	O'Konski
Addonizio	Gordon	O'Neill
Albert	Gorski, Ill.	O'Sullivan
Allen, La.	Gorski, N. Y.	O'Toole
Andrews	Gossett	Pace
Aspinall	Granahan	Passman
Barden	Granger	Patman
Baring	Grant	Patten
Barrett, Pa.	Green	Perkins
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	Peterson
Battle	Hardy	Philbin
Beckworth	Hare	Pickett
Bennett, Fla.	Hart	Poage
Bentzen	Hays, Ark.	Polk
Biemiller	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Blatnik	Hébert	Preston
Boggs, La.	Hedrick	Priest
Bolling	Herlong	Rabaut
Bolton, Md.	Hobbs	Rains
Bosone	Hollifield	Ramsay
Boykin	Howell	Regan
Breen	Huber	Rhodes
Brown, Ga.	Irving	Ribicoff
Bryson	Jackson, Wash.	Richards
Buckley, Ill.	Jacobs	Rivers
Burke	Jones, A'a.	Rodino
Burleson	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Fla.
Burnside	Jones, N. C.	Rooney
Burton	Karst	Sabath
Camp	Karsten	Sadowski
Cannon	Kee	Sasser
Carnahan	Kelley	Secrest
Carroll	Kennedy	Sikes
Cavalcante	Kerr	Sims
Chatham	Kilday	Smathers
Chelf	King	Smith, Va.
Chesney	Kruse	Spence
Christopher	Lanham	Staggers
Chudoff	Larade	Stanley
Colmer	Lesinski	Steed
Combs	Lind	Stigler
Cooley	Linehan	Sullivan
Cooper	Lucas	Sutton
Crook	Lynch	Tackett
Crosser	McCarthy	Tauriello
Davies, N. Y.	McCormack	Teague
Dawson	McGrath	Thomas, Tex.
Deane	McGuire	Thompson
DeGraffenried	McKinnon	Thornberry
Delaney	McSweeney	Trimble
Denton	Mack, Ill.	Underwood
Dollinger	Magee	Wagner
Donohue	Mahon	Walter
Doughton	Mansfield	Welch, Mo.
Douglas	Marsalis	Wheeler
Doyle	Miles	White, Calif.
Durham	Miller, Calif.	Whitten
Eberharter	Mills	Whittington
Elliot	Mitchell	Wickersham
Engle, Calif.	Monroney	Wiler
Evins	Morgan	Williams
Fallon	Morris	Willis
Feighan	Morrison	Wilson, Okla.
Fernandez	Moulder	Winstead
Fisher	Multer	Woodhouse
Flood	Murdock	Worley
Fogarty	Murray, Tenn.	Yates
Forand	Noland	Young
Frazier	Norton	Zablocki
Fugate	O'Brien, Ill.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—74

Arends	Buckley, N. Y.	Coffey
Auchincloss	Bulwinkle	Coudert
Bailey	Byrne, N. Y.	Cox
Bland	Carlyle	Davenport
Bonner	Case, S. Dak.	Davis, Ga.
Brooks	Celler	Davis, Tenn.
Buchanan	Clements	Dingell

Eaton	Klein	Scott, Hardie
Elston	Lane	Shafer
Fellows	Latham	Sheppard
Furcolo	Lovre	Short
Gathings	Lyle	Simpson, Pa.
Gillette	McConnell	Smith, Ohio
Gilmer	McMillan, S. C.	Taylor
Gore	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Hall	Madden	Tollefson
Leonard W.	Marshall	Towe
Harris	Morton	Vinson
Harrison	Murphy	Walsh
Havener	Norrell	Whitaker
Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.	White, Idaho
Heller	Pfeifer	Wilson, Tex.
Jenison	Joseph L.	Wood
Kearney	Price	Woodruff
Keogh	Quinn	
Kirwan	Redden	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Wood against.
 Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Harrison against.
 Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Gilmer against.
 Mr. Hall, Leonard W., for, with Mr. Heller against.
 Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Klein against.
 Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Murphy against.
 Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Brooks against.
 Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Vinson against.
 Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Walsh against.
 Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Madden against.
 Mr. Scott Hardie for, with Mr. Cox against.
 Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Clemente against.
 Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Quinn against.
 Mr. Short for, with Mr. Furcolo against.
 Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Whitaker against.
 Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Wilson of Texas against.
 Mr. Jenison for, with Mr. McMillan of South Carolina against.
 Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Lane against.
 Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Havener against.
 Mr. Fellows for, with Mr. Buchanan against.
 Mr. Tollefson for, with Mr. Bonner against.
 Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Davenport against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution, notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived excepting the provision appearing on page 19, lines 18 to 21, inclusive, in the paragraph under the heading "General Provisions." That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, we have before us for consideration House Resolution 182 from the Committee on Rules. I retain one-half hour for my own consumption and yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] one-half hour.

Mr. Speaker, I shall say only one thing with regard to the bill this rule makes in order: It is a bill making appropriations to cover deficiencies in departments in which the membership is deeply interested.

This appropriation expires with the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1949.

This appropriation touches almost all phases of our activities and I know the Members of the House will give it consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time. I am not going to detain the House longer, because I know the Members wish to consider this resolution immediately.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio has informed the House as to the legislation which this rule, if adopted, would bring before the House. I believe, however, it is my duty to point out to the House a certain provision in the rule itself which, if I am not mistaken, has not appeared in rules heretofore granted by the Rules Committee, at least not for a considerable period of time. It will be found in line 9 of the rule, that feature providing for the waiving of points of order. An exception is made excepting the provision appearing on page 19, lines 18 to 21 inclusive, in that paragraph under the heading "General Provisions." If this rule is adopted that in effect means that a point of order would lie against that particular provision specifically mentioned in the rule.

May I say just a few words about the situation which impelled the Committee on Rules to insert a special provision of this kind? I wish to say in explaining the situation that I am not criticizing the Committee on Appropriations. We all know it is a very hard-worked committee and has terrific demands made upon it, but as time has gone along and the Committee on Rules has received requests from the Committee on Appropriations from time to time we have noticed that an ever-increasing number of requests are made for the waiving of points of order on appropriation bills, those requests being impelled by the Chairman or other members of the Appropriations Committee in their desire to repeal or alter existing law with respect to appropriations. The first appropriation bill in this Congress was a deficiency appropriation bill. In it there were something like eight or twelve changes in existing law—in a bill reported from the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Rules granted a rule waiving all points of order, which meant that no point of order could be raised against those provisions which are legislation upon an appropriation bill in conflict with the standard rules of the House. The same thing has occurred on other

appropriation bills; and in this bill you will find half a dozen legislative provisions. In the hearing before the Committee on Rules it was ascertained that all but one of these legislative provisions were essentially not objectionable; they dealt with minor things, although they did deal with present law. But one of these provisions, which is legislative in character, actually repeals a statute completely; that is the one referred to in this rule. I do not know whether I am reflecting accurately the opinion of the Committee on Rules or not, although I know I am reflecting the opinion of a good many members of that committee regardless of party affiliation when I say that we are reaching the belief that some caution should be used hereafter in conceding to the Committee on Appropriations the power to legislate, for every time it is done that power is taken away from the standing committee which drafted the original authorization act. The standing committees have thoroughly studied such matters when they report legislation and if there are any changes in existing law that are needed, those are the committees that should consider that matter.

We also note—I think I am telling the truth—that in a considerable majority of requests for suspension of this rule, as it were, waiving points of order, the provisions which are sought to be freed from the ordinary rules of the House are provisions withdrawing certain restrictions heretofore imposed by law upon the executive departments in the spending of money. In nearly all cases the restrictions are urged to be withdrawn. It is a tendency which many of us think should attract our attention because, after all, if restrictions are to be withdrawn the withdrawal should emanate from the standing committee that originally imposed them by law.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. It seems to me that after all we should revert to what has been the policy of the House. The Rules Committee lately, apparently, is granting all kinds of closed rules. We have heard a lot about closed rules recently. This is an extensive rule. This rule takes away from the legislative committee the right to consider whether or not an important law should be repealed. I was a member of the Rules Committee for years. I am not a member this year. But we established a rule when the Appropriations Committee came in each year asking for permission to violate the law by rule of the committee, and we said: "You can have it this year, but do not come back next year with the same thing. Go to the legislative committee that considered it in the first place."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has accentuated the very thing I have been trying to explain. In this particular case the Rules Committee has declined to recommend a rule with ref-

erence to this particular provision in the appropriation bill which in effect repeals existing law.

I hope this rule is adopted, but I hope also that in the future the Rules Committee, and I can speak only for myself, will become a little more strict with respect to the granting of any rules waiving points of order, because otherwise the habit grows and grows and the Appropriations Committee will step by step take over the legislative functions of standing committees.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that the Rules Committee is making any effort in any way to punish legislative committees, but it is merely to try to have our laws conform to the rules of the House that this special arrangement is made.

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure now in yielding to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], such time as he may desire.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, for years I have called attention to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations from time to time has deprived the legislative committees of their functions and their right to bring in legislation. As most of the older Members know, I have served notice on the Committee on Appropriations that it must desist in its endeavor to take over the power of legislative committees.

During the present session I think the Committee on Appropriations has acted in a manner which has expedited the business of the House. It has not called upon the Committee on Rules and asked for rules that were unreasonable, and consequently they were granted. This rule is not a closed rule. It is an open rule waiving points of order on some provisions against which a point of order would lie. Now, waiving points of order means that the membership will have the right to vote upon those provisions that would be stricken out on a point of order. We are not depriving the Members of any rights. In this instance an exception has been made, and that is the reason I am taking the floor. We brought in a rule waiving points of order with the exception of one provision, as has been stated, on page 19, lines 18 to 21, inclusive, where the last Congress unfortunately, I think, and I think for political reasons, restricted the Department in spending certain moneys or limiting the expenditure of certain moneys. I thought that the Committee on Appropriations, as it explained its position, was justified in embodying that repeal in the appropriation bill, though it was legislation. It was merely aiming to eliminate the unfair restriction placed upon them by the Republican majority. But, to enable us to report a rule granting the request of the Committee on Appropriations waiving points of order on all the others, we were obliged to make that exception in this case. But, in the future, may I say to the chairman and the members of the Committee on Appropriations, they must refrain from including legislation in their appropriation bills unless it is absolutely necessary for

immediate consideration, or for the purpose of expediting business. I hope that they will take my advice and warning and will not do so in the future unless, as I have said, it is absolutely necessary for orderly procedure to bring about early consideration of legislation that is actually urgent.

In view of the fact that the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], stated that all the other eight or nine provisions that would have been subject to a point of order are satisfactory to the Republicans and to the members of that committee, I feel that the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittee have acted wisely and prudently and have not really done anything which would be considered unfair or unjustified. In view of conditions, I think the rule should be adopted, and I hope that the Committee on Appropriations will be careful in the future not to bring in legislation on their appropriation bills that would deprive legislative committees of their power and their function.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to debate this resolution, and I apologize to the House for taking time at this late hour.

But the impression which has been given by all who have spoken today is so erroneous that in justice to the House, which has listened to these strictures, and to those who will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and especially in justice to the Committee on Appropriations, which has been so grossly maligned—I desire to give you briefly the facts as they are.

The rules of the House of Representatives are, not only the product of 150 years of trial and experience in the American House of Representatives, but they also embody the centuries of practice and procedure in the English House of Commons, which constituted the foundation on which Jefferson predicated his first legislative rules of order. As a result they constitute the most perfect system of parliamentary procedure to be found in the world today.

But even so perfect a system of procedure cannot without adjustment meet every parliamentary situation. The business with which the Congress deals—the business of the United States—is the greatest business in the world. It covers so wide a field and involves such vast expenditures that no set of rigid rules could possibly be expected to meet every emergency. For this reason it is provided that where the rules do not meet the requirements of a specific situation the Committee on Rules may by special resolution take care of the specific needs of the moment.

In such instances, and this is such an instance, the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of the House may apply to the committee for a special order. That is why this resolution is before the House.

The rules very wisely divide the field of jurisdiction between the appropriation and legislative committees. No legislative committee may report a bill carrying an appropriation. And conversely no appropriation bill may carry legislation. This rule is and should be strictly enforced. And yet I do not recall any general appropriation bill reported to the House in the last 12 years which did not carry from 1 to 25 or more legislative provisions. The explanation is that they are of such a minor nature and so necessarily incident to the purpose of the bill that no legislative committee would think of putting in motion the ponderous machinery of the House to authorize them. That is true of every item subject to a point of order in the pending bill. No legislative committee would go to the trouble of drafting and reporting a bill to authorize any of these items.

On the other hand, no appropriation bill reported out in recent years has carried any major legislation encroaching on the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House and no legislative committee of the House has ever protested any item in the thousands of minor legislative provisions, of which the pending bill is a fair example, carried by the many bills reported out by the Committee on Appropriations.

None of these legislative provisions about which such a tempest in a teapot has been raised here on the floor in the last half hour originated in the Committee on Appropriations. We did not write a single one of them. They are incorporated in the budget estimates sent to the President by the Bureau of the Budget and by the President transmitted to the Speaker, who refers them to the committee. They are administrative recommendations and all that is asked is that they be laid before the House and the House given an opportunity to vote on them. So the Committee on Appropriations does not have the slightest personal interest in them. And when these gentlemen go to kicking them around here on the floor you are not merely slamming the committee. You are slamming the administration. You are slamming the Bureau of the Budget and the President and the Speaker as well as the committee.

But why slam them around at all? Why all this sudden turmoil? They are items which no legislative committee of the House would take the trouble to authorize. And all that is asked is that the House be given a chance to vote on them—and vote them up or vote them down as determined by their merit or demerit. The Bureau of the Budget asks that the House be allowed to vote on them. The President asks that the House be allowed to vote on them. The Democratic members of the subcommittee unanimously ask that the House be allowed to vote on them. The Democratic members of the Committee on Appropriations unanimously ask that the House be allowed to vote on them. But these gentlemen refuse to allow the House to vote on them. That means that

all which are knocked out of the bill on points of order will be put in over on the other side of the Capitol. And the House of Representatives, which is closest to the people and which has first hold on the purse strings of the Nation and which ought to be the ranking body of the legislative branch of the Government, becomes to that degree subordinate to the Senate.

The only question raised by this rule is whether the House will be allowed to vote on one particular item in the bill. So let us look at the merits of this particular item. It is not a law, as has been intimated here, which was sponsored by a legislative committee. It was put in an appropriation bill in the last Congress on recommendation from the Committee on Appropriations.

Incidentally, it is a freak in the legislative museum. No provision like this has ever been passed by any Congress in the last 150 years. This is the first time it has ever been used. And it is the last time it will ever be used, because no such provision is carried in the 1950 appropriation bill. The objection is that it is absolutely unworkable. The Department has been unable to enforce it. And the General Accounting Office is unable to say whether it has been enforced or not. It is a legislative monstrosity.

It purports to impose a limitation of \$875,000 on expenditures for personnel work. As a matter of fact, there are 252 separate appropriations to which the limitation presumably attaches. It would seem to be very easy to determine how much of the \$875,000 should be applied to each of these appropriations, but some of the appropriations—by far the largest amount of money involved—were appropriations for construction which are continuing from year to year and which lose their identity when necessarily intermingled on the books of the Department with previous appropriations for the same projects. Furthermore, there are nearly 2,000 separate offices and establishments, scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Canadian border to the Rio Grande, and in Alaska and the island possessions, supported by the various appropriations, each of which must be allocated a portion of the \$875,000. There is no Solomon alive who could intelligently distribute the fund, and there is no auditor who could ever prove that the allocations had been respected.

It is very easy to say that the Department of the Interior shall not expend more than \$875,000 for the various activities properly chargeable as personnel work. It is far from simple to administer such a far-reaching limitation when the practical facts are taken into account—that is, allocation of the limitation among 252 appropriations and 2,000 offices and establishments, involving a distribution which the Committee on Appropriations and the Comptroller General of the United States could never expect to audit and prove the compliance or noncompliance of the Department.

The recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations was to repeal this

unworkable and impracticable limitation. The committee, and the House, have already recognized its impracticability in striking it out of the appropriation bill for 1950. The Department cannot administer it, and the General Accounting Office can never prove whether they were right or wrong.

Now I ask anyone here, What legislative committee of the House would take the time and the trouble to bring in a bill authorizing this provision of the pending bill? It was originally enacted on a recommendation from the Committee on Appropriations. It has proven impracticable and has already been taken out of the 1950 appropriation bill on recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations. Only the money in the original bill is affected. No legislative committee would consider a bill to authorize this one isolated item. Why do these gentlemen protest so vociferously when the committee proposes to follow the time-honored procedure—and the only procedure which will repeal the provision before the Senate repeals it?

May I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding statements made on the floor here this afternoon, the Committee on Appropriations has been exemplary in its observance of the rules of the House. Even during those years of stress when we were reporting out the largest war appropriations of all time, and when routine sometimes yielded to expediency, the Committee on Appropriations scrupulously avoided reporting major legislation of any character. Never has any legislative committee of the House been given reason to protest encroachment on its jurisdiction by any appropriation bill.

I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, most emphatically that contrary to any statements made in this debate, the Committee on Appropriations has not at any time and will not at any time in the future encroach or infringe on the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that any attempt has been made to make this a partisan issue or question. I can assure you that it is not. This rule was reported as it is by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules, which is controlled by the majority party, by a two-to-one majority.

This rule is here because the great Committee on Appropriations came before the Rules Committee and asked for a special rule. I am sure you all understand that an appropriation bill can be called up at any time and considered under an open rule, subject to amendment, and to points of order, without obtaining a rule of any kind from the Rules Committee. It is only when the Committee on Appropriations wishes a special rule, either a closed or a gag rule, to prevent amendments, or one to waive points of order on items within an appropriation bill, that the Committee on Appropriations comes before the Rules Committee.

In my opinion it is often necessary—though it may be something to be regretted—for the Appropriations Com-

mittee to come before the Rules Committee and ask for a rule waiving points of order on some measure, simply because it saves legislative time, especially where there is no controversy or conflict over that which they want to do. But in this instance the application for this rule contained in it a request to waive a point of order on a section of standing or existing law that had been written into the statutes of the United States by the direct, affirmative action of the Congress. On all of the other items on which the waiver of points of order was requested on this bill, the provisions were limitations. But on this particular provision, lines 17 to 21 on page 19, the waiving of a point of order would permit the repealing of a limitation that had been previously enacted by the Congress. So that you will know what it is, the limitation was to limit the amount of money that could be spent by one department of the Government on personnel employees. This limitation had been written into the law, in the wisdom of the full Congress, because of certain bad practices which had been found in this one particular department, to wit, that they had just been having too many personnel employees. I do not think the Congress acted unwisely at all when it put that limitation into the law, because, during my service as a member of the Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, we had a task force made up of very distinguished Americans, a bipartisan or a nonpartisan task force, which made a study of the personnel problem and learned that we had some 43,000 employees in the Government who devoted all of their time to personnel problems, in addition to the Civil Service Commission and all of its employees. In other words, we have one personnel employee to every 50 other employees in the Federal Government, which is just a little more than we need.

I presume that the great Committee on Appropriations, when they brought in this original law, found that there were just too many personnel employees in this particular department in comparison with the number found necessary in the other departments of the Government. Therefore it wrote the limitation into the law.

Now, since that limitation was written into the law by the Congress, this present committee, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon], has already passed one deficiency appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There was no attempt, no provision made in any way, to repeal this section of law by any provision in the first deficiency appropriation bill or any other appropriation bill which came from the Appropriations Committee after the original limitation had been written into the law of the land. But now this provision is brought in in this bill, and we are asked to give a rule to waive points of order on it.

The Rules Committee went into the matter rather thoroughly. The Committee on Rules is your representative to see that we do not grant rules that will waive points of order and thereby take away from the Members their right to object to some legislative matter unless it is absolutely necessary and wise to do so and will help in the conduct of the business of the House and aid orderly procedure.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but I cannot yield.

So we inquired into this particular matter upon which we were requested to waive the point of order, just as we inquired into every other section. In the opinion of every member of the Committee on Rules each request the great Committee on Appropriations made that points of order be waived on different items in this bill was justified with the exception of this one. The testimony before the Committee on Rules was that no evidence whatsoever had been submitted to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, or to the Committee on Appropriations as a whole, justifying this action. No information as to why it was done was given except that it had been requested. There was no testimony taken by the Appropriations Committee on it at all. The Rules Committee, therefore, in the exercise of its judgment and discretion, came to the conclusion that it would be wrong to grant a rule to waive points of order on this particular item inasmuch as it had not been justified before the Committee on Rules. We were simply acting as your servant.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I will yield the gentleman one additional minute if he will yield for a question from the gentleman from Missouri and one by myself. Will the gentleman answer his question?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, I shall be pleased to answer.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I wish to correct the gentleman from Ohio. The vote in the Committee on Rules on this proposition was not unanimous; there were two dissenting votes, if I may correct the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If that be so, then I stand corrected. I knew the chairman of the committee brought up the question here on the floor, but if there was anyone else who voted against it I did not recall it. Although, perhaps, one member did vote against granting the rule because he was opposed to waiving any points of order.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Will the gentleman accept the time and answer the question of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said that the rule made it possible for anyone to object. Let me ask him: Does it make it possible for any one in this House to vote on this question?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, the gentleman understands that the general rules of the House give to every individual Member of this House the right to object to any item in an appropriation bill which has not been authorized by law, and when we pass a special rule waiving points of order we are taking away from individual Members of the House that right. In this case it should not be taken away.

Mr. CANNON. It is also taking away the right to vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend saying anything on this rule. I was one of those who voted against this rule in committee. But I do not like this idea that every time we call up a rule somebody gets up, and lambastes the Committee on Rules about this or that type of rule. If it is not proper to grant a rule of this type, why give the committee that authority at all? If the House does not want the Committee on Rules to have that authority, then the House can change the rules of procedure.

The Rules Committee is the servant of the House. It tries to carry out its duties to the best of its ability.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Yes; I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. No one has lambasted the Committee on Rules. I merely rose to protest the unwarranted and unprovoked castigation of the Committee on Appropriations. I object, and I am certain every member of the Committee on Appropriations objects, to unsupported statements made here this afternoon to the effect that the Committee on Appropriations habitually violates the rules of the House.

I wish to say again that the Committee on Appropriations has never included in any bill which has been offered in the last half dozen years any major legislation which deprived any legislative committee of its rights.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who is an authority upon the rules of procedure and certainly a great parliamentarian, if this House does not want the Rules Committee to have this type of authority, can it not change the rules of procedure to so correct the situation?

Mr. CANNON. That question has not been raised. Certainly I have not raised it here this afternoon.

Mr. COLMER. I am raising it now.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is the only one to raise it. But, on the contrary, every member of the Committee on Rules who has spoken on this resolution has charged the Committee on Appropriations with violating the rules when it has not been violating the rules.

Mr. COLMER. I am asking the gentleman if the House cannot change the rules.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly it can change the rules. And I shall vote for this resolution. But its right to change the rules does not give anyone the right to abuse any committee of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from a letter received from a union laboring man in his district.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Pathfinder Magazine.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a series of studies on the Taft-Hartley Act by Phelps Adams. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed 2 pages of the RECORD and will cost \$281.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Dr. I. I. Rabi.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by the Senator from Maine, Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, appearing in the Philadelphia Bulletin.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the statement of a former Member of Congress in regard to the pay of enlisted men.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution from the State Legislature of Oklahoma.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five instances and include excerpts.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. KEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FURCOLO (at the request of Mr. RODINO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by a 4-H Club winner.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of Connecticut.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include statements and excerpts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CARLYLE (at the request of Mr. KERR), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. WALSH (at the request of Mr. DENTON), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. KIRWAN (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD), for 10 days, on account of illness requiring his confinement in the naval hospital.

PRESENTATION OF BUST OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week a very inspiring ceremony was held on the east steps of the Capitol at which Mr. JOHN W. McCORMACK, the distinguished leader of this House, was the principal speaker. I was very much impressed by the ceremony itself which consisted of the presentation of a bust of Benjamin Franklin to Benjamin Franklin University of Washington, D. C. The presentation was made by the French Ambassador to the United States, M. Henri Bonnet, who made an excellent address, which is also included. My colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRY P. O'NEILL, was among the distinguished guests of honor.

I feel that the high lights of Mr. McCORMACK's address should be made a

permanent record of the annals of the House.

For the benefit of House Members who were unable to attend the presentation I want to say that the United States Navy Band, with Lt. Comdr. Charles Brendler conducting, added dignity and color to the occasion. The Most Reverend John M. McNamara, auxiliary bishop of Washington, made the invocation. The benediction was said by the Reverend Pierre Tourelle, pastor of the French Protestant Church.

Unfortunately, the Vice President of the United States was unable to be present as he had planned. The Senate met that morning at 11 o'clock and Mr. BARKLEY just could not leave the floor and his regrets were conveyed to the gathering by Mr. McCORMACK.

The bust of Benjamin Franklin was brought to this country on the French Gratitude Train which, as you know, was a spontaneous answer of the French people to the Friendship Train which was conceived by Mr. Drew Pearson, the well-known columnist and radio commentator. Mr. Pearson addressed the group, at the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and I am sorry that space does not permit me to quote excerpts from his remarks.

I was particularly impressed by the very fine address made by Mr. John T. Kennedy in accepting the presentation of the bust from Mr. Bonnet. Mr. Kennedy is the president of Benjamin Franklin University.

Here are the high lights of Mr. McCORMACK's address:

Mr. McCORMACK: We are gathered here this morning to witness the presentation of a gift from the French people to the Benjamin Franklin University of this city, a professional school of accountancy and financial administration. It is one of the few remaining professional schools of its type where free men and women in a free country, without great wealth, can receive a thorough academic background for the business world.

In its present form the Benjamin Franklin University was set up in 1925, so that by next year it will have contributed 25 years to public service. The university, reorganized in 1925, was the outgrowth of the former Pace Institute, which was established in 1907. So that in this sense the Benjamin Franklin University has rounded out nearly half a century of service to men and women and to country, and to men and women who otherwise would not have had the opportunity of receiving a professional education.

This occasion, the presence today of our distinguished guests, is a great tribute to the university and to Dr. John T. Kennedy, the president of Benjamin Franklin University; but I think today's occasion far transcends the presentation of a gift to this University. It is concrete evidence to the whole world of the close relationship between the French and the American people, a close friendship that has continued for decades and generations, and we hope and pray will continue for countless generations to come. It is a further manifestation of a long and enduring friendship between these two sovereign democratic countries and these two free peoples.

This occasion is, in a sense, democracy in action. We are showing by our actions today that free peoples can get along well through the exchange of gifts and not guns,

and if guns are necessary to preserve our way of life—this is my feeling; that we do not need planes poised for action to bully one another, but just like two neighbors, can help each other in moments of despair.

It was Benjamin Franklin who, when he was envoy to France, negotiated a loan from the French people totaling about \$60,000,000, a tremendous sum in those days, at almost the very hour of the birth of our own Government under constitutional form. The loan was made to us when we found ourselves in a most desperate situation.

We find ourselves this morning the recipient of another gift from France, a bust of Benjamin Franklin, which was executed during one of the trips to France of the great American patriot.

And now the bust, which the French people have so thoughtfully sent to this country, will be accepted by the Benjamin Franklin University. I want to introduce the university's president, a great educator, a man who has unselfishly served his fellowman, a distinguished Washingtonian—I wish he were a son of Massachusetts, we would welcome him—but a great American, which transcends all State lines, who has inspired thousands of men and women throughout his years as the head of the university. I am particularly pleased to present to you ladies and gentlemen, Dr. John T. Kennedy, president of the Benjamin Franklin University.

Following is the address by Dr. Kennedy:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and friends of Benjamin Franklin University and France, on behalf of the trustees, faculty and students of Benjamin Franklin University, I have the honor to accept this bust of Benjamin Franklin, which is one of the many tokens of friendship which have passed between the French people and our people.

We also accept the responsibility for keeping this bust on permanent display as one means of fostering that fellowship.

Particularly do we express our appreciation to Ambassador Bonnet, to Vice President Barkley, to Representative John McCormack, to the distinguished guests who are present, and to Mr. Olson and the District committee of the French Gratitude Train. Their efforts to promote good will between the two countries has received the wholehearted support of the American press, and one of our well-known commentators, Drew Pearson, has made notable contributions to this movement.

Benjamin Franklin was our pioneer in creating this spirit of friendship. He was the first diplomat to recognize that the relations between the two nations should be more than formal negotiations between governments and should represent the feelings of the people themselves.

To this end, on his mission to France he sought the support both of the French Government and of the French people. This support of the French people could never have been obtained as the result of any deliberate plan. It was obtained only because Franklin loved France and France loved Franklin.

The affection of the French people for Franklin was shown only in the way that the French can express their emotions. Everywhere Franklin went he was received with acclaim. There were numerous busts and statuettes of Franklin, and his portrait appeared on cards, on posters, on various souvenirs, and even on chinaware. Concerning these symbols one biographer writes that probably no man before Franklin ever had his likeness so widely current in so many forms.

Here it is to be noted that the French did not portray Franklin as being handsome or as being heroic. Rather, they portrayed him

as a sage, as a wise old man, and a counselor. Thus, their love for Franklin was shown to arise not from glamor but from the soul.

On his part Franklin expressed his affection for the French people in the warmest of terms. His feelings were summarized in a single sentence, which has been a household saying in France down to this very day. That sentence was: "Every man has two countries, his own and France."

Following Dr. Kennedy's address the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] returned to the stand and made one of the most dramatic condensations of a world problem that I have ever heard. His remarks were extemporaneous and I am sure after you have read them that you will agree with me that they will outlive the man. It was a speech delivered in truly heroic prose. Here it is:

What is the impression that this ceremony, this occasion, makes upon me, upon my mind, from the angle of deeper implications involving the minds of each and every one of us and the countless millions of people who believe in the dignity of man? The dignity of man cannot exist where belief in God is denied.

As a result of belief in God, the dignity of man and the rights of man necessarily follow.

As I sat here trying to get a thought, develop a thought, just to express it briefly so that I might fill in in the capacity of one making an address and yet not bore you, my mind went to pages of history and I saw down through the ages the time-honored struggle indicating that where law ceases tyranny starts. It is only under a government of laws, with many of which some of us may not be satisfied, but it is only under a government of laws that men and women can be free, free within the law, not free outside of the law. Today that great struggle of the countless ages of the past and for which unknown millions have given up their lives or have made sacrifices, the onward journey of mankind, today that great struggle and that great issue is again joined in probably the most direct way and direct manner in the known history of man.

The way of life that you and I stand for—and essentially it is the dignity of man, your dignity and my dignity, our home is our castle, our right to freedom some place under the law—is being challenged. Yesterday's pact (the Atlantic Pact) is the answer, not negatively but affirmatively. It is only as a result of pain and suffering that mankind makes progress, not only within a nation but from an international angle, and it is only as a result of great pain and suffering existing in the world today, in the free world of today, that nationalism and its restrictiveness could be thrust aside yesterday and the North Atlantic Pact signed by the 12 participating nations.

We know that that will be extended.

That is not only a defensive pact, but also a pact of an affirmative nature, if necessary, brought about as a result of the realization that governments of law are threatened unless they get together and that the dignity of man and woman is imperiled unless international action along the lines taken yesterday was taken by the remaining free nations of the world and other free nations joining in that pact or other pacts in the future.

With the right leadership in church—and thank God we have it in all religions—with the right leadership in government, forward-looking leadership, leadership which recognizes its trust in God and its people, whether in the United States, France, or any other country, forward-looking leadership which

serves the people and receives the confidence of the people, we need not approach the present world situation with fear or pessimism, but we can approach it with confidence and with optimism.

The following is the address of Ambassador Bonnet:

Your Excellency, ladies and gentlemen, if the United States is justly proud of the greatness of Benjamin Franklin, Frenchmen also have the feeling that the old sage, who did so much to shape the destinies of America and France, belongs to the history of their country. Every French child learns about him at school, about the negotiations he so ably conducted in Paris. With Lafayette he is considered to be the instigator of the understanding and friendship, which at the end of the eighteenth century united our two countries, developing into deep and everlasting friendship between the French and the American people themselves.

Like our own great men of that century, Franklin was foremost in every field of human endeavor. Our writers and philosophers, struggling for the democratic ideals which were to be entered in your Declaration of Independence and our Declaration of the Rights of Man, considered him to be one of their guides. Between them there existed that kind of friendship which Thomas Jefferson also enjoyed in France and which rests upon the faith in the same principles of civilization, upon the same conventions and the same ideals of freedom and progress.

In both our countries these ideals are still alive, they are stronger than ever. They have united us in the days of danger as well as in the days of glory. They are, indeed, the very foundation of the Atlantic Pact, which was signed yesterday in Washington, in order to preserve peace, freedom, and happiness for the people.

It is a great pleasure for me to present to the Benjamin Franklin University this bust executed by Monsieur Caffieri and brought to this country. It is one of the most striking masterpieces of that artist. It is through it that this great citizen of the United States continues to live among us, an enlightened symbol of wisdom and foresight, a noble example of the leadership of free men.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Jose Babac;
S. 27. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 208. An act for the relief of Ella L. Browning;

S. 278. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

S. 629. An act to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; and

S. 748. An act for the relief of Charles L. Bishop.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 8, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

507. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the education of children residing on certain nonsupporting federally owned property, and children residing in localities overburdened with increased school enrollments resulting from Federal activities in the area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

508. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

509. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 220, relating to receipt of commissions or gifts for procuring loans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

510. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a recommended amendment to section 4 (g) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 154 (g)); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

511. A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting the Ninth Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

512. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into special agreements for certain switching service by railway common carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 91. Joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 1158. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Marfa, Tex., of certain lands formerly owned by that city; with an amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 1338. A bill authorizing the transfer to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; without amendment (Rept. No. 408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 3851. A bill to amend Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress, with respect to surplus airport property and to provide for the transfer of compliance functions with relation to such property; without amendment (Rept. No. 409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3966. A bill for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City; without amendment (Rept. No. 404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3992. A bill for the relief of J. L. Hitt; without amendment (Rept. No. 405). 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. ASPINALL:

H. R. 4066. A bill authorizing modifications of the provisions of certain special contracts for the carriage of water through the facilities of the Uncompahgre project, Colorado; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4067. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of Centenary College, Shreveport, La.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 4068. A bill to amend sections 3108 and 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 4069. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Nevada for addition to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 4070. A bill to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian Irrigation project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 4071. A bill providing for the extension of the time limitations under which patents were issued in the case of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 4072. A bill to encourage construction of rental housing at or in areas adjacent to military and naval installations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 4073. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of New York of certain historic property situated within Fort Niagara State Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 4074. A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of

hospitalization by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4075. A bill to provide for assistance to State agencies administering labor laws in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe workplaces and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4076. A bill providing for the construction of Federal buildings at Mount Hope, W. Va., and Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4077. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4078. A bill providing for the construction of Federal buildings at Mount Hope, W. Va., and Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4079. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the State of California of easements for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a toll highway crossing and approaches thereto over and across lands of the United States in the vicinity of San Francisco Bay, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4080. A bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 4081. A bill to amend section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1948, as amended, in order to permit the delivery of excess peanuts to agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture and to define the term "cooperator" with respect to price support for peanuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4082. A bill to improve the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4083. A bill to provide for appeals to the Civil Service Commission in cases of employees improperly removed from the classified civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4084. A bill to provide for the payment by the United States of premiums on bonds of Government officers or employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4085. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and a survey of Mud River, Thief River, Moose River, and Lost River, as tributaries of the Red River of the North, for flood-control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 4086. A bill to prohibit the Home Loan Bank Board from revising its regulations so as to change the essential character of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 4087. A bill to extend the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to the widows and children of certain deceased veterans of World War II and to the spouses and children of certain totally disabled veterans of World

War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 4088. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to permit the United States to bear three-fourths of the cost of constructing certain highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 4089. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERNOS-ISERN:

H. R. 4090. A bill to extend the benefits of section 23 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 4091. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GWINN (by request):

H. R. 4092. A bill to authorize pay for persons who were subject to service in the Navy for training under the supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4093. A bill for the relief of owners of crops damaged or destroyed by migratory birds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. J. Res. 216. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special commemorative stamp to mark the one hundredth anniversary of the cranberry industry; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 183. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3190, to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; 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 Washington, requesting appropriate legislation to provide for a grant to the University of Washington for university purposes in the amount of the Federal income taxes heretofore paid to the National Government by the Metropolitan Building Co.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to designate the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, relative to endorsing the project for a harbor at Kawaihae, island of Hawaii, and requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate Federal funds for said project; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 4094. A bill for the relief of Bunge North-American Grain Corp., the Corporacion

Argentina de Productores de Carnes, Herman M. Gidden, and the Overseas Metal & Ore Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4095. A bill for the relief of W. P. Bartel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 4096. A bill to award a posthumous rating of T/4 to Richard J. Van Winkle; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 4097. A bill for the relief of George M. Beesley, Edward D. Sexton, and Herman J. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 4098. A bill for the relief of Mary Keavney; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 4099. A bill for the relief of Quock Quai Kue and Quock Quai Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 4100. A bill for the relief of Calvin E. Cranford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 4101. A bill for the relief of Salim Mahomed El Masri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4102. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Maloy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 4103. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of Brig. Gen. Wilber E. Wilder; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 4104. A bill for the relief of Cornel A. Leahu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4105. A bill for the relief of Michael Christos Lemos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 4106. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 4107. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. M. McElderry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4108. A bill for the relief of Ladislav E. Hudec, Gisella Hudec, Alessa E. Hudec, who entered the United States on June 25, 1948, at New York City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4109. A bill for the relief of Kenneth McKelvie, who entered the United States in November 1946 at San Pedro, Calif., and Mrs. Emily Ellen McKelvie, and daughter, Audrey Mallett, and granddaughter, Aimee June Mallett, who entered the United States in September 1946 at San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 4110. A bill for the relief of William C. Krumnow; 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:

507. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 23 members of the ladies' bible class of Memorial Church, of Saxonburg, Pa., opposing the proposed compulsory health insurance bill or any form of Government medicine known to many as socialized medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

503. By Mr. HINSHAW: Resolution of the Council of the City of Glendale, memorializ-

ing the Congress of the United States to pass and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

509. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition signed by more than 1,000 citizens of the city of Vassar and Tuscola County, Mich., urging the enactment of H. R. 3985, which would authorize the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the centennial of the cutting of the world-famous Cass River cork pine at Vassar, Mich.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

510. By the SPEAKER: Petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

511. Also, petition of S. B. Perkins and others, Pine Castle, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

512. Also, petition of Charles H. Nutting and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

513. Also, petition of E. A. Streling and others, Jacksonville, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

514. Also, petition of Walter Preston and others, Titusville, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

515. Also, petition of M. W. Manning and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

516. Also, petition of F. C. Van de Sande and others, New Smyrna Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

517. Also, petition of Mrs. Albina Bibeau and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

518. Also, petition of Jose Miranda and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

519. Also, petition of E. E. Saxton and others, Lakeland, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

520. Also, petition of Frederick A. Winchell and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

521. Also, petition of Victor Wlechmann and others, New Smyrna Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 8, 1949

(Legislative day of Friday, March 18, 1949)

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

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

Our Father God, we would turn from this tragic, troubled world without to the inner kingdom of our hearts, knowing that there are the issues of life and that as a man thinketh in his own heart so is he. So relentlessly are we driven by the pressure of demanding days that our very souls become jaded and drained. We come with feverish spirits and anxious cares to the healing balm of Thy presence seeking the perfect peace of those who stay their minds on Thee.

May Thy renewing grace restore our depleted life as this noontide we turn our faces to Thy shining, O Thou sun of our help and strength. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 7, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4016) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] be excused from attendance on the Senate today and tomorrow. He is president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and must officiate at its meeting, which is in session in Washington.

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

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have had a speaking engagement for a matter of 2 months which necessitates my being absent tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attending the session of the Senate tomorrow.

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.
Anderson	George	Kefauver
Brewster	Gillette	Kem
Bricker	Green	Kerr
Cain	Gurney	Knowland
Capehart	Hayden	Langer
Chapman	Hendrickson	Lodge
Connally	Hickenlooper	Long
Cordon	Hill	McCarthy
Donnell	Hoey	McFarland
Douglas	Holland	McGrath
Eaton	Humphrey	McKellar
Ellender	Hunt	McMahon
Ferguson	Ives	Maybank
Flanders	Jenner	Miller
Frear	Johnson, Tex.	Morse

Murray	Schoeppel	Tobey
Myers	Smith, Maine	Tydings
Neely	Sparkman	Vandenberg
O'Connor	Stennis	Wherry
Pepper	Taylor	Wiley
Robertson	Thomas, Okla.	Williams
Russell	Thomas, Utah	Withers
Saltonstall	Thye	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is absent by leave of the Senate, presiding as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, which is holding its annual meeting in Washington today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official committee business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted to present routine matters, including insertions in the RECORD, as though we were in the morning hour, without jeopardizing the parliamentary situation.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF STATE (S. DOC. NO. 40)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the Department of State, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.