

creeds, and cultures—giving us an amalgam that is new, unique, and immeasurably strong.

That is why tolerance is necessarily and rightly a supreme American characteristic. It is, in truth, another word for freedom. If ever the sad day arrives when our tolerance begins to crumble and decay, we shall know that the adventure is ended. Happily that day is too far off to be discerned.

True, there are crackpots and psychopaths and even foreign agents in our midst who preach group and race hatreds. But they are few and without authority, morally out-cast and despised by the overwhelming mass of Americans. They seem more numerous and stronger than they really are because they shout so shrilly, and also because the exception always attracts more attention than the rule. The fact that they are so conspicuous is further proof that such men and their ideas don't belong in our free country.

We Americans are a warm, generous, friendly people. We need seek no special credit for this, because at bottom these qualities are the proofs that we have been a lucky people. Our tolerance and open-handedness are the results, in large measure, of the spaciousness and natural wealth of our country. There was no inducement to the niggardly spirit, no reason for the murderous envies that have defaced other civilizations in this and former times. The polluted breath of tyranny has always and easily been swept away by the clean winds over our great prairies and towering mountains.

As a nation our nerves are steady and our heart is in the right place. The willingness to save life by losing life for great ideals has been demonstrated by Americans on a score of battlefields. Our spirit is robust, hardened by recent adversity, and refined by recent sacrifice. We can confront the future not with empty bravado but with true courage; and with an optimism based not only on inner certainty but on a conscious dedication to the American dream of justice and happiness for all.

If ever humankind and geography have been brought together under the most propitious circumstances, it is here in the United States of America. One feels almost that the kindly providence which contrived this miracle is watching anxiously to see how the epic test of man's capacity for grandeur is working out. Can man, thus richly dowered with all the prerequisites of greatness, live up to his magnificent opportunity? Can he temper his spirit and lift his mind to new and unprecedented levels?

If he can, then this is America unlimited.

Mr. President, is that the credo of a man who fronts for money changers? No, Mr. President; it is the credo of a man imbued with devotion to those things that have made America great. It is the credo of a man who has given sterling service to his country in time of peace and in time of war. It is the credo of a man with abiding faith in America and in his fellow man.

Mr. President, I invite these remarks about a very good friend and a great American, Mr. Eric Johnston, to the considered study of another splendid American and a good friend, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

RECESS

Mr. DOUGLAS. 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 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 16, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all goodness, we beseech Thee to be present and favorable unto these Thy servants, granting unto them grace and wisdom to perform the duties of their high calling with a pure and steadfast devotion.

May our hearts expand with pride that our beloved country, conceived in sacrifice and dedicated to Thy glory, is seeking to bring blessedness to all mankind.

Show us how we may mobilize the moral and spiritual resources and implement them in building a social order whose spirit is that of brotherhood and good will.

In the name of the Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include some newspaper articles from the New York Times.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in another instance to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the department commander of the American Legion, New Jersey.

Mr. REDDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Oceanside, Calif., newspaper.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article on aviation.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in each to include newspaper editorials.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SOCIALISM IN AMERICA

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, if I wanted to socialize the United States, I would do exactly what the administration is doing. I know that the American people are against socialism, just as the Australians, the New Zealanders, and almost half of the British are against it. I know that if the American people were asked to choose between liberty and socialism, all but a handful would vote for liberty.

The administration knows this too, so they are using a back-door approach. They are demanding more Government spending and more taxes. We are now paying about 30 percent of our income to the tax collector, and the administration wants to increase it. They would sap the vitality of our people and drag them down into the quicksand of an ever-growing Government. And then, if the administration succeeds, they will fasten their dictatorship on the American people.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANGELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CHURCH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the San Diego Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE INEQUITIES OF SOCIAL-SECURITY PENSIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY, NO. 8

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in a certain town in this country there lives a widow whose husband died before the

social-security law was enacted. She was left with five little children.

If this family needs help in addition to what this widow can make from her own toil our social security offers her nothing but the chance to prove to welfare workers that she needs relief.

Across the street is another widow with the same number of children. Her husband earned \$50 in a calendar quarter for six quarters in employment covered by social security. This husband was taxed the grand total of \$3 in social-security taxes on his earnings. The Federal Government will send to this family a check, as a matter of right, without any strings attached, to the widow and one for each of the children under 18 years of age, which will continue until the youngest one is 18. If the widow is alive at 65 they will resume payments to her as a matter of right without a needs test. These benefits will run into the thousands of dollars.

Why all this discrimination between these two families? Certainly it cannot be on the basis that one family paid for their benefits. If the taxpayers of America are to be taxed to help orphans, and I favor that, why not help all orphans? If they are to be taxed to help widows, and I favor that, why not help all widows? The social-security law is not a benevolent law. It is a cruel, harsh, and unjust lottery.

GOVERNMENT TAXES

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, spring is in the air. I am told that in the spring a young man's fancy lightly turns to thoughts of some young woman. But alas, he gets no encouragement from the Truman administration. In fact, the Federal Government acts more like a crotchety sourpuss that is opposed to romance, love, and the other pleasant things that happen in the spring.

Suppose our young man decides to propose. He has to pay a 20-percent tax on the engagement ring. And suppose they get married. Another 20-percent tax on the wedding ring. And suppose in due time they acquire an offspring. Then the taxes really start—20 percent on each bottle of baby oil, 20 percent on each can of baby powder, 20 percent on each bottle of baby lotion, and 20 percent on each jar of baby creams.

Here is the pay-off: These taxes are called luxury taxes. I ask: Why should a family be classed a luxury?

TAXES

Mr. GAVIN. 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. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, taxes, taxes, taxes.

The situation in Washington today is enough in itself to cause great consternation and the country is reaping the bitter fruit of Truman taxation.

We now have 4,684,000 people without jobs, the highest since August 1941. The Department of Labor lists 43 areas where unemployment has grown to the point where it is at the crucial stage.

If the Truman administration really wants to do anything about this tailspin, it will reduce taxes. Everyone knows, for example, how excise taxes are stifling many industries—transportation, communications, jewelry, furs, entertainment, and many others.

What the American people really want today is a sound, free-growing America. They are tired of spending and taxation and today are lifting their voices crying for relief from this tremendous burden of taxation that has been imposed upon them.

Instead of balancing the budget, cutting down expenses the administration is constantly presenting new programs and talking about increased taxes. I want to be specifically recorded as being unalterably opposed to continued deficit financing. But all we get from the administration is the same old answer—deficit on top of deficit, tax on top of tax.

The continuation of this spending program will lead us into bankruptcy. The issue is whether we are to continue good, sound, governmental policies, maintain the solvency of this Nation, and the preservation of our American way; or, degenerate into some bureaucratically controlled or planned economy with a regimented people being told what to do, when to do it, and how to do it by the Government.

The challenge before us is whether we are to surrender to these new philosophies of government, or restore sound governmental policies and thinking; whether we are to let the freedom of opportunity we enjoy pass on, or whether we have the determination to change the trend of thinking and preserve in America those ideals and principles which have been handed on to us.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to address a few words to the women of the United States; they are:

Ladies, when the tax gougers made up their "sucker" tax list you were placed right at the top and you have been there ever since.

You head that list because all of your toilet articles and cosmetics are classified by the Government as luxuries and as such are subject to the 20 percent luxury tax.

They are not luxuries. The American way of life has made these articles as essential to you women as daily shaving is to the average man.

The truth is that the Washington taxmasters looked upon you women as a

"soft touch" when this tax became law and they have not changed their minds since.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENSEN. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENSEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TAXES

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. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word of sympathy for the men of the country with regard to their excise taxes. From the time they get up in the morning they pay a tax on everything. They have already paid a tax on their pajamas. They pay a tax on their bath soap and on their shaving lotion, and shaving soaps or shaving creams. They pay a tax on their razor that they shave with, they pay a tax on the brush and comb for their hair, on their hair tonic, and the oil for their hair. They pay a tax on their tooth paste and their tooth brush. They pay a tax on their nail scissors or nail file, and on all of their toilet articles. They pay a hidden tax on the fruit juice they drink and on every item that they eat for breakfast, including coffee and even the bread they eat. They pay a tax on the percolators, on their toasters, and last but not least they must pay a tax on that all-important smoke.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word for the men of the country regarding their taxes.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, we Americans are great ones to set aside a day or a week in observance of an event in our history, or of some worth-while cause.

Therefore, I think that it would be most fitting to designate a special day to honor and to pay tribute to the most exploited man in all our history—the overtaxed American.

For 16 out of the last 18 years the Democratic administration has been piling the taxes on him until he is now shackled hand and foot. It is apparent that emancipation for him is not in sight. The only break he got in 18 long years was the tax reduction passed over President Truman's veto by the Republican Eightieth Congress. Consequently the least we can do is to fix a time to

give him proper recognition for the pain, penalty, and punishment he is undergoing at the hands of the Democrat tax masters.

Mr. Speaker, it was stated on the floor of the House a short time ago that the Jefferson \$100-per-plate banquet recently held in Washington was in the nature of a celebration—a banquet celebrating the accomplishments of 16 years of New Deal and Fair Deal spending for the benefit of the people.

Today fifty-two-odd-million tax-weary Americans, rich and poor alike, are reminded of the stark fact that they are paying the bill for this celebration themselves, that something for nothing is a myth. They realize as never before that everybody pays no matter how much money he makes.

These fifty-two-odd-million taxpayers are weary because:

First. They have witnessed that 16 years of spending and deficit refinancing by this and the Roosevelt administration has brought—not stability—but inflation. The dollar buys less and less. They realize that today the dollar is worth only 59 percent of what it was in 1940.

Second. They realize that no matter how much or how little money they earn or how they earn it, whether as a laborer, farmer, businessman, or anything else, they do not have any constitutional right to keep one dime of it. They realize today that they are living at the sufferance of the party in control of our Government insofar as their income is concerned.

Third. They realize that all are paying for the Truman socialistic bill, rich and poor alike.

Fourth. They realize that a government, similar to a private family that constantly goes further and further into debt, inevitably meets up with disaster.

Mr. Speaker, let each of us today, income-tax day, rededicate ourselves to the relief of the American taxpayers—the backbone of America—by reinstituting the American characteristics which have made this country great; namely, individual initiative, thrift, courage, self-reliance, personal responsibility, and religious faith for Government hand-outs and socialistic schemes designed to buy American votes and sell the free-enterprise system down the river.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a speech she made in Massachusetts.

Mr. SHAFER (at the request of Mr. WOODRUFF) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a pamphlet called A Call to Veterans notwithstanding that it exceeded two pages of the RECORD and, according to the Public Printer, cost \$300.68 to print.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

HIDDEN TAXES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, 300 years ago a Government employee in Holland named Johannes van den Broeck won a Government-sponsored contest for a new kind of tax.

If such a contest were held today, there is no question about who would win. Our Democratic friends who have been in power since 1933 would win in a walk-away. They have dreamed up new taxes by the score and they have hidden them so deeply that no one can unearth all of them. Counting only the taxes that can be traced, we find there are 639 hidden taxes on a new small house, 151 hidden taxes on a loaf of bread, 116 hidden taxes on a man's suit, 150 hidden taxes on a woman's hat, and 100 hidden taxes on an egg.

Yes, the administration spenders have done well in devising new taxes to harass our people and they have done well in hiding them in order to fool the people. But they have not taken the pain out of the taxes. In fact, as the tax load grows heavier and heavier, the pain becomes worse and worse. It is high time to administer medicine.

DR. WILLIAM H. ALEXANDER—HIGH TAXES

Mr. HILL. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my friends that down in the State of Oklahoma there is a man by the name of Dr. William H. Alexander, who was going to run on the Democratic ticket for United States Senator, but he found out that they did not want him, so he said, "I am going to run on the Republican ticket."

Then he goes on and says:

I think the greatest harm that has come to our country in the last 30 years is to bring up a segment of the people to believe if they won't work the Government will care for them.

I was once broad-minded toward socialism, but now I am against it because of what it does to people and to individuals. How long can we go against thrift, which is honesty in action, and spend \$5,000,000,000 more than we take in in a prosperous year?

We never will get rid of this wishful thinking until we get rid of the Santa Claus complex, and I can prove it isn't Santa Claus. The Government robs man of his ability to do.

We are selling out personal liberty after personal liberty. When we sell our personal liberties to any overhead—I don't care what

it is—you begin the toboggan slide that ends up by the overhead saying: "Little man, you go this far, and no farther."

If it continues, in 5 years we will find our democracy gone.

He is a great preacher. He has over 3,000 people in his church. He has visited our community and I know him personally. I hope the Republicans accept him wholeheartedly, and that they will elect him to the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, now a word on taxes. March 15 should be set aside as a day of national mourning. Crepe should be draped around the pocketbook of every taxpayer. With a wild spender in the White House, a balanced budget is dead as a mackerel. Only once since 1930 has the Government's budget been balanced. That was during the Eightieth Congress, when the Republicans were in control of the public's purse. In every other year the story has been the same: spend, borrow, tax, and write out another deficit.

Mr. Truman wants to spend \$42,400,000,000 during the coming year. Even after saddling us with back-breaking taxes, the President would have to borrow \$5,100,000,000.

If we cannot balance our budget in prosperous times like these, how can we during hard times? Deficit spending will finally result in the downfall of our Republic and chaos for all the free peoples of the world.

TAXES

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, this is March 15, otherwise known as high-tax Harry's holiday.

I have written and dedicated to him a poem entitled "Owed to the Tax Collector."

The poem is as follows:

No baby oil for you, young man,
Bareback babe, with cheeks of tan.
We cannot pay the Federal tax,
No, we can't give you oily whacks.
We'd like to pat you, head to toe,
With baby powder soft as doe.
Chafing's a trial, it is true
But there's nothing we can do.
By the rules of Uncle Sam
You're a luxury, little lamb.
The skin we loved to touch with powder
We sadly pat while you yell louder.
You can scratch and roll and squirm
While the tax man laughs, the worm.
"Tax his hide," he shouts with gail,
"Babies? How I hate 'em all."
So now you know, my little man,
Why mama votes Republican.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand the country is suffering today from an epidemic of what is known as

March 15 fever. The symptoms are an uneasy stomach, constant perspiring, trembling hands, and loud ringing sounds in the head. The ailment is usually brought on by paying a staggering income tax.

Until now no treatment for this strange malady has been known to man. But today I am finally able to prescribe a treatment. I suggest that the ideal way to avoid any trace of March 15 fever is to climb aboard a 243-foot yacht with your cronies and head for the balmy delights of Florida. Then when the fateful day of March 15 arrives, you can be at an ideal place, far out at sea, where never is heard that terrible word "taxes." There you just drift along in a pleasant little dream world all your own.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STOCKMAN. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STOCKMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL (at the request of Mr. KILBURN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HARVEY, Mr. REES, and Mr. HALE asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include editorials.

CANADA

Mr. POTTER. 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. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, I think this day should be known as T. T. D., that is, Truman's Tax Day.

Mr. Speaker, our good friend to the north, Canada, since the end of World War II has decreased its income taxes three times, has repealed its wartime excise taxes, and has lowered its excess-profits tax. Its national income has increased each year. It has balanced its budget each year, and it has paid a substantial sum on its national debt. We should learn a lesson from Canada. You cannot get real prosperity from a high-tax administration.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include copies of two letters, two newspaper editorials, and a news item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HESELTON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TAXES

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the people were perturbed by the ideo of March. Nowadays the thing that worries them is the "owed" in March.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, every small-business man in this tax-burdened Nation of ours requires a bookkeeper regardless of how many he might have on his pay roll. Among them are Chinese laundrymen who have no difficulty figuring the price of doing up a few shirts and socks by flicking the beads back and forth on bamboo sticks of the abacus. However, this ancient and dependable calculating board, used for over a thousand years—one of which I hold in my hand—is no longer any good to the Chinese or any other user of the abacus in compiling unending and complicated reports for income tax, unemployment-compensation tax, sales tax, social-security tax, withholding tax, to mention some of the various categories of taxes not forgetting the wartime excise taxes from which the aroused American taxpayer demands relief.

PROFITS

Mr. REDDEN. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, from the debate that has come from my left this morning one would think that the Republicans are the only people in America who pay taxes. I am delighted to say that is not true. Payment of taxes naturally means profits and only from profits can taxes be exacted. The Democrats evidently are not saying much about taxes because they realize they have made a sufficient amount of profit upon which to pay taxes, and upon which they ought to pay taxes. So when we hear "taxes, taxes, taxes" this morning, we might add to that song, "profits, profits, profits."

This is not 1932 when the average man in America was dealing with the referee in bankruptcy because of losses. It is a new age of profits for all when we are called upon to report our gains. So again I say "Taxes, taxes, taxes from profits profits, profits."

REPUBLICAN PARTY POLICY

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican National Committee must have been extremely busy writing these 1-minute speeches that we have heard this morning. Never in the 14 years that I have been a Member of the House have I been treated to so much original thought emanating from the Republican side. These precious gems were delivered by such cute little fellows whose smiling faces did not betray for a second that they were novelties to them too.

The Republican Party really has but one objection to President Truman. That was his insistence upon being re-elected in the last Presidential race. He just refused to fall in with their plans. He failed to recognize that their contours had not been given the opportunity to make impressions on the seats that they were planning to occupy. He upset all Curley Brooks' Republican inauguration plans and compelled the GOP to return their rented suits and top hats without having a chance to wear them. Eightieth Congress chairmen had not even become accustomed to the title when Mr. Truman said, "That's all boys. The game is up."

Today at noon it was stated over the radio that the Republican National Platform Committee announced that the future policy of their Members both in the House and in the other body would be to vote for all appropriation bills and at the same time abolish all taxes.

Be careful my GOP stalwarts, election again is just around the corner.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES BOARD

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a speech prepared here many pages long. I am going to place it in the RECORD because of its length. I would like to say that the Fair Employment Board of the Civil Service Commission instructed our Treasury Department to give an examination this morning open to all of our citizens. There is in the House of Representatives now a bill, H. R. 7185, reported out of our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as of Friday, with the express purpose of contravening the action of the Fair Employment Board of the Treasury Department.

I would like the Members of the House to read this speech which I have prepared so that they will know just what is happening here in direct violation of the President's order, of the order of the Secretary of the Treasury, and contrary to the platforms of both sides of this House.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE PROPAGANDA MILL

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House has enjoyed the efforts of the Republican National Committee propaganda mill here today. I know that the businessmen of this country and the wage earners of the country have an acquaintanceship today with the Collector of Internal Revenue. They are now paying income taxes on income earned during the past year, just as in previous years, in Democratic national administrations, they have paid taxes on their profits.

What a contrast when we look back to 1932.

The acquaintanceship of American businessmen back in those Republican days was only with the referees in bankruptcy.

American wage earners in the days of Hoover—and few there were—the soup lines were longer than the work lines—also were acquainted with the sheriff and the constable foreclosing on their homes. No one will ever forget the bankrupt condition of American business and our people in 1932 at the end of 12 years of Republican misrule.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I come from the great city of Buffalo, N. Y. Buffalo is a windy city, especially during the winter months when strong winds blow in from Lake Erie. Despite this, it is known as the Queen City of the Lakes and the City of Good Neighbors. However, I have never felt so much wind blowing as I have this morning in the well of the House, coming from the Republican side.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] made mention that the taxpayer is sick today. Well, the taxpayer is not sick because he is employed and has the money to pay his taxes. It is the Republican Party that is sick. The diagnosis is very simple. They are suffering from simple fever which produces "talkarrhea" and a brain block which makes it impossible for them to offer any constructive program to the people of this Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and to include editorials.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

SILENCE IS GOLDEN

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to send via the well of this House, a message to President Harry S. Truman and claim as my right to do so the fact that I am one of two State and Federal candidates for public office in Nebraska, in 1948, who supported you for the Presidency openly and vigorously.

Almost every day now, we witness a talking psychosis indulged in by a number of men who seem to have nothing but wind between their ears. They are calling upon you to answer their silly provocative questions. Please do not answer them, Mr. President, but let them enjoy to the fullest, the charity of your exquisite silence. Let silence like a poultice come to heal the blows of senseless reactionary sound.

You will always remember, I know, the old verse:

It is only the lighter waters which fly,
From the sea on a windy day.
And the deep blue ocean never repiles,
To the sybillant voice of the spray.

TAX DAY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am sure both you and I have enjoyed the remarks which have been made from both sides of the aisle on this day, the 15th day of March, the day upon which the American people pay their Federal income taxes.

I arise simply to call to the attention of the 7,000,000 Americans who are today not paying Federal income taxes that their exemption from such taxes is entirely due to the tax-reduction bill enacted by the Republican Eightieth Congress.

I would also like to call attention to those taxpayers who have been compelled to file their tax returns and pay taxes today that they would be paying much more in Federal income taxes on this fateful day were it not for the enactment of the tax-reduction bill by the great and sound Republican Eightieth Congress, which, for the first time in the last 20 years in the Nation's history gave tax relief to the American people.

The Republican Eightieth Congress reversed the trend. Instead of increasing Federal spending, we reduced it. In-

stead of raising taxes, we cut them. Compare that record of the Republican Eightieth Congress, if you please, with that of the Democratic Eighty-first Congress—the "spendingest" Congress in the peacetime history of our Republic.

THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

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, if I did not know better, I would almost believe that the thinking processes of my good friend from Ohio had become atrophied. Everybody in the United States, almost, has succeeded in forgetting the Eightieth Congress except the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. And then he has to remind them of it.

THE DIGNITY OF CONGRESS

Mr. PLUMLEY. 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 Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I probably shall wish to expunge from the Record the remarks I contemplate to make on the urge of resistance. I have been here 17 years. I submit to you I never saw this Congress before so desecrated by blank, blank cheap politics as it has been attempted today for purely partisan political purposes. This is no place to lay such a cheap basis for a campaign.

This Congress has a record to maintain. As of its original constitution for the purposes contained in the articles which made it, it should be beneath the dignity of anyone who is a Member of it to talk about constipation of brains and diarrhea of the mouth and certain other things we heard this morning. I regret that it has to appear that anyone should make a speech so stupid as the one made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAURIELLO], who referred to constipation of brains and diarrhea of the mouth of the Eightieth Congress. I am using that only as an example.

The people look up to us, whether deserved or not; they should look up to us, they have set us up to represent them. Deservedly or not, they have placed upon us a very great responsibility. I am not fooling. I have tried to carry my own part and always to try to represent my people.

When I consider whether or not I should run again because of experience gained to the advantage of Vermont, I am wondering if I want to run again with such a group as is around me as would indulge in the type of conversation we have had to listen to today.

The Congress of the United States should preserve its dignity. It should always be entitled to the respect expected of it by those who send us here to represent them. This is not a ward

meeting hall, a precinct convocation, nor smoke-filled back-room session for cheap political oratory, else we would not be here, for it is assumed we are above it.

I recognize the fact it is not for me or for any other Member to try to lecture Congress; however, such language as was used is not appropriate as I understand it nor is it in keeping with the dignity of this body. That is what I think, and only for what it is worth. I resent such abuse of constitutional privilege as exercised by the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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 addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a radio address to be given on Friday, March 17, by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. CELLER (when the Committee on the Judiciary was called). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary I call up the bill (H. R. 4703) relating to the internal security of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 99]

Baring	Ellsworth	Morrow
Battle	Fogarty	Michener
Boykin	Furolo	Monroney
Brooks	Gilmer	Morrison
Buckley, N. Y.	Gossett	Murphy
Bulwinkle	Heller	Nixon
Burdick	Hoffman, Ill.	Norrell
Byrne, N. Y.	Horan	Norton
Chatham	Jenkins	O'Hara, Minn.
Chiperfield	Jennings	Passman
Clemente	Johnson	Pfeiffer
Clevenger	King	William L.
Dawson	Kirwan	Philbin
DeGraffenried	Kunkel	Poulson
Dingell	Lichtenwalter	Quinn
Dolliver	McCormack	Rabaut
Dondoro	McGrath	Rains
Douglas	Macy	Reed, N. Y.
Doyle	Magee	Rivers

Rooney	Shafer	Whittaker
Roosevelt	Sheppard	White, Calif.
Sabath	Short	Whittington
Sadowski	Smathers	Woodhouse
Scott, Hardle	Smith, Ohio	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

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. 4703, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill now before you, H. R. 4703, relating to the internal security of the United States, was reported a long time ago, to wit, May 20 of last year, by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

A request was sent to the Committee on Rules for a hearing on the rule. On several occasions since then the chairman of that committee has sought to have a hearing, but for reasons beyond his control, as well as mine, a hearing has not yet been held.

In the meantime the Attorney General of the United States has on several occasions requested that the Congress expedite its approval of this security measure.

In bringing the bill up at this time under the Calendar Wednesday procedure, it is not in any sense an expression of dissatisfaction of the failure to get action from the Committee on Rules, for the circumstances were purely fortuitous, but rather because the Calendar Wednesday procedure happens to be a convenient vehicle.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman has referred a good many times to the fact that the committee was unable to get a rule from the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules held extended hearings on this bill, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] presented in extenso, as well as several other members of the committee reporting it.

The majority of the members of the Committee on Rules tried to get a vote on this so it could be brought to the floor of the House. We were told over and over again that Members of the House wanted to appear in opposition to this bill. But no member of the Committee on Rules could find out who those Members were. It was arbitrarily set over again and again against the wishes of the majority members of the committee.

That is the reason this bill has not received a rule.

Mr. CELLER. I, of course, offer no criticism against the Committee on

Rules or any of its members. I hope the Members understand that.

Mr. HERTER. I merely thought that the record ought to be kept straight. The majority of the members were willing to vote for a rule on this bill.

Mr. CELLER. As I said, since the Committee on the Judiciary had the call today, the committee felt it appropriate to bring this bill up under the procedure prescribed for Calendar Wednesday.

I may say that the report from the Committee on the Judiciary was unanimous; in fact, no one appeared in opposition to this bill when we conducted hearings. We wrote to a number of organizations interested in civil liberties and in civil rights, but no one of these organizations saw fit to voice any opposition by appearance before the Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which held hearings on the bill.

In its original form the bill was drafted by the Interdepartmental Intelligence Committee, a joint group consisting of representatives of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence of the Department of the Army, the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Department of the Navy, and the Central Intelligence Agency. All the intelligence agencies of the Government, therefore, united in a request to the Committee on the Judiciary to adopt this measure. As chairman of that committee I urge that the House adopt this measure.

When first presented to us the bill contained a provision concerning wire-tapping. The members of the Committee on the Judiciary felt that it would be improvident and improper to accept the recommendations of these various intelligence units concerning wire-tapping. This bill does not in any respect whatever touch the wire-tapping statutes that may exist today. It is my understanding that wire-tapping is not illegal per se; wire-tapping may be exercised but under decisions of the Supreme Court, any information obtained as a result of wire-tapping cannot be used in evidence in any of our courts. Suffice to say, we did not accept the recommendations of the intelligence units concerning wire-tapping.

I shall not attempt to describe in minute detail the provisions of the bill except to say that it relates to the strengthening of the internal security of our Nation. Other members of the committee who studied the bill intensively will undertake its detailed analysis to you. I do want to assure you, however, that it is not an hysteria bill, but instead a very stable, thoughtful, and necessary effort to tighten up those provisions of existing law which our recent experience in combating subversive activity in this country indicates to be highly desirable.

There are serious gaps in our security laws which must be filled, and this bill measurably fills them. We cannot allow people, citizens and aliens alike, opportunities to get valuable classified and other information, data, and records vital to our security and have that information, data, and records used and disseminated to our grave discomfort and with danger to our security. Our laws presently are weak and must be strength-

ened in that regard, and that is exactly what this bill purports to do.

While military laws are adequate to deal with military personnel, most of the troublesome cases of military security violations are of persons not subject to military law. In some cases it may be undesirable for reasons of policy to resort to the military law even where the violator is subject to military law, if adequate civil law is available. This bill seeks to make our civil laws available in these matters.

We have ample evidence on all sides of people unfortunately seeking to bore from within (Trojan horses, we might call them) who must be prevented from taking, and acquiring, and stealing valuable information vital to our defense, affecting our foreign policy, and definitely related to our security.

In general, Section 1 of the bill compels persons having in their possession certain enumerated classes of items to surrender the same under penalty for refusal to do so. Presently, the law affords no adequate punishment. For example, there is no violation unless the specific person entitled by law to receive the documents makes the demand for their return. This is frequently impossible because of unavoidable absence. Presently, those in possession of items and records relating to the national defense who negligently permit unauthorized removal commit a punishable offense. This bill extends the offense to persons who know the material entrusted to them has been illegally removed, lost, stolen or destroyed and who fail to report the loss or theft promptly to their superior officer. The present penalties are increased in this bill for conspiracy to commit the forbidden acts from \$10,000 or 5 years or both to 10 years or \$10,000 or both. This increased penalty conforms to the general statute. It makes, in a word, the conspiracy to commit an offense as grave as the crime itself.

Section 2 in general increases the statute of limitation for espionage from 3 to 10 years. The Department of Justice wanted no statute of limitations at all, but in its wisdom the Committee on the Judiciary felt it would be improper to have no statute of limitation and the increase was from 3 years as presently fixed in the statute to 10 years.

Section 3 amends the Foreign Agents Registration Act so as to make failure to register a continuing offense.

Section 4 delegates to the Secretary of Defense the power to promulgate orders and regulations, the violations of which are made punishable by fine and imprisonment for the security of new military installations.

There may be some question as to whether this Congress has the right to delegate broad authority like that to the Secretary of National Defense and permit him to make regulations and rules concerning military installations and to prescribe penalties. The Judiciary Committee has consulted many precedents in that regard and those precedents clearly indicate that the Congress has the right to delegate to executive agencies this power to promulgate security regulations

of a criminal nature. The Supreme Court has frequently sustained that delegation of power to the executive branch.

The only criticism that the Supreme Court has offered is that there must be clearness and clarity in the writing of the statute so as to clearly and succinctly describe the limits of the grant of power. We have taken the pains and trouble to limit this grant of power. We have tried to place the grant in the clearest language so that he who runs may read; therefore, we deem that this provision concerning the delegation of power to the Secretary of Defense is perfectly constitutional.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, on this day of decision for millions of taxpayers, a friend of mine has placed in my hand a priceless piece of American prose. With due apology to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, I should like to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

One score and 16 years ago our fathers brought forth upon this Nation a new tax, conceived in desperation and dedicated to the proposition that all men are fair game. * * * Now we are engaged in a great mass calculation, testing whether that taxpayer, or any other taxpayer, so confused and so impoverished, can long endure. * * * We are met on Form 1040. We have come to dedicate a large portion of our income to a final resting place with those men who have spent their lives, so that they may spend our money. It is altogether anguish and torture that we should do this. But, in the legal sense, we cannot evade, we cannot cheat, we cannot underestimate this tax. The collectors, clever and sly, who computed it, have gone far beyond our power to add or subtract. Our creditors will little note, nor long remember, what we pay here. * * * It is for us, the taxpayers, rather to be devoted here to the tax return which the Government has thus far so nobly spent. It is rather for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these vanishing dollars we take increased devotion to the few remaining that we may highly resolve that next year will not find us in a higher bracket. * * * That this taxpayer, underpaid, shall figure out more deductions and that taxation, of the people, by the Congress, and for the Government, shall not cause our solvency to perish.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN TAXPAYERS FOOT THE BILLS FOR THE COLD WAR

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, it is significant to point out that the outlay

of the United States for war purposes is more than twice that of all 11 other Atlantic countries. Now the United States has in its current budget \$13,500,000,000 for defense costs. The combined total of Great Britain, France, Canada, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, Portugal, Luxembourg, and Iceland is only \$5,100,000,000. In other words Uncle Sam is footing most of the bill for the cold war. The budgets of the nations allied with us give a much smaller slice to national defense. This does not include the program of the administration to arm western Europe. The portions of the national budgets spent on arms in these nations is as follows: United States, 31.9 percent; Italy, 25.2 percent; Netherlands, 20.8 percent; Portugal, 20.8 percent; Britain, 20 percent; France, 16.3 percent; Canada, 15.2 percent; Norway, 14.1 percent; Denmark, 11.9 percent; Belgium, 8.5 percent; Luxembourg, 2 percent; Iceland, none.

These are pertinent facts which led me to make the statement in previous newsletters that we could reduce the costs of Government and the national budget in the allocation of funds to be spent overseas by 25 to 50 percent in many cases, and not only thereby save the American taxpayers billions of dollars and enable us to balance the budget and cut out deficit spending but we would in the long run be giving a bigger boost to these foreign countries. Under the present procedure we are educating them to lean on Uncle Sam for their bread and butter and the sooner we adopt a sensible program which will put them on a self-sustaining basis, the better it will be for the nations themselves as well as for the United States Treasury. Foreign aid should be a springboard for self-help and not a wheel chair of permanent doles. We have already spread abroad since the war's end over \$30,000,000,000 wrung from American taxpayers. Let us call a halt to this waste of tax dollars. This is March 15 and the tax-ridden American citizens today must pay their exorbitant tax bills. Let us give them a break and cut to the bone these unnecessary expenditures.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, one of the most highly appreciated assignments I have thus far received at the hands of my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] was when he authorized me to present this important piece of legislation, H. R. 4703.

As is stated on page 2 of the report, the bill was originally drafted by the Interdepartmental Intelligence Committee, a joint group consisting of representatives of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army, the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Department of the Navy, and the Central Intelligence Agency. Our committee carefully considered the suggestions made and have worked out what we believe to be an adequate, yet acceptable, bill. It is interesting to note that the bill comes before you today with the unanimous

backing of the House Judiciary Committee. This is not usually the case. It is natural that there should be an honest diversity of opinions among our 27 members regardless as to political affiliations. This legislation is sorely needed and has been neglected too long. Individual opinions have been waived in minor details so as to get proper safeguards written into our statute law.

We have been astounded during the past few years to find that there are certain weaknesses and inadequate provisions of law to deal with those who would betray and destroy our country. In view of the several cases which have been disposed of by the courts or are now in process of litigation, let us arouse ourselves to the great need for immediate action. I shall not enumerate or name the individual cases to which I refer. You know about them. The fact that we have failed to provide proper safeguards should be an inducement to make sure that these wicked acts in the future are adequately covered under the law.

Since this is the final unpleasant day to pay our income taxes, we listened this morning to repeated criticisms of the way our Government is being run. Some of the criticisms are justified. In spite of all our shortcomings and imperfections our country is still the most favored one. We have the only, and last remaining real free Government on the face of this troubled world. In no other country are citizens permitted to criticize those in high places without fear. There is hardly a person in the world who would not literally give his right arm for the privilege of coming to and living in our beloved country.

Because we are the recipients of countless blessings, let us be admonished that under whom much is given much in like manner is required. You may rest assured that there is nothing in this pending bill that will operate adversely against any honest, upright, law-abiding citizen. We have been far too lenient, I fear, with those who would destroy us.

As the chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation, I now invite your honest criticisms but I plead with you to cooperate with us to the end that this needed protection be speedily provided.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with what the gentleman from South Carolina has said; of course. Every person on the Federal pay roll ought to be like Caesar's wife, above suspicion.

Mr. BRYSON. Certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. Whenever a suspicion rests upon an individual on the Federal pay roll, a suspicion that is really based on something tangible, that person ought to be removed; I do not care who he is or what administration is in power.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I should like to ask the gentleman about another phase of this bill. The other day I heard of an in-

stance where someone had in his possession a detailed aerial map of the Oak Ridge atomic-energy plant. Is there anything in this bill that would stop people from making flights of that sort where they could make aerial maps and then circulate them around generally?

Mr. BRYSON. I believe the bill in its present form will take care of a situation like that. We at least hope so. If it develops in the debate that it is not sufficient, I hope a proper amendment will be offered.

Mr. BROOKS. It seems to me it is extremely hazardous to permit photographs to be taken indiscriminately of plants of that character, and then permit those photographs to get loose and perhaps get into alien hands.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield further, the FBI's letter on Edward U. Condon, head of the Bureau of Standards, branded him as the weakest link in our atomic security. That was one of the most damaging letters I have ever known to be written about a man on the Federal pay roll, but he is there yet. Whenever conditions like that arise, a man on whom the FBI would make such a report ought to be removed from the Federal pay roll.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. I am in accord with most of the provisions of this bill. I think we need additional safeguards, especially after what has been disclosed by the court trials. But I call the gentleman's attention to paragraph (f) on page 4 of the bill, where it is provided that gross negligence is punishable by a fine of \$10,000 or imprisonment for 10 years. Gross negligence basically is confined to civil proceedings, and it is susceptible to a thousand interpretations. It seems to me it is rather harsh, in the light of all that has been going on in this country, to subject the American people to an interpretation of gross negligence where they have hanging over their heads a penalty involving imprisonment for 10 years and a fine of \$10,000.

Mr. WILLIS. That is in the law today. This bill makes no change in that portion of the law.

Mr. BRYSON. I certainly would not want to change it so as to make it weaker or less applicable.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN], a member of the committee.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, the very splendid analysis of this bill just given by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the very fine statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON], leave very little necessary to be said. The bill is aptly and succinctly described by its title. It relates to the internal security of the United States.

It is a national defense bill. It came to the committee and now comes to the House after careful preparation and much study in committee. In the prep-

aration of the original draft there was intensive collaboration among representatives from the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army, the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Department of the Navy, and the Central Intelligence Agency, these several units making up the Departmental Intelligence Committee.

H. R. 4703 is intended to close up loopholes which the Department of Justice and the Department of Defense feel are present in existing law by reason of which opportunities are open for the unauthorized acquiring both by citizens and aliens of information vital to our national security and making it possible for such information to be used against the public safety without fear of prosecution. It is not necessary to recount instances fresh in the minds of us all indicating the necessity for the strongest possible legislation to prevent the collection and dissemination of information relating to the national defense of such a nature as to clearly constitute a threat to our national security by making it possible for a foreign nation to acquire information or material of tremendous value to that nation because vital to our own defense and security.

So far as I know, there has been no responsible, legitimate opposition voiced to this bill, except possibly some that may have come to the committee after the close of the hearings from certain individuals or groups who may honestly and conscientiously believe there is something in this proposal which would restrict civil liberties.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, we must remember that the rights and liberties of the individual cease when the rights of the people intervene and become paramount in the interest of the national safety. I think we ought also to remember that when we think of our vaunted and boasted civil liberties, we might well pause to reflect that these liberties and rights might very easily disappear unless we in the legislative halls do everything within our power to insure that this Republic shall exercise its right and its duty of self-preservation.

By rendering to the several agencies of the Government whose responsibility it is to protect and maintain the national safety the facilities provided by this legislation, we will make it easier for the Government to defend itself from subversive elements within our borders as well as enemies on the outside. We are also setting up additional insurance to guarantee the perpetuity of the Republic in order that individual citizens may continue to enjoy their rights and liberties.

No honest citizen need be fearful of any consequences which could possibly flow to him as a result of the passage of this legislation. No citizen, who is loyal and willing to admit that the interests of his Government outweigh any personal interests he may have, need fear that any of his civil liberties or the individual rights of any other citizen are in any degree violated by this proposed amendment to our internal security law. I hope the bill will pass unanimously and speedily become the law of the land.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe we are all interested and in agreement on the purposes of this bill.

The question then comes up as to the proper methods of approaching the problem. We all want to protect the internal security of the United States, both in peace and in war, but we also want to protect the civil liberties of the United States. The question then is, Where is the dividing line between the legitimate interests of internal security and where is the legitimate interest of the freedom of the people? Where those interests of the freedom of the people begin, then the people should have the right to freedom without suspicion and without their actions being taken for anything other than the free actions of free people.

May I ask the committee what several items mean, so that we will have them for the record?

I notice under paragraph (a) of the bill, if anyone flies over, for example, a work of defense, or a canal or railroad or camp or factory, if it is connected with the national defense—it does not have to be United States owned, it can just simply be constructed originally for defense—if this occurs and the location is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States it is an offense under this act. How far does that provision go?

Mr. TACKETT. If the gentleman will read the first line of that paragraph which says:

Whoever, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense with intent or reason to believe that the information is to be used to the injury of the United States—

If he then goes ahead and flies over and takes some pictures, he is guilty.

Mr. FULTON. Who has the "reason to believe"? Is that phrase definite enough?

Mr. TACKETT. That would be like any other question in the trial. It would be necessary for you to prove he had reason to believe that it would be to the detriment of the United States, or be to the detriment of the national defense of this country, or helpful to some foreign country.

Mr. FULTON. Must the overt acts that individual has taken of themselves show a reasonable belief, or must it be proved by intent that the person who is doing the acts reasonably believed they would help a foreign power?

Mr. TACKETT. You mean whether or not it is necessary to prove his intent?

Mr. FULTON. Yes. What kind of proof do you have to have on this intent?

Mr. TACKETT. I will admit that it is not required to prove intent beyond a reasonable doubt when the national defense is concerned, as it is in ordinary crimes which are tried in the various courts of the country.

Mr. FULTON. That is the point I am trying to bring out. May I say to you, if that is the intent of the committee, then this legislation, so far as that particular provision is concerned, is unconstitutional.

Mr. TACKETT. We do not think it is.

Mr. FULTON. Congress cannot change the criminal statutes so as to find a man guilty without adequate proof, simply because of his supposed intent. You must have some overt act and then intent which have to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt, which question is submitted to the jury. If the committee does not have that in mind as a test, then to me this provision is unconstitutional.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. The provision that the gentlemen are talking about contains the word "intent." There has to be an intent. If the gentleman will read that paragraph he will find out there has to be the kind of intent he was talking about.

Mr. FULTON. I agree with the gentleman from Maine on that. However, let me ask you this question as to proof. As the gentleman from Oklahoma and I were discussing, How do we prove that intent, by what means, and by what weight of evidence under this section?

Mr. FELLOWS. Of course, you have to prove intent beyond a reasonable doubt, the same as you do in any crime.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman from Maine therefore disagrees with the gentleman from Oklahoma because the gentleman from Oklahoma has just said under this provision it is not intended by the committee that the proof shall be beyond a reasonable doubt.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, may I explain that in my opinion I do not think you have exactly what I intended to say. I say that this bill does modify intent, but in this particular paragraph which you are talking about it could not modify what is ordinarily used as intent on this particular phase of the bill.

Mr. FULTON. Then in conclusion even under this paragraph, the act plus the intent must be proved by evidence which is beyond a reasonable doubt?

Mr. TACKETT. Sure; that is plain.

Mr. FULTON. But that is exactly opposite to what the gentleman said previously.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman is mistaken, because I was talking about the general provisions of this bill; in other words, for the gathering, transmitting, and losing of information concerning the national defense. At the present time it is necessary to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the intent and purpose of the person when he has information that he lost to the hands of someone that would be detrimental to this country.

Mr. FULTON. My purpose in asking these questions is to clear this matter of necessary proof. May I ask of the Chairman: There is no intent by the provisions of this bill to change the rules of evidence commonly accepted in the United States and to allow any crime alleged under the provisions of this bill to be proved by less than "beyond a reasonable doubt"?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman states it exactly. There is no attempt on the part of the committee in offering this bill to change the ordinary rules of evi-

dence with reference to proof by the prosecuting officer.

Mr. FULTON. One further question, on page 2, line 7, the bill states "within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States." Does that mean jurisdiction in the legal sense as to courts, or does that mean only an installation under the control and operated or owned by the United States?

Mr. CELLER. That means the general jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. FULTON. So it does not, then, mean the limiting of this particular provision simply to particular installations either owned or operated exclusively by the United States?

Mr. CELLER. No.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I call the gentleman's attention to page 1 of the bill, paragraph (a). The gentleman will notice that the expression there is in the alternative:

Whoever, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense with intent or reason—

The gentleman will notice the alternative "or"—

with intent or reason to believe that the information is to be used to the injury of the United States, or to the advantage of any foreign nation.

So, if you leave out the word "intent" the man could be convicted on "reason to believe" under this section.

Mr. FULTON. I should like for the chairman to hear that. Would the gentleman repeat it?

Mr. JONAS. I am calling attention to paragraph (a) on page 1 where it states:

Whoever, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense with intent or reason to believe—

That is stated in the alternative. Even if intent were stricken out the man could be convicted on "reason to believe" and intent would not have to be proved.

Mr. FULTON. But each one must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

Mr. JONAS. It is "reason" or "intent."

Mr. CELLER. It is in the alternative; and "reason to believe" is pretty close to "intent," is it not?

Mr. FULTON. But the proof on each must be beyond a reasonable doubt, must it not?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, either "intent" or "reason to believe." I do not see very much difference between them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Just before the last war Japanese officers were strutting around this capital with photographic instruments taking pictures of everything they could find. I was over in Hawaii in 1937 and found the same condition prevailing there. When the time came for the storming of Pearl Harbor those same Japanese traitors used that information to help destroy the American Navy. From my viewpoint you cannot make this language too strong. I doubt if any foreign power has a right

to fly its planes over our places of national defense.

Mr. FULTON. The point we are making here is to make the language clear so that when proper cases come up the courts will then know what the intent of Congress is. That is the purpose we have in mind.

Mr. RANKIN. I would make it as strong as it possibly could be made. The safety of America comes first.

Mr. FULTON. I direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to page 6, line 19, subsection (5) where the language reads:

Any person who has knowledge of or has received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party—

Will the gentleman from New York tell the Committee what he understands that to mean? Suppose I know about the Conservative Party in England and that I learned about it in school, had received instruction on it, and had knowledge of it—and this language, too, is in the alternative—how far does this offense under this subsection (5) go? Are we condemning persons acting in a legitimate political interest, or does it have to be the kind of party that we would label here as subversive of democratic institutions? There is no label indicative of that in this bill.

Mr. CELLER. Read the balance of that subdivision 5, page 7:

has been acquired solely by reason of academic or personal interest not under the supervision of or in preparation for service with the government of a foreign country or a foreign political party or unless, by reason of employment at any time by the Department of Justice—

And so forth. That language modifies what the gentleman first said.

Mr. FULTON. But if the Conservative Party in England put out a brochure and if I had it, then I would be guilty.

Mr. CELLER. It all depends upon the purposes to which the action alluded. If he did it, and it comes squarely within that language at the end of the paragraph on page 7 I think he would be guilty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, may I admit in the beginning that I was a bit confused a while ago during the colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I was thinking of subsection 1 (d) with respect to intent and I wish the Members would read on page 3 of the report the provisions of subsection 1 (d):

Subsection 1 (d) provides that those having lawful possession of the items described therein relating to the national defense who willfully communicate, or cause to be communicated, or attempt to communicate them to an unauthorized person, or who willfully fail to deliver them to an authorized person on demand, shall be guilty of a crime.

Here is the portion that I think is of particular interest:

No showing of intent is necessary as an element of the offense, provided the possessor

has reason to believe that the material communicated could be used to the detriment of the United States or to the advantage of a foreign nation. The absence of a requirement for intent is justified, it is believed, in contrast to the express requirement of intent in subsections 1 (a), 1 (b), and 1 (c), in view of the fact that subsection 1 (d) deals with persons presumably in closer relationship to the Government which they seek to betray.

That portion of the report clarifies the question involved concerning the required intent under this proposed legislation.

Mr. WALTER. Does that not merely shift the burden of proof?

Mr. TACKETT. This merely shifts the burden of proof of ordinary intent. What the courts require in this country concerning intent is not in the least changed.

There is but one subsection of this bill that would be involved in the "intent" controversy. No showing of intent is necessary as an element of the offense under subsection 1 (d).

Mr. Chairman, this bill simply attempts to take care of some cases of late that we all know about, and that have happened during the last few years pertaining to the gathering of, the transmitting of, or the intentional losing of, information affecting the national defense, detrimental to our country and helpful to some other country.

The statute of limitations has been changed so that a person may be prosecuted for an offense as late as 10 years after the offense has been committed rather than the present requirement that he be prosecuted within 3 years. It was first suggested that the statute of limitations be entirely removed; but, that would be a hardship on an innocent accused person because his witnesses may have vanished or have died or some other things might have taken place. The lapse of memory would preclude him from having a proper defense. Therefore, the committee felt a 10-year statute of limitations was sufficient.

This bill under section 3 provides a penalty for failure to register and makes it a continuing offense for an organization to fail to register.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Would the change in the statute of limitations from 3 to 10 years open up the possibility of penalizing those more than 3 years from this date or from the date of the enactment of this act back? It would be retroactive for 10 years; is that correct?

Mr. TACKETT. No. Should 3 years time have expired since an alleged offense has been committed, this legislation would not make possible the opportunity to prosecute the offender. However, should 3 years time not have expired by the time this proposed legislation becomes effective, the statute of limitations will be extended concerning any previous offenses.

Mr. WALTER. If the statute of limitations has already run, then the case could not be reopened. However, if the statute has run only partly, then it would be extended to the full period of 10 years.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The statute of limitations, though, does not run in favor of a man who is outside of the jurisdiction of the United States. Say, if he has escaped and gone to a foreign country, the statute of limitations does not run in his favor.

Mr. TACKETT. That is the present law. The Secretary of Defense is authorized under the provisions of this proposed legislation, to prescribe regulations and penalties for the security of the military installations. Now, that portion of the bill might be the most controversial, I do not know, but we can all well imagine instances wherein it is necessary that we not wait for the Congress to pass legislation that would protect the military installations of this country.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Would the chairman of the committee explain the meaning of subsection (5) of section 3? Will the gentleman explain how that was written, so that the language becomes clear?

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania has raised a good point. The language is not too clear, and I think we ought to clear it.

On page 6, line 19, there should be a comma after the word "of" and a comma on line 20 after the word "in" so that subsection (5) would read: "any person who has knowledge of, or has received instruction or assignment in, the espionage". At the appropriate time, I shall offer that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the bill we are now considering is to protect the safety of the United States against the spying or treasonable activities on the part of any person or persons. The bill should be enacted into law to prevent anyone from acquiring information vital to our national security and using that information for the advantage of a foreign power and to the disadvantage and danger of the United States without fear of prosecution in our courts and punishment under our laws. The protection afforded by this measure will safeguard our defense installations where our weapons and munitions are manufactured. This measure is necessary to protect the great war plants where our guns, ships, ammunition, and the atomic bomb are manufactured. Conviction for violation of these provisions of the act is punishable by a fine of not more than \$10,000 and by imprisonment of not more than 10 years, or both.

Anyone who wilfully and unlawfully discloses information within his knowledge that affects the national safety is made liable to a fine of \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

The act extends the statute of limitations from 3 to 10 years, so that one violating the act may be prosecuted and convicted any time within 10 years after he violates the act. The statute of limitations does not commence to run during the term of office of any officer of the United States who violates the act until such person's term of office has expired.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not aimed at any decent citizen in this country. No loyal citizen, no American who is attached to his Government and is loyal to it need fear that he will come within the sweep of the condemnation of this statute. I have no concern for anybody who wants to hamstring or betray, for money or for any other purpose, this Government, and I am happy to state that we do not produce that kind of people down in my neck of the woods in eastern Tennessee. That is one reason why the Government located the Atomic Energy Plant at Oak Ridge in Anderson and in Roane Counties in my district. It was put there, in the first place, because it is far removed from the coast, protected by mountains and by hills; and, in the second place, because it was located in a section of the country which is more predominantly 100 percent American than any other section of the country, and I do not say that in derogation of anybody who has come here from a foreign country in order to become a good citizen, who becomes naturalized and takes the oath of allegiance.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Please let me finish.

Mr. RANKIN. I was going to give the gentleman the main reasons for putting the Atomic Energy Plant at Oak Ridge.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am going to come to that, if you will give me a chance.

It was put there because of the unquestioned loyalty of those people. A few miles from Oak Ridge is located the greatest aluminum plant in the world. During the war 13,000 men, women, boys, and girls, both colored and white, were employed in that aluminum plant, and among that 13,000 employees each and every one of them, with one exception, was a native-born American. That could not happen anywhere else in this great country of ours.

In the third place, the atomic energy plant was located where it was because we had an unlimited quantity of hydroelectric power due to the fact that it was located within the heart of the area where has been built the Tennessee Valley Authority and the greatest system of hydro-electric plants in the world.

Those are the three reasons why it came there. During all the time the bomb was being fabricated there was no suggestion of any espionage, no suggestion of any leak of any secrets. People did not try to find out what it was all about. Some of the girls that worked down there, when they passed by some of those plants may have lost their bobby pins out of their hair, they would jump out of their hair, but that did not disclose anything.

I am not worried about the meaning of anybody's intent, I am not worried

about anybody's violating this law and feeling the halter drawn by virtue of doing something that he has reason to believe will be inimical and dangerous to the security of this Nation. Every lawyer knows what intent means. As used in this statute, it is a desire, a purpose to do anything that is condemned by this proposed law. A man is presumed ordinarily to intend the necessary consequences of his own act. A person who has sense enough to be engaged as a spy or a traitor by a foreign government or an agency representing a foreign government, or an enemy of this country, if he was stealing some secret process from Oak Ridge or some other defense plant in this country, would know what he was up to.

I am not disposed to split hairs on questions like this. I had a friend some years ago who lived at Williamsburg, Ky., which is across the State line from where I dwell in Jellicoe, Tenn. He had been a Member of Congress. He would come up to my town and I would say, "Charlie, how are you feeling today?" He would say, "Fine, John, fine as frog hair, but not fractional."

In this proposed act we are not dealing in fractional frog hair or fractional any kind of hair. We are not splitting hairs.

I have no apprehension, no mental disturbance about the danger of this law to anyone who seeks to injure or to betray this country. I subscribe to the doctrine of Bobby Burns, that it is the fear of hell and the hangman's noose that keeps the wretch in order. Let them know once and for all that we have a statute on the books with teeth in it, and that if they violate it J. Edgar Hoover's men or somebody else who is in the law enforcement business and the crime prevention business of this Government will put their finger on him. I believe the arm of this country should be long enough and strong enough to reach the collar of every traitor beneath the flag and bring him into a United States district court, where he will be indicted and where he will be arraigned and put on trial before 12 honest men, honest jurors, and where a judge learned in the law will know how to instruct the jury.

There is nothing highly technical about this. I am not trying to punch any sifter holes in this law by asking questions and quibbling and fumbling around with it. Just let it be said once and for all that this is a law for the protection of the United States of America, and it is aimed at a man who wants to betray this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman on that statement, but I want to add two more reasons this plant was placed at Oak Ridge. The prime reason was that it was close to an ample supply of hydroelectric power.

Mr. JENNINGS. I just said that.

Mr. RANKIN. The other was that it was on a navigable stream and can be reached by barges at all times of the year and it is only a short distance from the Tennessee River, which is navigable all

the time. More than a million tons of essential materials have been delivered to Oak Ridge by barges.

Mr. JENNINGS. No; it is not navigable, in the sense that it can be navigated by a big steamboat, but it is full of water and it is wet, and they use it in carrying on that atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge. I wish the river were navigable. Oak Ridge is on Clinch River. You can go up and down it in a duck boat, a fishing boat, but you cannot use a steamboat on it. The big thing about which we can all rejoice is that it is down there where the people are loyal, where it is away from the coast, and where there is plenty of electricity.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This bill extends the time under which the acts complained of could be prosecuted?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is important.

Mr. JENNINGS. It is important.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In connection with some of the espionage activities the Committee on Un-American Activities has been investigating in the past year, we found that the statute of limitations on certain things has run out, and about the only way you can get at some of these things is to charge people with perjury. They should be charged with the original crime.

Mr. JENNINGS. It is too bad they could not be charged with both perjury and treason. I am talking about Alger Hiss and all of his cohorts and accessories both before and after the fact, and within the sweep of that language comes Acheson, our good-for-nothing Secretary of State.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I simply wanted to say to the gentleman in my judgment the people of his district demonstrated their loyalty as good Americans best by sending the gentleman here to Congress.

Mr. JENNINGS. I appreciate those kind words, and I am grateful for the support of my friends in my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 4703, relates to the internal security of the United States.

Section 1 (a) virtually reenacts existing law making it a crime for a person to go upon a vessel or other work for defense for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense, with intent or reason to believe that the information is to be used to the injury of the United States.

The only new language is the addition of Air Force bases to the list of places defined in the present act.

Section 1 (b) restates existing law making it a crime for a person to make copies of or to make away with plans, blueprints, and other listed items, with the intent aforesaid.

The only new language is the addition of the word "matter" to the list of items in the present law. The term is designed to include such physical matter as uranium or analogous substances which are not precisely within the scope of the balance of the enumerated items.

Section 1 (c) also restates existing law making it a crime for a person to receive from another code book, for example, and other items listed, knowing or having reason to believe that it has been obtained to the injury of the United States.

Again, the only new language is the addition of the word "matter" to the provisions of the present law.

Subsections 1 (d) and (e) split the fourth paragraph of section 793 of title 18 of the United States Code into two parts in order to draw a distinction between a person having lawful possession and a person having unauthorized possession of a map, code book, for example, and other listed items.

Under subsection 1 (d) if a person has lawful possession of such material and delivers the same to another person not authorized to receive it, or willfully retains it and fails to deliver it on demand, he commits a crime. A demand is necessary because such person had lawful possession to begin with, but a showing of intent is necessary if the person has reason to believe that the material communicated could be used to the detriment of the United States.

Under subsection (e) if a person has unauthorized possession of such an item and delivers it to one not authorized to receive it, or willfully retains it and fails to deliver it, he commits the crime. Here a demand is unnecessary, because the possession is unauthorized and the person had no business obtaining the material to begin with. Note that the term "unauthorized" instead of "unlawful" possession is used so as to preclude the need for proof of illegal possession.

Both subsections (d) and (e) make the transmission of information relating to the national defense unlawful.

Under present law it is made a crime for a person having lawful possession of a document, for example, and other listed items to permit it to be removed from its proper place through gross negligence. Section 1 (f) (2) makes it likewise unlawful for a person having knowledge that such material has been removed or stolen, not to report it.

In all instances the crime is made punishable by a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 10 years, or both.

Section 1 (g) makes a conspiracy to commit the crimes above listed as grave as the commission of the crime itself, and punishable in the same way.

Section 2 increases the statute of limitations in prosecutions under the preceding sections from 3 to 10 years. The Hiss case is an example of a situation which, if one period of limitations had been adequate, prosecution could have been had against Hiss and Chambers. Although we do not know the precise facts in the Fuchs case, it is possible that under present law, had Fuchs been held for action in the United States he would go scot free through the short-

ness of the statute of limitations in the present law.

Section 3 amends the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938.

It provides that a person who has received instructions in espionage, counter-espionage, or sabotage service of a foreign country must register—Fuchs.

It exempts from the provisions of the law, however, persons who acquired such knowledge solely by reason of academic or personal interest, not under the supervision of or in preparation for service with a foreign power.

And section 3 makes the failure to register a continuing offense, so as to postpone the commencement of the statute of limitations.

Section 4 delegates to the Secretary of Defense the power to promulgate orders and regulations, the violations of which are made punishable. These security regulations, however, must relate to the protection of the military establishments listed, such as ports, water-front facilities and so on against fire, sabotage, and so forth. Congress gave such authority to the Secretary of the Navy during the war but the act expired June 30, 1947. The committee has satisfied itself that such delegation of authority is constitutional. Many similar delegations have occurred in the past and upon being tested in court their constitutionality has been confirmed. Nor does the committee feel that the broad power conferred on the National Military Establishment is a bit more than necessary for minimum security purposes in this atomic age.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, those of us who have lived through the last decade have realized the changing situation in America. No longer are we an isolated nation.

We are dealing now in terms of possible warfare, in terms of chemistry, in terms of high explosives. It is becoming increasingly apparent that there are serious loopholes and modes of escape in our defense laws, and the necessity we are under of closing those loopholes. Various departments of our Government have awakened to the necessity of meeting this situation adequately and conclusively. This bill is designed for that very purpose.

Without going into any of the technicalities of the bill, I may state that it has for its end the protection of America, to prevent the recurrence of such things as you and I have witnessed within the last few years, the escaping of valuable material from this country, the disclosure of secrets that are highly necessary for our own protection.

No citizen who obeys the law has any occasion to fear the provisions of this act. I urge that we honestly and earnestly protect ourselves in the enactment of this adequate legislation.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing wrong with this bill except that it does not go far enough. I rise with the

utmost respect for our chairman—for he also later was the author of a wire-tapping bill—to make sure that no one misunderstands his statement that the Committee on the Judiciary was unanimously in favor of deleting those provisions of the bill which dealt with wire tapping. There are many of us on that committee who thoroughly agree that any provisions that are reasonable, that clothe the FBI and the Intelligence units of our Defense Establishment with the power of wire tapping for their peculiar purposes, including the use of the product of such wire tapping in evidence. But we were in the minority. I cannot help thinking, however, and as long as I can think and voice my thoughts, I am for such wire tapping. I remember that 6 or 8 months before Pearl Harbor my wire-tapping bill with those provisions was voted down in this House by less than 10 votes, and that Mr. Justice Roberts in the Pearl Harbor report said that if we had had the protection of an adequate wire-tapping authorization, the tragedy of Pearl Harbor might have been avoided.

I was for Mr. Justice Sutherland's dissenting opinion when it was held that the Federal Communications Act meant to outlaw legitimate wire tapping. I am still for it, and I believe that it ought to be the law of the land, no matter whether it comes through the Supreme Court or through Congress.

I quote from Mr. Justice Sutherland's dissenting opinion, concurred in by Mr. Justice McReynolds:

I think the word "person" used in the statute does not include an officer of the Federal Government, actually engaged in the detection of crime and the enforcement of the criminal statutes of the United States, who has good reason to believe that a telephone is being, or is about to be, used as an aid to the commission or concealment of a crime. The decision just made will necessarily have the effect of enabling the most depraved criminals to further their criminal plans over the telephone, in the secure knowledge that even if these plans involve kidnapping and murder, their telephone conversations can never be intercepted by officers of the law and revealed in court. If Congress thus intended to tie the hands of the Government in its effort to protect the people against lawlessness of the most serious character, it would have said so in a more definite way than by the use of the ambiguous word "person." *Commonwealth v. Welosky* (276 Mass. 398, 403-404, 406; 177 N. E. 656.)

My abhorrence of the odious practices of the town gossip, the peeping tom, and the private eavesdropper is quite as strong as that of any of my brethren. But to put the sworn officers of the law, engaged in the detection and apprehension of organized gangs of criminals, in the same category, is to lose all sense of proportion. (*Nardone v. U. S.* (302 U. S. 385, 387.))

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am happy to say in that connection that I recall the occasion when the bill the gentleman brought in to legalize wire tapping in cases such as we are talking about now and its use as evidence in court, and I

voted in favor of it. I have been happy about it ever since.

Mr. HOBBS. And a great many others voted likewise; so did the members of the Committee on the Judiciary when they reported the bill overwhelmingly.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. With pleasure, sir.

Mr. FULTON. Is the gentleman in favor of tapping the wires of Congressmen and Senators? And are they tapped now?

Mr. HOBBS. I am in favor of allowing the FBI, our Federal investigational body, in which I have the utmost confidence—also the national defense intelligence groups—to tap wires indiscriminately to detect criminals, no matter who they are; and if the first one they catch is SAM HOBBS, God bless them; I would still be for them.

Mr. FULTON. Then, as a member of the committee, may I ask the gentleman: Are any Congressmen's wires tapped now by the FBI?

Mr. HOBBS. I know of none; and I do not believe so. I still believe that we ought to authorize the law enforcement agencies of this Government at least to the extent of enabling them to compete with criminals who tap wires indiscriminately always and all the time, 24 hours a day.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. In response to the interrogation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, may I say that we of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the legislative branch recently had before us witnesses representing the telephone company who testified that in no instance were the wires of a Member of Congress being tapped insofar as they knew.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for that enlightening information.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Then the inferences of a newspaper columnist recently that there was wire tapping of the phones of Members of Congress is incorrect, is that right?

Mr. CANFIELD. The testimony is that Members' wires are not tapped.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I say in addition to what I said a moment ago that I believe the practice indulged in by some Federal agencies of having the telephone company install recording devices to be used by those agencies to record telephonic conversations with Members of Congress is entirely improper, especially for those agencies not concerned in any way with the national defense.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, the gentleman and I are in hearty accord on that

point. I know of no one who favors any such practice.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to use this 3 minutes to refer again to those taxes and taxes and taxes that were referred to here so often this morning. Yesterday during the time when 1-minute speeches were in order I referred on the floor of the House to the 49 percent increase in profits after taxes of General Motors over their profits of 1948. The gentleman from New York informed me later in the course of the morning that under socialistic forms of government great corporations prospered. We do not have a socialistic form of government or anything bordering on socialism. So I thought I would check the record to see just what basis there was for her statement.

I found on checking that the tobacco manufacturers of the United States, and all through the industry, increased their profits in 1949 over 1948 by 12 percent; chemicals 10 percent; cement 18 percent; glass 28 percent; agricultural implements 22 percent; autos and trucks, clear across the industry, 31 percent; mines 6 percent; chain stores 22 percent; transportation 28 percent; amusements 12 percent; electric power 8 percent; telephone and telegraph 4 percent; construction 7 percent; farm casualty insurance companies 65 percent; investment companies 18 percent; finance companies 13 percent.

I do not like pessimists who come to the floor of the House every day to tell us something to be sorry about, something to be afraid of or be scared over. While we are looking at the dark side, let us look at the light side once in a while. This country is enjoying the greatest business prosperity ever known in peacetime.

I am glad that these things are true. I am glad we do not have that depression that was prophesied by Republicans a year ago. I am glad that business is prospering and under the Truman administration it is prospering, and that is not socialism.

When you come down to the income tax, Mr. Chairman, it is the fairest tax in the world. I may owe 80 percent of the going value of a property. I pay property taxes on the part of the business I own and the part of it I do not own. Its operation may show a net loss, yet I pay taxes on full value of the property just the same. But in the case of the income tax I can deduct wages and I can deduct depreciation and if I do not show a net I do not have a tax to pay. I tell you that the income tax is the fairest tax, the most just tax, that has ever been levied in the United States and I hope that every gentleman within the sound of my voice will never see the time come when he will love his money more than he will love his country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] has again come back on the same subject that he and I were discussing yesterday. I cannot see that anything he has said this afternoon changes my argument in any way. He has again read off a long list of large corporations that have made large profits. We all know that. My contention was that when the gentleman brought this up as an argument against socialism and the Socialist state, he was taking the wrong end of the argument. I did not speak specifically of the United States, because I do not consider that this country is yet socialistic. I believe the gentleman and I agree at least on that.

I would like to point out, however, that what I did say was that under national socialism the big corporations flourished. That cannot be denied. I refer the gentleman to Italy and Germany before the war. The great cartels were there and were flourishing; in fact, after the war we treated the heads of those big corporations as war criminals, and it may be a consolation to the gentleman from Missouri, and to some others who do not care very much about big business, to realize that after the next war, if we should meet reverses, the president of the Chrysler Corp., the board of directors of General Motors, and others, will probably go to the Siberian salt mines with the distinguished Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States.

No; big government and big business go hand in hand, and small business is being pushed more and more to the wall. It is not quite there yet, but what we want to do, and what I am sure my distinguished colleague wants to do as much as I, is to save the small businesses of the United States of America.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, with such inspection as I have been able to give to this bill, I think it is a good bill. I know what you are trying to do here, from my work on the Atomic Energy Committee, and I think it has a worthy object.

However, on page 8, beginning with section (a), on line 10, I want to ask if some language could not be substituted there which would put the approval of such regulations as are promulgated up to the President of the United States in place of the Secretary of Defense, or any military commander designated by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I personally would be agreeable to an amendment which would provide in effect that the Secretary of Defense would have to first get the approval of the President of the United States to promulgate such regulations.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I was concerned about exactly the same thing, and propose to offer an amendment which I would like to submit to the gentleman to see if it would not meet our joint views. My amendment proposes, in line 14, to insert the words "reasonably required."

Now, if the gentleman will read it, I will tell him what it means.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have read it, and I have considered those words already, and I believe there can be better language evolved.

I would suggest that the following language be stricken in line 12, after the word "promulgated", "or approved by the Secretary of Defense or by any military commander designated by the Secretary of Defense." Those words, in my opinion, should be removed and "President of the United States" substituted. The reason I make this request is this: We are in another section of the bill giving the President the power to extend the scope of this act.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I have an amendment I intend to offer which will perhaps meet the gentleman's objections to the existing language. On page 8, line 12, after "promulgated" strike out "or approved by the Secretary of Defense or by any military commander designated by the Secretary of Defense" and insert in lieu thereof "by the Secretary of Defense, approved by the President of the United States."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That would be satisfactory to me. The point at issue is this. Under the present language, as I construe it, any military commander, even though he might be in charge of a squad of men at some obscure station, could promulgate a rule or regulation which would bring the unwary violator under a penalty of a fine of \$5,000 or imprisonment for 1 year. I believe that is going a little bit further than we want to go in peacetime in giving power to an obscure military commander. I would not even want to give it to the Secretary of Defense, although I respect him very highly. It is not a personal matter. I believe that in time of war these things have to be done, but I am very wary of giving additional powers in peacetime to this great, sprawling military establishment, which spends six-sevenths of our procurement in our economic plane, and has such a tremendous effect on our universities through grants-in-aid to scientific research, and so forth. I believe the country is entirely protected by having the President approve such rules or regulations as the Secretary of Defense might promulgate, but it would give the civilian part of the United States one more check against arbitrary use of military power in peacetime.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I can see the apprehension under which the gentleman might labor, that corporals, sergeants, and lieutenants might issue such directives, but does not the gentleman realize that the military commanders here referred to are generals who are in charge of an area? Does the gentleman doubt the patriotism of the Secretary of Defense or the good sense of the Secretary of Defense or of a man big enough to be a general in charge of an area or an Army corps? I think the gentleman is looking under the bed for something that is not there.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not doubt the patriotism of the Secretary of Defense or any member of the National Defense Establishment but I might be inclined to doubt the wisdom of some obscure corporal or lieutenant who might be carried away by the emotion of his patriotism and act unwisely.

Mr. JENNINGS. I think the gentleman is seeing something there which does not exist.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The fact of the matter is that I think the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is sufficient guard to take care of the situation raised by the gentleman from California, who has just left the floor. I would call his attention to the fact that he does not need to be concerned, it seems to me, about some obscure corporal or lieutenant or sergeant issuing regulations, because this law as drawn states that it must be promulgated or approved by the Secretary of Defense or by any military commander designated by the Secretary of Defense. So the hobgoblin the gentleman from California sees could not possibly exist under the very language of the law itself.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to raise this question with the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Pennsylvania. One of my colleagues raised with me a very pertinent question of a "No smoking" sign in an ordinary quartermaster's depot, which could, I might tell the gentleman from Wisconsin, be under the command of a junior officer—might such a man, because there was a sign posted saying "No smoking," be held liable under this severe section.

The question I raise is whether we are better off as a matter of policy leaving these regulations to the President, which is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania proposes, or are we better off leaving it to a court to determine, at the same time it determines whether or not a misdemeanor has been committed. This could be done by providing for a determination whether or not the regulation which was violated was "reasonably required" for—and I use the words of the section—"the protection or security" of the particular installation?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would have this remark to make, and I am not a lawyer, so I may be wrong. I know of a recent instance at Oak Ridge where an appeal to a civil court was denied on the ground of lack of jurisdiction. The plaintiff was ordered to go to the Federal court in order to obtain relief. Of course, you have to go through certain procedures to be heard by a Federal court, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. JAVITS. Could we have the views of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on that subject, whether he would rather have the court or the President determine this question of the reasonableness of the regulation?

Mr. WALTER. I am quite certain the gentleman has an overabundance of caution to protect the rights of the people. This is entirely adequate. It certainly does not seem to me that this is the sort of thing to be interpreted by the courts.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman and am sure that the amendment will be offered at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that we are all aware of the threats being made to our form of Government and to the liberties guaranteed to all of us by our Constitution. No loyal American will question the need for the greatest amount of security—when we are threatened in this manner. Since this threat is new and strange to America—America must exert every effort and find every conceivable means to cope with these subversive forces which threaten it.

We owe it ourselves, we owe it to our children to preserve the interests of the United States. What good our rights if they will eventually be destroyed by lack of adequate protection from subversive forces? For this reason it is imperative we improve our security legislation so that we discourage and prevent a certain amount of espionage.

Some question may be raised as to the validity of this measure from the point of constitutionality because it delegates to the Secretary of Defense the power to promulgate orders and regulations, violations of which are made punishable by fine and imprisonment provided in the section 4, for the security of enumerated military installations.

Many precedents exist for the delegation by Congress to executive agencies of its legislative power to promulgate security regulations of a criminal nature. The Supreme Court, on numerous occasions has sustained such delegation. The only criterion has been the clarity of the statute in describing the limits and objects of the grant. It is the opinion of the committee that this requirement is satisfied.

Let us also remember that in these troubled uncertain days the security forces of this country must be equipped to respond quickly to emergencies. And the failure to be able to respond instantaneously because of the lack of power

to adopt such regulations instantaneously could serve to cripple our security.

Mr. Chairman, we need this added protection. Therefore, I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 4703. I hope and urge that it will be passed unanimously. We need this law to strengthen the internal security of our country. I also take this occasion to urge the Judiciary Committee to hold hearings on House Joint Resolution 9. I introduced House Joint Resolution 9 in the first month of the Eighty-first Congress. It provides for a treason penalty for persons who give aid or assistance to agents of a foreign nation seeking to overthrow the United States Government, whether or not by force or violence. At present there is no such thing as peace-time treason, for the Constitution limits the crime to making war on the United States or giving aid to a nation at war with the United States. The constitutional provision should be broadened to cover peace-time treason, by providing that one is a traitor if he gives aid or assistance to an agent of a country seeking to overthrow the United States Government. The omission should be corrected immediately and I hope that House Joint Resolution 9 will receive the immediate attention of the House Judiciary Committee so we in Congress can vote on this measure.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

THE MISSING LINK IN OUR DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, first permit me to say I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS], so far as what he said about the people of that area are concerned.

That area is filled with the finest Anglo-Saxon people in the world, and they not only occupy that area, but all the way down through Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida.

I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that it was fortunate that this project has a mountain range between it and the ocean. It is about 800 miles we will say, from the Gulf of Mexico. Those facts were all in favor of the establishment of this, the greatest national defense on earth, at Oak Ridge.

But the most important qualification is the fact that it is adjacent to the Tennessee Valley Authority, the greatest development ever wrought by the hand of man, where an ample supply of hydroelectric power was available at all times for the development of the atomic bomb.

Another one very important fact is that it has a connection with the Gulf by barge. The Tennessee River is navigable and the Clinch is navigable for barge transportation. These facts made this the ideal location for this, the greatest of all defense plants.

As I pointed out, more than a million tons of essential materials have been de-

livered to Oak Ridge by barge, to say nothing of the materials shipped out.

Let me call your attention to the fact that now that this, the greatest defense plant the world has ever known, is the one on which America must depend in case of another conflict. For that reason I have been pressing the Congress, the Army engineers have been pressing the Congress, and other Members of Congress have been pressing for the construction of the connection with the Tennessee River and the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile by way of the Tombigbee.

That will cut the water distance from Mobile to Oak Ridge by more than 800 miles and cut the cost of transportation from Mobile to Oak Ridge by approximately 50 percent, at the same time giving us two outlets to the sea instead of one.

This Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway is the missing link in our national defense program, as well as the missing link in our internal-waterway system and should be constructed as quickly as possible.

Now, getting back to the proposition of prosecuting these criminals, so far as I am concerned, I do not think the statute of limitations ought to run against treason at all; I think you have been extremely lenient, extremely mild, in writing into this bill the qualifications that you have so far as the statute of limitations is concerned.

Any man who will betray his country or anybody who comes here for that purpose and violates the laws of the land in order to betray the American Government, ought to be hanged when he is caught. It ought to be the same penalty that we apply for murder.

There are plenty of Japs in this country, and especially in Hawaii, today who participated in the perpetration of the Pearl Harbor disaster. I do not care how long it has been. I do not care if it has been 50 years, when one of them is caught, who helped to direct the attacks on Pearl Harbor, he ought to be hanged by the neck until he is dead.

As far as I am concerned, therefore, you cannot extend this statute of limitations too far, because all traitors, all disloyal men ought to be faced with it. I think that we have been too lenient. We are too lenient now.

If I had my way, there would be a housecleaning in every department of this Government, and wherever there was doubt as to the loyalty of an individual on the Federal payroll, that individual would go off at once.

Until we clean house and fumigate every department of our Government, this country is not going to be safe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York, if he desires to use it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope I am not taking too much time, but some of us are striving to perfect the bill. May I call the attention of the Chairman of the Committee, and also the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] to page 6, line 21, where the bill states:

Counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a government of a foreign country—

I believe that it is necessary that the bill be amended to read "subversive tactics," or "tactics subversive to democratic institutions." The word "subversive" if inserted before the word "tactics" makes the language clear as to the intent of the committee.

Mr. CELLER. Would not the word "sabotage" refer to "tactics" also?

Mr. FULTON. I believe not, because the sentence structure is put in the alternative. If the word "sabotage" were an adjective that modified the phrase "espionage, counter-espionage service and tactics," the gentleman would be correct.

Mr. CELLER. I see no objection to the addition of the word "subversive" in line 21, before the word "tactics."

Mr. FULTON. Thank you, I believe that addition will strengthen the bill, and I hope that amendment may be done by consent at the proper time.

Under the present law there is power, placed in an appropriation act, for the respective secretaries to remove during the fiscal year 1950, summarily, any employee of the State Department, the Defense Department, and the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. That power summarily to remove people under Civil Service in these departments expires on June 30, 1950. I have prepared a bill, but have not yet introduced it, to protect the security of the United States by extending for a limited period, that is, from June 30, 1950, to June 30, 1951, the summary termination by the respective Secretaries of the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State, or the Department of Defense. It would seem to me, because that is now in the law solely through a provision in an appropriation bill, that there should be substantive legislation providing for it. I therefore would add it by amendment to this act, because it certainly relates to the internal security of the country.

If I may do so, I would point out to the Chairman of the Committee and to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], that the Department of State is covered in the appropriation bill carrying salaries and expenses for the Department, under Public Law 179 of the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. While I sympathize with the gentleman's point of view, I should like to know whether it would be appropriate in a bill of this character, since the gentleman's proposal concerns personnel of Government departments

and has something to do with appropriations. Would it not be well to consider it in a separate bill with separate hearings rather than to bring it up on the floor at this time?

Mr. FULTON. The idea of this bill is that there should be the same rule on this subject matter in each department; as matters stand at the present there is not. The power of summary removal of these persons exists through a provision in appropriation bills. We should have substantive legislation on the subject because it deals with a separate subject and does not relate solely to salaries.

Mr. CELLER. As I said, this rather catches the members of the committee unawares. It is of far-reaching character and should be considered on its own merits rather than as a mere appendage to a bill of this character.

Mr. FULTON. If that is the way the gentleman feels about it, I will submit it separately as a bill rather than as an amendment to the pending measure.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the bill adequately and fully protects atomic-energy installations?

Mr. FULTON. I will refer that to the chairman of the committee for an answer, whether this act fully protects the atomic-energy installations.

Mr. CELLER. I believe it does. A close reading of the bill indicates that.

Mr. ELSTON. Does it also protect laboratories and universities not owned by the Federal Government but acting as contractors for the Government?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] has an amendment which I have looked at and which he will offer that will cover the situation of laboratories as outlined by the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 18, United States Code, section 793, be, and the same is hereby, amended, to read as follows:

"(a) Whoever, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense with intent or reason to believe that the information is to be used to the injury of the United States, or to the advantage of any foreign nation, goes upon, enters, flies over, or otherwise obtains information concerning any vessel, aircraft, work of defense, navy yard, naval station, submarine base, fueling station, fort, battery, torpedo station, dockyard, canal, railroad, arsenal, camp, factory, mine, telegraph, telephone, wireless, or signal station, building, Air Force base, office, or other place connected with the national defense, owned or constructed, or in progress of construction by the United States or under the control of the United States, or of any of its officers, departments or agencies, or within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, or any place in which any vessel, aircraft, arms, munitions, or other materials or instruments for use in time of war are being made, prepared, repaired, or stored, under any contract or agreement with the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or with any person on behalf of the United States, or otherwise on behalf of the United States,

or any prohibited place so designated by the President by proclamation in time of war or in case of national emergency in which anything for the use of the Army, Navy, or Air Force is being prepared or constructed or stored, information as to which prohibited place the President has determined would be prejudicial to the national defense; or

"(b) Whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, and with like intent or reason to believe, copies, takes, makes, or obtains, or attempts to copy, take, make, or obtain, any sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, document, matter, writing, or note of anything connected with the national defense; or

"(c) Whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, receives or obtains or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain from any person, or from any source whatever, any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, matter, or note, of anything connected with the national defense, knowing or having reason to believe, at the time he receives or obtains, or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain it, that it has been or will be obtained, taken, made, or disposed of by any person contrary to the provisions of this chapter; or

"(d) Whoever, lawfully having possession of, access to, control over, or being entrusted with any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, matter, or note relating to the national defense, or information relating to the national defense which information the possessor has reason to believe could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation, willfully communicates, delivers, transmits, or causes to be communicated, delivered, or transmitted, or attempts to communicate, deliver, transmit, or cause to be communicated, delivered, or transmitted, the same to any person not entitled to receive it, or willfully retains the same and fails to deliver it on demand to the officer or employee of the United States entitled to receive it; or

"(e) Whoever having unauthorized possession of, access to, or control over any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, matter, or note relating to the national defense, or information relating to the national defense which could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation, willfully communicates, delivers, transmits, or causes to be communicated, delivered, or transmitted, or attempts to communicate, deliver, transmit, or cause to be communicated, delivered, or transmitted, the same to any person not entitled to receive it, or willfully retains the same and fails to deliver it to the officer or employee of the United States entitled to receive it; or

"(f) Whoever, being entrusted with or having lawful possession or control of any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, note, matter, or information relating to the national defense, (1) through gross negligence permits the same to be removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of his trust, or to be lost, stolen, abstracted, or destroyed, or (2) having knowledge that the same has been illegally removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of his trust, or lost, or stolen, abstracted, or destroyed, and fails to make prompt report of such loss, theft, abstraction, or destruction to his superior officer—

"Shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"(g) If two or more persons conspire to violate any of the foregoing provisions of this section, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be subject to the punishment provided for the offense which is the object of such conspiracy."

SEC. 2. An indictment for any violation of title 18, United States Code, section 792, 793; or 794 may be found at any time within 10 years next after such violation shall have been committed. This section shall not authorize prosecution, trial, or punishment for any offense now barred by the provisions of existing law.

SEC. 3. The act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631; 22 U. S. C. 611-621), entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Strike out the word "and" at the end of section 1 (c) (3), insert the word "and" at the end of section 1 (c) (4), and add the following subsection immediately after section 1 (c) (4):

"(5) Any person who has knowledge of or has received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party, unless such knowledge, instruction, or assignment has been acquired by reason of civilian, military, or police service with the United States Government, the governments of the several States, their political subdivisions, the District of Columbia, the Territories, the Canal Zone, or the insular possessions, or unless such knowledge has been acquired solely by reason of academic or personal interest not under the supervision of or in preparation for service with the government of a foreign country or a foreign political party or unless, by reason of employment at any time by the Department of Justice or the Central Intelligence Agency, such person has made full written disclosure of such knowledge or instruction to officials within those agencies, such disclosure has been made a matter of record in the files of the agency concerned, and a written determination has been made by the Attorney General or the Director of Central Intelligence that registration would not be in the interest of national security."

(b) Add the following subsection immediately after section 8 (d):

"8 (e) Failure to file any such registration statement or supplements thereto as is required by either section 2 (a) or section 2 (b) shall be considered a continuing offense for as long as such failure exists, notwithstanding any statute of limitation or other statute to the contrary."

SEC. 4. (a) Whoever willfully shall violate any such regulation or order as, pursuant to lawful authority, shall be or has been promulgated or approved by the Secretary of Defense or by any military commander designated by the Secretary of Defense for the protection or security of military or naval aircraft, airports, airport facilities, vessels, harbors, ports, piers, water-front facilities, bases, forts, posts, laboratories, stations, vehicles, equipment, explosives, or other property or places subject to the jurisdiction, administration, or in the custody of the National Military Establishment, any department or agency of which said establishment consists, or any officer or employee of said establishment, department, or agency, relating to fire hazards, fire protection, lighting, machinery, guard service, disrepair, disuse, or other unsatisfactory conditions thereon, or the ingress thereto, or egress or removal of persons therefrom, or otherwise providing for safeguarding the same against destruction, loss, or injury by acci-

dent, or by enemy action, sabotage, or other subversive actions, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be liable to a fine of not to exceed \$5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) "Every such regulation or order shall be posted in conspicuous or appropriate places.

(c) "In time of war, or national emergency as proclaimed by the President, the provisions of this section may be extended by Presidential proclamation to include such property and places as the President may therein designate in the interest of national security."

(d) If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this section and the application of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, strike out lines 15 to 20, inclusive, and insert:

"Sec. 2. (a) The analysis of chapter 213 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 3281 of such title, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"3291. Espionage and security of defense information."

"(b) Chapter 213 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 3290 the following new section:

"§ 3291. Espionage and security of defense information."

"An indictment for any violation of section 792, 793, or 794 of this title may be found at any time within 10 years next after such violation shall have been committed."

Page 7, line 20, strike out "8."

Page 7, strike out line 25 and insert the following:

"Sec. 4. (a) The analysis of chapter 67 of title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1381 of such title, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1385. Promulgation of security regulations."

"(b) Chapter 67, title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 1384 the following new section:

"§ 1385. Promulgation of security regulations."

Page 9, line 7, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)."

Page 9, line 9, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

Page 9, strike out lines 14 to 18 and insert the following:

"Sec. 5. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act and the application of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer certain perfecting amendments:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 7, line 1, strike out the word "Sates" and insert the word "States."

Page 8, line 20, insert the words "or of" after the word "Establishment."

Page 8, line 21, insert the word "of" after the word "or" where it occurs the first time.

Page 9, line 7, strike out "(c)" and substitute "(b)."

Page 9, line 9, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

Page 6, line 19, insert a comma after the word "of."

Page 6, line 20, insert a comma after the word "in."

Page 8, line 21, after the words "service or", insert "subversive."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 8, line 12, after the word "promulgated" strike out "or approved by the Secretary of Defense or by any military commander designated by the Secretary of Defense" and insert "by the Secretary of Defense and approved by the President of the United States".

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I favor and will support H. R. 4703. I think that my colleagues will agree in my brief service here that I have been diligent in protecting all of the rights and freedoms guaranteed to the American people by the Constitution. Since our Constitution was written, Congress and the American people have seen fit to revise and amend it many times. Each time a law is written, or the Constitution amended, we find that some previous right or freedom guaranteed by the Constitution has been modified or taken away entirely and it is right and proper in many cases that these rights and freedoms should be taken away. The law in a republic, such as that in which we live, is necessarily molded to fit the changing times or the changing public opinion. This bill, H. R. 4703, is designed partly to meet a disgraceful situation which has arisen in this country in the past quarter century. This bill is made necessary because of a group of American citizens who have as their ideal and philosophy the overthrow of our constitutional form of government by force and violence. Most people in the United States cherish their right to live in a free republic. This group of subversives to whom I have referred previously are deliberately and with premeditation attempting to destroy that sacred right that we loyal American citizens cherish; so if by passage of this bill, as the gentleman from New York, [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has suggested, we do deprive some of our citizens of some rights presently guaranteed by the Constitution, we are on the other hand protecting the more cherished and blessed right of an overwhelming majority of the American people.

While I can see no particular reason for arbitrarily setting the statute of limitations for peacetime espionage at 10 years, I do agree that 10 years after a criminal act is committed should be long enough to allow our Federal Government to act. I feel that there should probably not be any statute of limitations at all, but am willing to abide by the decision of the distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee. Lest my support of

this bill be misunderstood, let me say here and now that I do not feel that it is the answer by any means to the problem of espionage and subversion existing today in the United States. We can pass all of the laws we want to here in Congress and we still could not solve this problem. I am convinced that in order to meet the problem we must have a President, Attorney General, and an administration which will actively and openly engage in a campaign to enforce our already existing laws against the crime of peacetime espionage and against subversion. The present administration and the administrations over the past 20 years have failed, refused, or neglected to enter into such a campaign. The record of law enforcement over this period of years, especially in the espionage and subversive-activity field, has been disgraceful. We need only cite a few cases to illustrate these failures. The administration has seen fit to use the heretofore 3-year statute of limitations on the crime of peacetime espionage as an excuse for its failure to protect the internal security of the United States. The prosecution for most of the acts of espionage that have been so excused could have been brought within 3 years after the act was committed had we an aggressive, loyal, and active administration—so, the passage of this bill might be compared to locking the barn after the horse has been stolen—and I suppose that the administration will, if it suits its purpose, avoid or defer prosecution for the crimes this bill defines in future cases. Congress, however, cannot be blamed for failure to provide the tools of prosecution if this bill is passed. I therefore urge my colleagues to support this bill without weakening amendments.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, in the bill as reported by the committee, a vast amount of power has been delegated to the Secretary of Defense who, in turn, has the power to delegate this authority to subordinate officers. If this authority were exercised by officers on the top, that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee mentioned a moment ago, nobody would have to be apprehensive on the abuse of power. But there are cases, that everybody who has ever served in the military knows full well, where junior officers have been given commands in outlying outposts where they are law unto themselves, and it certainly seems to me that the small amount of delay incidental to having a proposed regulation approved by the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States would in nowise work any hardship whatsoever.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I compliment the gentleman on that amendment, and make the observation that security in our Government will be better served by equity and fairness and great care for the rights of individuals than in any other way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, it is after much soul searching that I deem it necessary to take the floor today to evidence my great concern over the activities of our State Department.

The hearings now being held by a committee of the other body bring to light further evidence of State Department employees who are poor security risks. The charges alone are shocking, but the concerted efforts made by the policy makers of the State Department to hide the records of these employees from public view is utterly disgusting and inexcusable.

Mr. Chairman, we have at the present time many men in confinement because during battle they became scared and afraid, and so were charged with desertion. Many of these were young, inexperienced boys. How can we justify keeping these young men in confinement when at the same time the Government is allowing people, who have histories branding them as poor security risks, handling confidential and secret Government documents? Not only are these people in a position where they can do our country immense damage by relaying secret information to a potential enemy but many of such Government employees hold policy-making positions where they can influence policy detrimental to our national interest.

I am confident there are thousands of people in these great United States, whose loyalty to their country is above reproach, who could handle the positions now held by those whose histories have been blackened by kowtowing with Communist and Communist-front organizations. I see no reason why the burden of proof to establish loyalty should not rest with the individual, whether he be now employed by the Government or whether he is seeking Federal employment, rather than with the Government. The claims now being made by the State Department that there is no security risk involved by any of its employees do not ring true to my ears. We all remember Alger Hiss. He was claimed to be a good security risk before his indictment. We also know that Alger Hiss was not working alone; that he had others who aided him in his apparatus. The country's confidence in the State Department would be restored if it were evidenced that our Secretary of State was making a sincere effort in ridding his Department of individuals whose ideologies are foreign to ours.

I noted in day before yesterday evening's Washington Star, in the column by Constantine Brown, that the Secretary of State plans on touring the country for the explicit purpose of selling the American people on his foreign policy. I wish to take this opportunity to invite the Secretary of State to Michigan's Eleventh District, the district it is my privilege to represent. This so he can explain to our people the State Department's appeasement of Russia's selling

China down the river; explain, particularly to our citizenry who are of Polish descent, the administration's justification of the sell-out of Poland to Russia at Yalta. Yes; I believe the people of Michigan's Eleventh District would also be interested in knowing why the State Department quaked and quivered when Gubitchev was convicted of espionage, with the result that State Department officials used their influence to have his sentence suspended and allowing Gubitchev to be sent back to Russia. This action despite the fact that at the present time we have the American citizen Vogeler, after a mock trial, spending 15 years at hard labor in some Communist concentration camp. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we also have two American marines, who have been held over 2 years without trial by the Communists of China with little effort being made by the State Department to secure their release. All over the world American citizens in the Soviet sphere of influence are being subjugated to harsh humiliating treatment. This constant appeasement of communism smacks of the Chamberlain era of not too long ago. If the Secretary of State can sell the American people on his so-called foreign policy, then this master salesman could sell earmuffs in Panama.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman's address brought back to my mind what are known here in Washington as the Jaffe cases, where six people, arrested by the FBI, and they do not arrest people unless they have the goods on them, succeeded in taking 151 files out of the State Department and Naval Intelligence. They were found 257 miles from Washington. They could not have done that unless they had assistance from inside the State Department.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

OUR DISTINGUISHED SECRETARY OF STATE

I think at this point in the discussion of H. R. 4703, it is most appropriate that we note for the record a few cogent facts about our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson.

Our country is most fortunate—and I emphasize most fortunate—that in these strained and crucial times the post of Secretary of State is occupied by a man with courage, integrity, humility, and compassion. There is a desperate need for statesmen of vision and forethought. There is just as desperate a need to stop the tide of hysteria which threatens to engulf and overwhelm the attributes of good sense and calm judgment.

We should give humble thanks that our Secretary of State has firmly resisted the unhealthy, ill-conceived pressures of this hysteria—a hysteria that gives heat but no light. How well could we fare if the Secretary of State permitted himself to be whirled about by the political winds that blow hot and cold as dictated by the personal politics of each Member of Congress?

The conduct of foreign affairs is the constitutional responsibility of the President and his Secretary of State. Our critics abroad if they were to judge from these oratorical blasts could easily infer a concerted movement on the part of the misguided to discharge the President of this responsibility and place it—the Constitution notwithstanding—in the hands of the legislative body.

Jefferson refused to allow two of his Cabinet officers to reveal Cabinet documents in the trial of Aaron Burr.

Washington refused to yield to demand of Senate to submit documents to support the Jay Treaty.

Monroe, in 1825, declined to turn over to Congress certain documents relating to two naval officers being investigated on Capitol Hill.

Recently the Judiciary Committee submitted an opinion that certain legislative records are impervious to judicial subpoena.

All these precedents clearly indicate separation of executive, judicial, and legislative branches.

Determination, primarily, of our foreign policy is not in the judicial branch; nor yet in the legislative branch. It lies with the President and his Secretary of State.

Sound criticism is always a healthy manifestation of the democratic way of life, but criticism motivated by personal fortune is a disservice to the country. It breeds internal and external confusion when ill-founded. Such has been this merry-go-round of attacks against Mr. Acheson personally and as Secretary of State that the conclusion could easily be reached that we have not one but 435 secretaries of state in the House of Representatives and 96 secretaries of state in the Senate.

One undeniable effect of this pattern of irresponsible statements has been the undermining of Mr. Acheson's authority in diplomatic discussions abroad. It has raised serious doubts in the minds of friendly nations whether there can be any degree of continuity of foreign policy and raised the question as well of how much reliance can be placed upon the representations of our own diplomats.

I touch upon this problem now because I feel it is related to the question of our internal security. Efforts to protect our internal security must be affected by our external relations with other countries. No internal security can be foolproof if the conduct of our foreign affairs is haphazard—creating such gaps that cannot be filled even if 100 laws affecting internal security were passed.

Mr. Acheson is now carrying burdens which few men would undertake were they charged with his responsibility to find the right answers if civilization, as we know it, is to continue.

It is one thing to make a speech on the floor of the House for home consumption, and it is quite another thing to know that the road you take can lead to either peace or war. The man who makes a speech for local consumption can retire to safety after the words have been spoken. He has no Atlas on his shoulders.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HUBER. I hold no brief for Chambers or Alger Hiss, but should not the record show that the last person who employed Alger Hiss was John Foster Dulles?

Mr. CELLER. If that is the fact, the record should show it. I hold no brief for the gentlemen named by the gentleman from Ohio. However, I believe the Secretary is a man of great compassion and that was exemplified by his conduct relative to one of the men named.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD at this point in answer to the statement made by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, rather impromptu and spontaneously and with no opportunity to give to such a matter the consideration to which it is entitled, reserving the right to revise and to extend and later to enlarge these remarks, may I say I possibly take my responsibility as too heavy a burden. However, there comes a time when to hold one's peace is to choke to death disrespectfully. So I am constrained to say I admit I distrust the security involved in the statement just made by my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. Vermont, unfortunately, has been dragged into these discussions off the floor by the tail, so to speak, since Alger Hiss and others are and have been summer residents of Vermont. It is true we do have a group of national and international Communists in Vermont. It is true we have their sympathizers and fellow travelers in one or two of our colleges, and at least one in our legislature. The facts are not to be denied.

The extent to which these people have expanded both openly and subversively their influence and their control of legislation, education, politics, and elsewhere has only to be checked to be appreciated.

It has gone too far, too soon, despite all some of us could do.

In my State its influence is subversive and destructive and will be ruinous unless some notice be taken by those who should feel some responsibility for what will happen to the next generation unless they have the guts to call names.

The truth is no man should be allowed or permitted to conduct our negotiations with foreign governments who smells of and is so attached to a traitor to this Government that he counts his loyalty to that friend of more importance than that he should feel to the country of which he is the agent, meaning Mr. Acheson.

It is time to think that over, Mr. CELLER.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments to offer. I ask unanimous consent that both amendments be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 2, line 10, after "time of war" insert a comma and the following: "including items relating to nuclear energy"; and on line 10, after the word "repaired" insert "processed".

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 2, line 11, after "or stored", insert "or a subject of research and development".

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I see no objection whatsoever to these amendments.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to hear the chairman of the committee make that statement and will take the time of the committee only to indicate the purpose of the amendments. I am certain the objective of the Committee on the Judiciary is to include all phases of our national defense program, even including the atomic energy or nuclear energy phases. I think the bill, as drafted, properly covers all those phases with respect to plants, or facilities, or installations owned or controlled by the Government of the United States.

However, there is to my mind a doubt as to whether it applies to work done in connection with national defense or the atomic energy program in installations not owned by the Government, but under work done through contract with the Government. So it is for the purpose of making certain that those activities are covered by this bill, that these amendments are designed.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I am not sure how far the gentleman's amendment goes. I wish the gentleman would explain whether he believes that this would cover the entire field of atomic energy or nuclear fission, that is in the non-secret and the nonweapon field as well as the weapon field.

Mr. COLE of New York. As to that I would not at the moment be able to say, except to venture the opinion that it does not cover unclassified material or information, that is material, even though connected with the nuclear energy program which is open for the information of the public. I think that would not be covered by this law any more than information with respect to any of our implements of war which are not classified.

Mr. DURHAM. I hope the gentleman's amendment does not go beyond the point of usefulness for war. This bill carries very serious fines. We have at the present time projects in schools and universities throughout the country in the matter of atomic research and I am wondering whether or not those people would be subjected by this amendment to the pains and penalties of the bill; will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. COLE of New York. I would say that if those people were engaged in re-

search activities related to nuclear energy to be used in connection with instruments of warfare they would be covered by the act, and I think they should be.

Mr. DURHAM. It is a question of definition that disturbs me if nuclear fission covers the entire field. That definition, as the gentleman knows, has not been made very clear as yet.

Mr. COLE of New York. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that my amendment applies only with respect to items related to instruments of warfare. I think if there is some atomic energy program not related to war that this amendment would not cover such case.

Mr. DURHAM. I believe the gentleman agrees with me that there are other uses for atomic energy rather than those of warfare and I do not believe it necessary to make this bill apply to information beyond the field of weapons of warfare.

Mr. COLE of New York. I suggest to the gentleman that he read the bill with the amendment which has been proposed. It would read as follows:

Any place in which any vessel, aircraft, arms, munitions, or other materials or instruments for use in wartime, including items relating to nuclear energy are being made, prepared, repaired, processed or stored, or are the subject of research and development.

So it would be my opinion, and the amendment is offered for that purpose, to limit the features of this bill to research and development in connection with nuclear energy related to instruments of war.

Mr. DURHAM. What effect does the gentleman think this amendment would have on the industrial use of nuclear energy, for instance?

Mr. COLE of New York. I would say that this amendment would not affect that information, nor is it intended that it should, because that information, I think, is properly protected in the atomic energy law itself.

Mr. DURHAM. If the gentleman feels that it does not go too far, I see no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Without objection, the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACOBS: On page 6, at the end of line 8, insert the following: "Provided, That such period of limitation shall not commence to run in regard to any such violation or violations by any officer, agent, or employee of the United States during any period that such individual holds the office, position, employment, or appointment he held at the time such offense was committed."

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will leave the statute of limitations in the bill as it is written; in other words, 10 years, in reference to the offenses to which that limitation applies. I think there are three in section 2. But it does arrest the running of the

statute of limitations in reference to any person who holds an office or an appointment or is an employee of the United States Government.

The philosophy back of the amendment is substantially this: Public office is a public trust. Any man who holds a position of trust with the Government is also probably in a position to conceal the offense that he might have committed. That is one factor. A second factor is that perhaps he would be in a position of influence so as to prevent the commencement of a prosecution. The statute of limitations, therefore, should not run until after he has vacated the office or position of trust that he held.

This language is taken from a bill, H. R. 1759, which I introduced on January 24 of last year, but concerning which, so far as I know, there have been no hearings. At least I have not been informed of any. It seems to me it is a perfectly sound principle that any man who holds a position of public trust should not have the statute of limitations toll as against him so long as he holds that position. That is the philosophy back of this amendment, I think it is sound and should be adopted.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, any statute should have a reasonable period of limitation as part of it. Unless you limit the period of time during which a man might be prosecuted you are going to have a situation as the gentleman from Arkansas suggested. Witnesses might disappear, witnesses might die, the defendant might be deprived of a defense he originally had, and thus too great a burden is placed on the individual.

This amendment also would discriminate against American citizens as compared with foreign agents possibly. You would have one statute of limitations applicable to American citizens employed by the Government and another one that would apply, for instance, to a foreign agent who came here and violated the law. I do not know offhand whether this amendment would strike at the constitutionality of this act. I do not think it would be fair to provide one period of limitation for employees of the Government and another period of limitation for a foreign agent.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Does not the gentleman think the Congress has the right under the Constitution to make a provision that has a reasonable basis and does he not further believe it is a reasonable basis that a man who holds public office is in a better position to conceal his offense or to prevent prosecution from being commenced?

Mr. WILLIS. I do not believe a Federal employee is a greater violator in that respect than a foreign agent. A foreign agent is going to keep secret the violation just the same. Congress, of course, has the power to establish periods of limitation, but within the four corners of the statute they should apply to all persons affected.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, the Constitution would be offended because it would not be equal protection to all?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. The amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana extends the statute of limitations beyond 10 years?

Mr. WILLIS. Surely. It might be 70 years. A man might be employed 60 years and the period would start only after the termination of his employment.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not also a fact that the Attorney General wanted the statute to be unlimited?

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CELLER. But the Committee on the Judiciary felt there should be some limitation. They figured 10 years was long enough because many similar statutes have a statute of limitations of 10 years.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JACOBS. Is the gentleman not aware of the fact that the running of the statute of limitations is frequently tolled in cases where there are affirmative acts to conceal the commission of the offense?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes, but wherever that is so all persons similarly situated under that statute are treated in the same way.

Mr. JACOBS. Would not all persons similarly situated who hold an office of public trust and are thus in a position to conceal the offense they commit and are thus in a position to influence commencement of the prosecution? Would they not be similarly situated?

Mr. WILLIS. I said "persons similarly situated." I should have said "all persons affected under the terms of the statute should be treated alike."

Mr. JACOBS. Does not the gentleman agree that under this amendment every person would be treated alike. If he is in public office he is thus treated. If he is not charged with a public trust, then the 10-year statute of limitations starts.

Mr. WILLIS. Under the gentleman's amendment all persons within the law and under the law would not be similarly treated and I therefore oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS], is a good one. We have to keep in mind that the statute of limitations is not a right. It is a privilege. You have to plead it specially if you want to take advantage of it, as was shown in the late Capone case. The Supreme Court of the United States refused to entertain Capone's action for a writ of habeas corpus because he had not pleaded the statute of limitations at the right time and had therefore waived the right to insist upon same.

There is nothing unconstitutional about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. You must be aware of the fact that in many States treason and murder never outlaw, and in some of the Southern States rape never outlaws, and, as I recall it, in the State

of Nebraska forgery and arson along with murder and treason never outlaw. I do not believe it is correct to say that this law would be held to be unconstitutional because you do not have the same statutory period of limitation apply in each and every classification of people.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The statute of limitations with reference to fraud in civil actions frequently starts running from the discovery of the fraud; is that not true?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. That is correct.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. On the merits of this proposal, the gentleman from Louisiana seems to think we would be treating our own people worse than foreign agents. Does the gentleman not think it is a more serious crime to occupy a position of trust with the Government and betray that trust than for a foreign agent to betray the United States while he is here?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I think so, and I would say this also, that "to whom much is given much is expected." We have given much to our public servants even after we exclude the salary and the honor of holding public office. As Grover Cleveland so aptly said, "a public office is a public trust," and you cannot deal too lightly—too gently—with people who hold public office and positions of trust and responsibility with the Government, and then are recreant to their trusts, and do great disservice to their country as recent criminal trials have disclosed.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The statute of limitations in many of the States does not outlaw murder. Should not treason take the same form, because treason can become mass murder?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. That is correct. I do not see anything wrong with this amendment at all. I think it strikes at the heart of the very purpose sought to be attained by this bill to prevent first of all disloyalty on the part of persons in the Government service and give alien spies a bad time.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Of course, this is not a statute dealing with treason at all.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. This law attempts to deal with treason's first cousin and with spies also.

Mr. WILLIS. Well, I would say the action is treasonable in the sense that it is reprehensible, but this is not a statute dealing with treason.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. No, because treason is defined by the Constitution of the United States, and you cannot overrule the Constitution of the United States by legislative action. That is why we have had some prosecutions for offenses less than treason recently. Similar prosecu-

tions, if this bill passes, are contemplated by this law. I repeat again that the thing denounced by this law is the first cousin of treason, according to my way of looking at it.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. May I note that in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania we do have a statute of limitations that applies to public officers similar to this amendment, where the public officer has under his control public records which he might alter or falsify, but still he is renewed in public office, and the statute says that we can prosecute him within a period of 7 years after he relinquishes the possession of those public documents, and that is exactly what this amendment does.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. That is very correct. I do not see anything wrong with this amendment at all. I think it is a good amendment. I know it is possible for public-office holders sometimes to cover up their misdeeds, and if they continue in office long enough, then they cannot be prosecuted often after they leave office.

I intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS] because I believe it is a good amendment. I believe it is an amendment that is right, and I want to say in the language of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who preceded me here today, that this law cannot be made too strict—too strong from the penalty standpoint—as far as I am concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us read this amendment for a moment and consider it. Here it is. This is in respect now to the period of time within which prosecutions can be brought against a person violating any of the provisions of this act:

Provided, That such period of limitations shall not commence to run in regard to any such violation or violations by any officer, agent, or employee of the United States during any period that such individual holds the office, position, employment, or appointment he held at the time such offense was committed.

This is a good amendment. It should be adopted. There is no reason why any man or woman who occupies a position of trust and who is sworn to uphold and protect and defend the Constitution of this country and faithfully perform the duties of his or her trust—I say, there is no reason why such a person who in violation of his or her oath of office and in violation of his or her trust and the duties which he or she swore that they would perform faithfully and honestly—I say, there is no reason why they should use that position as a shield or as a screen or as a protection against their own wrongs. It is fundamental that no one should be permitted to take advantage of his or her own wrong.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. It is not unusual, is it, for State statutes to provide that the statute of limitations shall not begin to run in fraud cases until the fraud is discovered?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is true, and much more should that be the law when it is a case of treasonable misconduct.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. We have also passed Federal laws prohibiting persons who have been employed in the Government in certain positions of trust from practicing before the departments with which they were formerly associated.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is true. They are prohibited from taking advantage of what they learned while serving the Government. They should not go out and unhorse or disembowel or split the pockets of the Government and profit by the training they received while in the pay of the Government. It is time to get rid of these lice that crawl over the body politic and feed on the Government.

I compliment my friend from Indiana on his thoughtfulness in offering this amendment. It should be adopted. In fact, there ought not to be any votes against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, 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. 4703) relating to the internal security of the United States, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. KEARNEY objected to the vote on the ground that a quorum was not present and made

the point of order that a quorum was 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 368, nays 2, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—368

Abbitt	Delaney	Jennings
Abernethy	Denton	Jensen
Addonizio	D'Ewart	Jonas
Albert	Dingell	Jones, Ala.
Allen, Calif.	Dollinger	Jones, Mo.
Allen, Ill.	Dondero	Jones, N. C.
Allen, La.	Donohue	Judd
Andersen,	Doughton	Karst
H. Carl	Durham	Karsten
Anderson, Calif.	Eaton	Kearney
Andresen	Eberharter	Kearns
August H.	Elliott	Keating
Andrews	Ellsworth	Kee
Angell	Elston	Keefe
Arends	Engel, Mich.	Kelley, Pa.
Aspinall	Engle, Calif.	Kelly, N. Y.
Auchincloss	Evins	Kennedy
Bailey	Fallon	Keogh
Barden	Feighan	Kerr
Barrett, Pa.	Fellows	Kilburn
Barrett, Wyo.	Fenton	Kilday
Bates, Ky.	Fisher	King
Bates, Mass.	Flood	Klein
Beall	Forand	Kruse
Beckworth	Ford	Lane
Bennett, Fla.	Frazier	Lanham
Bennett, Mich.	Fugate	Larcade
Bentsen	Fulton	Latham
Biemiller	Furcolo	LeCompte
Bishop	Gamble	LeFevre
Blackney	Garmatz	Lemke
Blatnik	Gary	Lesinski
Boggs, Del.	Gathings	Lind
Boggs, La.	Gavin	Linehan
Bolling	Gillette	Lodge
Bolton, Md.	Golden	Lovre
Bolton, Ohio	Goodwin	Lucas
Bonner	Gordon	Lyle
Bosone	Gore	Lynch
Boykin	Gorski	McConnell
Bramblett	Graham	McCulloch
Breen	Granahan	McDonough
Brehm	Granger	McGregor
Brooks	Grant	McGuire
Brown, Ga.	Green	McKinnon
Brown, Ohio	Gregory	McMillan, S. C.
Bryson	Gross	McMillen, Ill.
Buchanan	Gwinn	McSweeney
Buckley, Ill.	Hagen	Mack, Ill.
Burke	Hale	Mack, Wash.
Burleson	Hall,	
Burnside	Edwin Arthur	Madden
Burton	Hall,	Mahon
Byrnes, Wis.	Leonard W.	Mansfield
Camp	Halleck	Marsalis
Canfield	Hand	Marshall
Cannon	Harden	Martin, Iowa
Carlyle	Hardy	Martin, Mass.
Carnahan	Hare	Mason
Carroll	Harris	Meyer
Case, N. J.	Harrison	Miles
Case, S. Dak.	Hart	Miller, Calif.
Cavalcante	Harvey	Miller, Md.
Celler	Havenner	Miller, Nebr.
Chelf	Hays, Ark.	Mills
Chesney	Hays, Ohio	Mitchell
Christopher	Hébert	Morgan
Chudoff	Hedrick	Morris
Church	Herlong	Morrison
Cole, Kans.	Herter	Morton
Cole, N. Y.	Heseltan	Moulder
Colmer	Hill	Multer
Combs	Hinshaw	Murdock
Cooley	Hobbs	Murphy
Cooper	Hoeven	Murray, Tenn.
Corbett	Hoffman, Mich.	Murray, Wis.
Cotton	Holifield	Nelson
Coudert	Holmes	Nicholson
Cox	Hope	Nixon
Crawford	Howell	Noland
Crosser	Huber	Norblad
Cunningham	Hull	Norrell
Curtis	Irving	O'Brien, Ill.
Dague	Jackson, Calif.	O'Brien, Mich.
Davenport	Jackson, Wash.	O'Hara, Ill.
Davis, Ga.	Jacobs	O'Konski
Davis, Tenn.	James	O'Neill
Davis, Wis.	Javits	O'Sullivan
Deane	Jenison	O'Toole

Pace	Sasscer	Underwood
Passman	Saylor	Van Zandt
Patman	Scott,	Velde
Patten	Hugh D., Jr.	Vinson
Patterson	Scribner	Vorys
Perkins	Scudder	Vursell
Peterson	Secrest	Wadsworth
Pfeifer,	Shelley	Wagner
Joseph L.	Short	Walsh
Phillips, Calif.	Sikes	Walter
Phillips, Tenn.	Simpson, Ill.	Weichel
Pickett	Simpson, Pa.	Welch
Plumley	Sims	Werdell
Poage	Smith, Kans.	Wheeler
Polk	Smith, Va.	White, Idaho
Potter	Smith, Wis.	Whitten
Preston	Spence	Wickersham
Price	Staggers	Widnall
Priest	Stanley	Wier
Ramsay	Steed	Wigglesworth
Rankin	Stefan	Williams
Redden	Stigler	Willis
Reed, Ill.	Stockman	Wilson, Ind.
Rees	Sullivan	Wilson, Okla.
Regan	Sutton	Wilson, Tex.
Rhodes	Taber	Winstead
Ribicoff	Tackett	Withrow
Rich	Talle	Wolcott
Richards	Tauriello	Wolverton
Riehlman	Taylor	Wood
Rodino	Teague	Woodhouse
Rogers, Fla.	Thomas	Woodruff
Rogers, Mass.	Thompson	Yates
Sadiak	Thornberry	Young
St. George	Tollefson	Zablocki
Sanborn	Trimble	

NAYS—2

Marcantonio

Powell

NOT VOTING—62

Baring	Heffernan	Philbin
Battle	Heller	Poulson
Buckley, N. Y.	Hoffman, Ill.	Quinn
Bulwinkle	Horan	Rabaut
Burdick	Jenkins	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson	Reed, N. Y.
Chatham	Kirwan	Rivers
Chipfield	Kunkel	Roosevelt
Clemente	Lichtenwalter	Sabath
Clevenger	McCarthy	Sadowski
Crook	McCormack	Scott, Hardie
Davies, N. Y.	McGrath	Shafer
Dawson	Macy	Sheppard
DeGraffenried	Magee	Smathers
Dolliver	Morrow	Smith, Ohio
Douglas	Michener	Towe
Doyle	Monroney	Whitaker
Fernandez	Norton	White, Calif.
Fogarty	O'Hara, Minn.	Whittington
Gilmer	Pfeiffer,	Worley
Gossett	William L.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Gilmer with Mr. Macy.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Michener.
 Mr. Rabaut with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
 Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Towe.
 Mrs. Norton with Mr. Dolliver.
 Mrs. Douglas with Mr. Chipfield.
 Mr. Battle with Mr. Kunkel.
 Mr. Crook with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
 Mr. Heller with Mr. Reed of New York.
 Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Hardie
 Scott.
 Mr. McCormack with Mr. Shafer.
 Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Jenkins.
 Mr. Whitaker with Mr. O'Hara of Minne-
 sota.
 Mr. Smathers with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
 Mr. McGrath with Mr. Morrow.
 Mr. White of California with Mr. Hoffman
 of Illinois.
 Mr. Doyle with Mr. Poulson.
 Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Clevenger.
 Mr. Magee with Mr. Horan.
 Mr. Rains with Mr. Johnson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on House Joint Resolution 398.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. MCSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution (H. Res. 513, Rept. No. 1783), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6567) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation. 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 Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments there-to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Education and Labor, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the following bills and that they be referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 7462, to reestablish a Civilian Conservation Corps; to provide for the conservation of natural resources and the development of human resources through the employment of youthful citizens in the performance of useful work, including job training and instruction in good work habits; and for other purposes.

H. R. 7463, to reestablish a Civilian Conservation Corps; to provide for the conservation of natural resources and the development of human resources through the employment of youthful citizens in the performance of useful work, including job training and instruction in good work habits; and for other purposes.

H. R. 7523, to reestablish a Civilian Conservation Corps; to provide for the conservation of natural resources and the development of human resources through the employment of youthful citizens in the performance of useful work, including job training and instruction in good work habits; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRACTITIONERS BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I call up the bill (H. R. 4446) to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

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. 4446, with Mr. BIEMILLER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the measure under consideration is designed to provide a uniform method of qualifying practitioners before the Government agencies. The subject matter of this bill was contained in the Administrative Procedure Act, but at the time that legislation was adopted it was deemed advisable to separate the two proposals.

This bill was on the Consent Calendar, and would probably have been adopted by unanimous consent but for the fact that several of the Members were concerned about the opposition the American Institute of Accountants had to the proposal. Since that time a committee of the American Bar Association and the Committee of the American Institute of Accountants have reconciled their differences, and I am now authorized by the American Institute of Accountants to state that this group not only is no longer opposed to the measure but feels that it is in the public interest to enact it as quickly as possible.

Another group was opposed to the bill, namely, the so-called class B practitioners, consisting of traffic managers and people of that sort, who represented various trade organizations. The committee has incorporated in the bill language which will protect their right to practice, not as lawyers or accountants, before the several Government agencies.

In a word, the bill does this: It provides for the creation of a committee of five, four members being in the executive branch of the Government and the fifth being a member of the bar selected by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, all of whom serve without compensation. This committee will provide uniform regulations for the admission of regularly qualified practitioners to practice before each and every one of the executive branches of the Government.

One of the reasons that prompted those of us who have been interested in this legislation to espouse it has been the fact that many members of the bars of the courts of last resort in their States have come to Washington to represent clients and, when they got here, found they were not qualified to practice be-

fore this or that or the other one of the several hundred agencies.

A uniform method is provided for the qualification of lawyers in good standing in their States. When they receive the necessary credentials, they will be entitled to practice before any of the Government agencies.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do I correctly understand that if a lawyer is in good standing in his own State all he needs to do is produce his credentials here?

Mr. WALTER. Exactly. He submits the kind of evidence he submits when he is admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States, a certificate from the court that he is a member of the bar in good standing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This goes beyond attorneys, does it not?

Mr. WALTER. It goes beyond attorneys in this, that there are what are known as class B practitioners.

They are the representatives of the brotherhoods and the various veterans' organizations and groups of that sort. They are permitted to carry on the kind of practices in which they are engaged today. However, they are not, because they are entitled to practice in a particular agency, empowered to practice law and engage in practices beyond the employment which qualifies them to practice where they are now practicing.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The commission will promulgate these rules, but who will enforce them?

Mr. WALTER. The commission will have the authority to revoke the privilege of a practitioner as a result of any abuse of the rights given him by the commission.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Under the provision of the bill, then, the commission makes the rules and then enforces them by having the right of revoking the privilege. It is a license arrangement, then, is that it?

Mr. WALTER. That is right. If a person is guilty of improper practice before an agency and complaint is made, then the commission decides that.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Do the provisions of this bill apply to the whole United States, or just to the District of Columbia?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for bringing in this meritorious bill. Regarding the internal revenue service, what is the provision of the bill with respect to that

agency as to who can practice before the internal revenue service?

Mr. WALTER. Those accountants engage now in the preparation of income tax returns and in the settlement of disputes with respect to income taxes are permitted to carry on the same practices in which they are now engaged.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. WALTER. That is not interfered with.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What would be the situation in the case of an accountant who is not a certified public accountant?

Mr. WALTER. That accountant could continue the practice that he now is engaged in. The only thing he could not do would be to get up to the point where an effort was being made which would ultimately find its way into the courts.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. In New York we have a number of practitioners before the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization who are specialists in their field, but who are not lawyers. Would they be affected by this bill?

Mr. WALTER. They would not be affected. I call the gentleman's attention to page 8 of the report where he will find this language:

Previously licensed nonlawyer practitioners will be entitled, by the third sentence of section 6, to new credentials under this bill enabling them to continue in their practice.

Mr. KEOGH. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Section 6 says:

So long as and to the extent that any agency shall find it necessary in the public interest and in the interest of the parties—

And so on, which permits the licensing of nonlawyers. Is that intended to change existing law, or just to continue existing situations in each agency insofar as its power over those who practice before it right now?

Mr. WALTER. We felt that this language preserved existing practice in the several agencies with respect to the issuing of licenses to all practitioners before that particular agency.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman be good enough to answer the question which he did not have an opportunity to answer before?

Mr. WALTER. This applies all over the United States.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to ask some further questions of the chairman of the committee. This bill provides, does it not, for what amounts to the creation of still

another commission or agency of Government?

Mr. WALTER. I suppose technically speaking that is the fact, but it actually means this: It is not going to cost the Government a penny. It means that the commission will consist of men who are already in the employ of the Government. This is an added function of that group and I am certain that after the new set-up has been determined, this agency will not have a great deal to do.

Mr. GROSS. On page 3 of the bill you say:

For the purposes of this act the Credentials Committee shall appoint a secretary, have such staff, other assistance, or advisory services or committees as may be required, incur obligations, make rules, issue individual notices by mail requiring the renewal of credentials from time to time, fix compensatory admission and renewal fees, and require the submission of necessary information from any person or agency.

Does the gentleman recognize that that is a "shotgun" proposition?

Mr. WALTER. Of course it is not a "shotgun" proposition. I am certain that the fee charged to practice will more than cover the very minor expense involved in setting up the agency.

Mr. GROSS. What will be the fee under this provision?

Mr. WALTER. That has not been determined.

Mr. GROSS. Who will determine it?

Mr. WALTER. This Commission will determine it. My guess is that it will not exceed \$15. It will be a very nominal fee.

Mr. GROSS. That fee will be paid by those who hire people to represent them here; is that right?

Mr. WALTER. No; it will be paid for by the practitioner. Ultimately, of course, it will come out of the client's pocket.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; that is certainly right.

Mr. WALTER. That is not an uncommon thing, you know.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that perfectly.

On page 4 the bill states:

Individuals admitted to practice under section 5 or 6 shall honor, and presiding and deciding officers in any agency proceeding shall conduct themselves in accordance with, the canons of judicial ethics generally applicable to members of the judiciary.

Is there some question that administrative officials in Government today are not conducting themselves properly?

Mr. WALTER. No; this does not apply to the people that the gentleman is talking about; this applies to practitioners.

Mr. GROSS. But the language of the bill reads "presiding and deciding officers in any agency."

Mr. WALTER. This merely means, of course, that the proper respect should be shown by the practitioner to the person before whom he is practicing.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that would be the administrative official, presiding or deciding officer. And this says that they shall conduct themselves under the canons of judicial ethics.

Mr. WALTER. The canons of judicial ethics, of course, are very well known.

I may say to the gentleman that a copy of them may be found in the library of the Committee on the Judiciary or in the library here in the Capitol.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this has all the appearances of being something on the order of a lawyers' WPA, and I am opposed to it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. What is the position under this bill of certified public accountants appearing before the agencies of the Government? In other words, to what extent will they be eliminated from practice, if at all?

Mr. WALTER. I am sure that the gentleman from Michigan was not on the floor when I made my brief opening statement, or he would have heard me read from a letter from the American Institute of Accountants, in which they stated that the opposition they had originally was withdrawn and that they are now not only in favor of the bill, but they urge that it be acted on promptly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was in the telephone booth at the time that was read and did not hear it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. May I say that the accountants in Iowa, and the traffic managers of Iowa and the Iowa Commerce Commission have in no wise dropped their opposition to this measure.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I call the gentleman's attention to section 6 on page 5 in which it is stated that—

So long as and to the extent that any agency shall find it necessary in the public interest and in the interest of parties to agency proceedings before it to authorize practice by individuals not subject to section 5—

And so forth. At any time an agency can decide that it is not in the public interest to receive public accountants or anyone else to represent someone as an agent, and rule out public accountants or any other profession. That is my fear.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the part of the language that I was questioning.

May I also ask the chairman of the committee another question? Under the chairman's interpretation of this language are public accountants unquestionably authorized to appear before the Tax Court or the Tax Appeals Board?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Without any strings on them imposed by this bill?

Mr. WALTER. No strings whatsoever. As a matter of fact, the language which guarantees them the privilege of that type of practice was agreed to between them and the American Bar Association.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman refer to the bill and give us that language?

Mr. HINSHAW. While the gentleman from Pennsylvania is looking up that language will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is a grandfather's clause in the bill beginning in line 4 on page 6, but so far as future admissions to practice are concerned, I see no guaranty whatsoever.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Just what was the crying need that brought about this legislation? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I intended to ask the chairman of the committee that very question. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania answer?

Mr. WALTER. For a great many years lawyers throughout the United States have been embarrassed because of their inability to represent clients when they came to Washington. They found when they got here they either had to retain some District of Columbia lawyer or were embarrassed when they finally appeared before the agency to find they had to be especially admitted. All of this took a lot of time, caused a lot of delay and was very costly. That is one thing.

The second reason is that Washington seems to be the gathering place for all of the elements of all of the bars in the Nation that have questionable standing at those bars. There are a great many people in the District of Columbia today who were about to be disbarred from the bars of the several States. They came here and hold themselves out as lawyers but to use the vernacular many of them are nothing but fixers.

It is the idea of the Judiciary Committee to set up somewhere some authority to prevent that type of individual from preying on many people who have legitimate claims against the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the committee about the language on page 1, the first sentence of section 2. Is that the language which the certified accountants agree to?

Mr. WALTER. The language which the gentleman is interested in starts in line 21, page 5, section 6:

The Credentials Committee shall issue credentials to applicants under this section—

And so forth.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, I think that is a restriction because, it seems to me it puts the power as to whether or not a certified public accountant shall practice entirely in the hands of the Credentials Committee and is not based on the certificate of qualifications which the CPA laws of the various States give.

Mr. WALTER. The certified accountants committee or association felt that the mere presentation of their license in the States was sufficient to meet the pro-

visions of this section. As a matter of fact, this section was written with that in mind.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the big question that stands in my mind as to why that presentation would not qualify them.

Now, going back to section 2 where it reads: "shall have the same meaning as in the Administrative Procedure Act (Public Law 404, 79th Cong.) except that the term 'agency' shall not include the Tax Court of the United States."

What is the committee's interpretation of that language?

Mr. WALTER. The Tax Court of the United States is not an agency within the strict meaning of that term. That is the reason for the difference in this language. The Tax Court has its own rules.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania several questions relative to this legislation. I have in mind the effect this would have upon representatives of the brotherhoods who appear before the several administrative agencies of the Government. First, would the gentleman say that the ICC is an administrative agency?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, of course. A representative of the brotherhoods appeared before the Judiciary Committee at the time of the hearings and made their position very clear. We felt that in this section we take care of that type of practitioner so that their legitimate practices in that agency will in nowise be interfered with.

Mr. WITHROW. However, this Credentials Committee that is set up will have to pass on their qualifications to appear before the ICC for example.

Mr. WALTER. No; it will not work that way. The ICC passes on them. The ICC will certify over the names of those people who have qualified from time to time and then they will be given the necessary credentials.

Mr. WITHROW. Who have qualified from time to time?

Mr. WALTER. To practice before the ICC.

Mr. WITHROW. But, now, what about those who represent the brotherhoods in the future and want to appear before the ICC?

Mr. WALTER. They can qualify in the same way that the people qualified who are already engaged in that practice.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand this bill, the Credentials Committee cannot be nonpartisan.

Mr. WITHROW. I do not know. They have a lawyer on the Credentials Committee and three others.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Personally, I think this bill gives the Credentials Committee the power, if it desires to do so, to channel this practice into the hands of a selected group of people. I think it does that.

Mr. WITHROW. I do not know so much about this or how it will really work, but it seems to me that this Credentials Committee will have an awful lot of authority. First of all, from the report of the committee, it is very apparent that the committee considers that the Credentials Committee shall pass upon the moral character of all those people who are given the right to practice before these administrative agencies. That is found on page 3 of the report. Moreover, it says that the public is entitled to representation by persons not only of good moral character, but equipped with the necessary technical skill and understanding of professional responsibility. I say to you that that is quite an authority to vest in the Credentials Committee. Who are they to determine the moral character of a man who is sent down by a group of people to represent those people?

Mr. WALTER. The authority given there, if the gentleman will yield, is the authority vested in the State Board of Law Examiners in every State of the Union and of the District of Columbia. That is the usual qualification. It certainly does not mean what I think the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In following up the question to the chairman relative to the status of the representatives of the brotherhoods, just how would our farm organizations fare with this particular bill? Perhaps we could ask the chairman that. The great farm organizations are naturally interested in freight rate cases that come before the Interstate Commerce Commission and cases that might come before the Federal Trade Commission. How would they be affected by this particular legislation?

Mr. WITHROW. I would like to have the chairman answer that question. I fear for their status.

Mr. WALTER. Let me assure the gentleman and the gentleman from Minnesota that those representatives have nothing to fear whatsoever. They have the right to continue in the practice that they are now engaged in, and I am sure that they are convinced that they are protected under the provisions of this measure in their right to practice.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if I understood the chairman, those who are now practicing would be protected under the grandfather clause, pointed out by the gentleman from California, but the new men, as I understand this bill, would be subjected to the scrutiny of the Credentials Committee. Now, suppose company A, for instance, hires a man who is very capable from the standpoint of appearing before Government agencies to rep-

resent the company's business, and the Credentials Committee finds that his morals do not square with their rules; what does that company do? Go find some other fellow and give him 4 or 5 years' training so that he understands the company's technical problems, or is he kicked off and left out in the cold?

Mr. WITHROW. I think that is a danger in the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to ask my colleague from Wisconsin: What sort of standard would they have down here for morals, anyway? You have heard about the State Department. How could any standards that they have here hurt anybody? Anybody could come in under their measuring stick.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question or two now that this thing has reached the point of inquiry. I want to determine if what we do here and now may not turn out as badly as happened after we changed the Board of Tax Appeals to the United States Tax Court.

I am not so satisfied with what the Tax Court has undertaken to do. It is completely in violation of what we in Congress believed that court was created for. It has gotten to the point where certain questions are asked applicants who seek to practice before the Tax Court. It is now known as the Tax Court. It used to be the Board of Tax Appeals. The Supreme Court said it is an administrative agency. It never was a court, and I do not believe it ever will be a court, and it ought not to be a court.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act the control of the legislation was taken away from the Committee on Ways and Means, which created the original United States Board of Tax Appeals. I am wondering if in this instance we are not running into a situation similar to that which we faced with the so-called Tax Court, which has enabled them to inaugurate a line of questioning of applicants that is purely legalistic. A man can be qualified in every respect, but if he is asked a lot of technical, legalistic questions he flunks, and he is disqualified.

That is not what they had led us to believe at any time they were going to do, but that is precisely what I understand they are now doing, to make tax practice exclusively a field for lawyers.

I am told by our committee experts, by Mr. Colin Stam himself, that in certain respects, in certain types of tax cases, it is far more important to have a good accountant than it is to have a lawyer. As a matter of fact, you do not have to have a lawyer. The truth of the matter is, that the Board of Tax Appeals was created to provide an informal procedure for settlement of tax disputes. Now you have all the formality, all the "flam-doodle," all the togas, and you have to bow and scrape as you do in a police

court. We did not ever intend that it should be that way. It was intended that a taxpayer could come in there with his coveralls, that he could sit across the table from the so-called judges, and find out exactly where he stood, and he could present his case in his own way.

Now, however, they are trying to get away from all of that informality which, by the way, is preliminary to asking for judicial privileges of another sort, as I understand tenure pensions, and all that, as provided for the rest of the judges.

Had we anticipated this at the time the name was changed from the Board of Tax Appeals to the United States Tax Court it would never have happened, but they got it by misrepresenting their case, and we yielded. We found later that we were betrayed. I use that word advisedly. We were betrayed, so far as I am concerned, and I have never become reconciled to it.

Let me ask my good friend from Pennsylvania, Is it intended by this legislation to exclude, by a legalistic line of questioning, anybody who might otherwise be qualified to practice before these boards, missions, or commissions?

Mr. WALTER. No, it is not. I am quite certain the language of the bill is very plain in that respect. I am sure the accountants are satisfied that they can continue their practice in the Tax Court.

Mr. DINGELL. What about the practical laymen who were neither lawyers nor accountants? Take, for example, a man who has served on the Committee on Ways and Means for 20 years. He might be able to give a lawyer a pretty good lesson in taxation.

Mr. WALTER. Except that perhaps he would make the kind of record in the Tax Court that would be very difficult for a court of appeals to pass on.

Mr. DINGELL. But if he were otherwise competent to represent somebody after having left Congress, he would nevertheless be excluded if he had not taken an examination which was prescribed by a lot of lawyers?

Mr. WALTER. It would be up to the rules, of course. If he could pass the examination, he would qualify.

Mr. DINGELL. That is exactly what I am talking about, but the examination and rules, if drafted by lawyers, might be such as to exclude a layman.

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I am in disagreement with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, whom we all hold in such high regard. I know he is the author of the Administrative Procedures Act. May I ask the gentleman if a lawyer from his State of Pennsylvania or my State of Tennessee came to Washington and wanted to appear before the Bureau of Internal Revenue or some other agency of the Government, whether it would be necessary for him to go before a board or pay a fee to qualify him to take care of some service for some client back in his home town? Does this bill create a monopoly for the District lawyers and the District accountants?

Mr. WALTER. I hope that is not the fact, and that just the opposite will be the case.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is rather a deep subject for me to be involved in, since I am not an attorney. I want it thoroughly understood I have a high regard for every member of the Committee on the Judiciary and for most every attorney that I know personally. My ambition was to be an attorney myself when I was a young lad but for good reasons I was not so fortunate. However, I can read and think, and I have learned that every good law must be based on good common American sense and be fair to all it affects.

In reading this bill and hearing the debate, I find some things in it which greatly concern me. In plain words it looks bad to me. Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the chairman of the committee, answer a few questions for me?

I am going to have to reduce this thing down to layman's language. After all, there are a number of good, common, ordinary laymen in the House of Representatives and the country is full of them. What I would like to know is this: We have from every State many people coming to Washington representing reputable organizations and necessary organizations such as farm organizations, lumbermen's, grocerymen's, and business organizations, and every kind. Many of those representatives are not attorneys. But they know their business from top to bottom. They have lived with the problems concerning them all their lives. Is there anything in this bill which denies them the privilege of going before any agency of Government where they can get permission to go and testify in favor of or against any legislation which might be proposed in the Congress, or to propose legislation, or to favor or oppose some rule or regulation of their business imposed by an agency of Government?

Mr. WALTER. No, they would not be. These groups, such as chambers of commerce, boards of trade, representatives of farm groups, and people of that sort are not prohibited from acting as spokesmen for their particular organization in the affected agency.

Mr. JENSEN. Would they necessarily have to be certified by this credentials committee?

Mr. WALTER. They would not, unless they were making it a practice to carry on these activities right along. But for a casual appearance, it would not be necessary.

May I just add one further thing in answer to that question. On page 2, line 4, you will see "practice" means regularly appearing, participating, or offering to do so in behalf of others for a consideration."

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will answer the following question, I believe we will get to the heart of what is bothering me. Today we have many representatives about whom I have just spoken. Can they continue if this bill becomes law, to carry on their functions

as they have in the past without interference by any provision of this bill?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, they would be qualified and would continue to qualify to do what they have been doing in the past.

Mr. JENSEN. What if an organization changed representatives? Would the new representative have the same rights?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, he would still have the authority, provided he was not regularly engaged as a representative for various groups for a consideration. If he came here with the kind of people you are talking about and appeared for them, there is no reason why a new statesman could not appear every time this particular group felt they had a matter to present to the Government.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, this man is being paid by the association he represents. Did I hear you say that if he were not being paid, he could practice before the agency without going before this committee and getting clearance?

Mr. WALTER. You mean to say if there is somebody in Washington who acts as a public relations man for various groups and is being compensated right along? That type of person would have to obtain credentials to appear and practice.

Mr. JENSEN. What if a man does not live in Washington? What if he is a farmer, for instance, and represents a farm organization?

Mr. WALTER. There is no reason in the world why he cannot come here with his farm organization any time they have any matter to present to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JENSEN. Suppose he is the secretary of a farm organization and he is paid as such and he comes here to Washington to appear before an agency of Government in the capacity of a representative for that farm organization?

Is it necessary for him under the provisions of this bill to get a clearance before the proposed certifying committee?

Mr. WALTER. As an officer or regular full-time employee of a corporation or other organization appearing on its behalf, then he very clearly does not have to obtain any particular permission to appear on behalf of that organization.

Mr. JENSEN. Whether he be an attorney or not?

Mr. WALTER. It does not make any difference whether he is an attorney or not; if he is employed by this organization, then he has the right to appear before that agency.

Mr. JENSEN. Without going before this committee and getting permission to appear?

Mr. WALTER. Exactly.

Mr. JENSEN. So there will be no change in the present status of people in that category whether this bill is made law or not? Am I right?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased to yield to one of the most able attorneys, and possibly the most able attorney in this House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], because I am seeking light,

Mr. KEEFE. I do not think the situation should be left as broad as the answer of the gentleman from Pennsylvania would seem to indicate.

The individual the gentleman is talking about who comes down to represent an organization, to appear before an administrative agency of Government, would be permitted to appear without credentials provided the rules and regulations of that agency of Government permit such; and that is the wording of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. WALTER. The only prohibition, I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, would come in a hearing under section 7 or 8 of the Administrative Procedures Act, and that is the type of hearing from the decision of which there may be an appeal to the courts; it is the type of hearing where a record is made.

Mr. KEEFE. I call the gentleman's attention to the plain wording of the act, subsection (6) on page 2:

If permitted by rule of the agency in any proceeding not conducted pursuant to section 7 or 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, by an officer or regular full-time employee of a corporation or other organization on its behalf.

Under those regulations that are presently in existence which require some regulatory standards to be met by people who come before an administrative agency of Government, the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not mean to tell the gentleman from Iowa that under this law anybody could come down here and in violation of existing rules be permitted to appear and practice, so to speak, and present a matter to an administrative agency of Government that is not recognized under presently existing rules and regulations in that agency of Government?

Mr. WALTER. Of course not, because I am assuming that if this man should come here to appear before this agency he would have the qualifications required by the agency with respect to his appearance.

Mr. KEEFE. He certainly would have to do that before they would permit him to appear; that is a certainty.

Mr. WALTER. That is what that type of representative is doing today.

Mr. JENNINGS. I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if I am right in understanding that this provision which he has just cited leaves it entirely within the discretion of the agency before which this person wants to appear as to whether or not the agency will allow him to appear.

Mr. KEEFE. Answering the gentleman's question, I do not, of course, pretend to be the last word on this at all, but I have studied this proposition, and I have been licensed to practice in years past before agencies of the Government; I know what I had to do as a lawyer attempting to practice before the Treasury Department. I think I know that every department of the Government has certain rules and regulations governing the

conduct of people who appear in proceedings pending before it, whether they be lawyers or nonlawyers, CPA's or what not. But just read the act; this is what it states:

Nothing in this act shall prevent appearance or participation in an agency proceeding if permitted by rule of the agency in any proceeding not conducted pursuant to section 7 or 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act by an officer or regular full-time employee of a corporation or other organization on its behalf.

I interpret that language to mean that if some gentleman from your district or mine represents an organization that is interested in a matter pending before an administrative agency of Government and he is not a practicing agent or attorney who comes down here asking to be heard on that matter, he would be permitted to be heard provided he complied with the rules and regulations that would permit that individual to appear under existing regulations. Is that correct? I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. That is it exactly.

Mr. KEEFE. Is not that the fact? And if the rules and regulations drawn by the Department are such as to preclude such an individual from appearing he would be denied the right to appear. If that is not the law as it is written, then I cannot read English. You agree to that, do you, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. JENSEN. In my studied opinion this bill is not good in its present form at least. I sincerely hope plenty of time will be given and taken to go into every phase of it fully and completely before we must vote on final passage for certainly this is a long departure from regular procedure in our land of free speech as we know it, and most of us want it to remain.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to question the language on page 8, line 18, and if the members of the committee here present will read that language I think they will be interested. It says:

No subsequent legislation shall be held to supersede or modify any provision or application of this act except to the extent that such legislation shall do so expressly.

Ordinarily it is held that a subsequent act which differs from an act already on the books, to the extent that the subsequent act modifies or in anywise changes the law in respect to the original act, whether or not that act is mentioned, the law is changed by the subsequent act. Now we are going to be required to expressly refer to this act, which will in due course become buried in the statutes quite deeply, in order to make any change whatsoever or modification in respect to some subsequent legislation's intent; otherwise the intent of the subsequent legislation will not have the effect that the committee bringing it here thinks it will have. I would like to have the committee members express themselves on that.

Mr. WALTER. This is the language in the Administrative Procedure Act and

is the language employed to save provisions or legislation that are intended to remain in effect where subsequent legislation repeals or modifies or changes existing statutes, the idea being to keep in effect all parts of the statute except that which is expressly modified, repealed or changed.

Mr. HINSHAW. In other words, you have to expressly refer to this act in a subsequent act in order to modify it in any respect?

Mr. WALTER. Exactly.

Mr. HINSHAW. For example, if the Civil Aeronautics Board should have representing some individual or corporation an agent who might be an accountant or somebody else, and if the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce were to bring in such legislation that would permit this representation, no such representation could be had unless the new legislation presented by my committee expressly referred to this act. I wonder whether or not an amendment to a bill of that character which was offered on the floor of the House to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act would be considered germane to that bill? I doubt it. May I ask the gentleman to answer that question?

Mr. WALTER. Would the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. HINSHAW. I would be glad to repeat it. I am assuming that my own committee, which deals with a good many transportation agencies in the Government, brings a bill to the floor of the House without necessarily mentioning directly a change that it proposes in that bill in the nature of proceedings before such an agency; then on the floor of the House that committee, through its ranking member, intends to offer an amendment to that bill duly amending this bill to permit such a practice. I wonder if the gentleman, in his great experience as a chairman of the Committee of the Whole house, would know whether such an amendment would be germane or not?

Mr. WALTER. I certainly think it would be. It is practicing before an agency whose legislation is being considered, and would not in any wise affect the germaneness of that sort of a proposal. This can only prevent the accidental repeal of any section of the bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Even on purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question now concerning the language on page 5, line 5, to which I referred when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] was addressing the committee. The agencies referred to in section 6, lines 15 to 20, have the power to make rules as to who may act as agent or attorney before them in proceedings not subject to sections 7 and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. WALTER. Yes; some of the agencies have that power today, given to them by statute.

Mr. HINSHAW. They have the power to determine who may practice. Do they have the power to exclude?

Mr. WALTER. They have the power to exclude, to this extent: They can provide for qualifications, and if those qualifications are not met, those who cannot meet them are, of course, excluded from practicing.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not know at the moment of any case in which members of my own profession would want to practice before an agency in any proceeding under the Administrative Procedures Act, but they certainly represent a great many different organizations as professional people. My own profession, as the gentleman knows, is that of civil engineer, and I am a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers which has, I think, as good a code of ethics as has the bar, and yet I find here that it is quite possible to exclude members of my profession from practicing before an agency of the Government as an agent of principals. Is that wrong, or am I correct?

Mr. WALTER. I think the gentleman is wrong, except this: that certainly he does not believe in his particular profession he is qualified to practice law any more than a lawyer feels he is qualified to practice as an engineer.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have found a lot of lawyers who thought they could practice engineering as well as law. I am rather unhappy about this bill, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if we go back to page 2—I want to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]—you outline certain categories which would not be prevented from, you say, "appearance or participation in any agency proceeding" for five purposes there designated. Is there any difference between appearing and participating and practicing?

Mr. WALTER. Appearing, participating, and practicing?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is there any difference between appearing and participating and practicing, as that term is used?

Mr. WALTER. Well, of course, this is not considered practicing. These exceptions are not considered as practicing before an agency.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, say a man was an expert and represented a certain agency, any farm group, for example, if I understood your remarks here in answer to some questions by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], if that man was here he could represent, say, the Farm Bureau, but if he wanted, for hire, to represent two or three other farm groups, he could not do that unless he complied with the provisions of this act.

Mr. WALTER. Then he is an independent contractor and he is no longer an agent for any particular group. He then becomes an independent contractor, and is then a practitioner, but must qualify to practice.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. So that all that the ordinary, average citizen

could do would be to appear and practice for his own organization?

Mr. WALTER. Exactly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, is it not true, for example, if I am arrested, even though I am not a lawyer, I can practice all the way from the city court clear up to the Supreme Court; can I not?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Your rule, then, for the department, is much stricter, is it not?

Mr. WALTER. No, no. Any individual can appear on his own behalf or on behalf of his organization, but what this is principally aimed at is this man who, for example, will pick up a bill that has been introduced and alarm a number of people and try to get an organization together to collect dues in order to retain him to represent them. That is the type of thing we are shooting at.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know what you are shooting at, but while you are getting that fellow are you not also filling full of lead the fellow who is just an ordinary citizen? He appears as a witness and then suppose he wants to carry his case on up. Then he becomes a practitioner.

Mr. WALTER. No, indeed. If he is appearing on his own behalf he can appear anywhere at any time; he cannot be excluded. He does not have to qualify.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He can make his own record, file his own brief, and all that?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That believes me a lot.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I think of all the remarkable measures that have ever come before Congress this is the most so. On page 3 it is provided:

For the purposes of this act the Credentials Committee shall appoint a secretary, have such staff, other assistance, or advisory services or committees as may be required, incur obligations, make rules, issue individual notices by mail requiring the renewal of credentials from time to time, fix compensatory admission and removal fees, and require the submission of necessary information from any person or agency.

That is unlimited power. There is not a board in the Government today that has the power this Committee would have.

The bill provides later that any person violating any of the rules they arbitrarily set shall be subject to a fine of \$5,000 or a year's imprisonment. This is an unlimited bill. It ought to be killed and killed quickly.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman inform me just when we are going to quit creating new agencies of government?

Mr. HULL. I cannot tell the gentleman that. I do not think we should ever create one like this bill proposes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, there are a few things in connection with this legislation I should like to understand before I am asked to vote on it.

Under the situation that exists today, every executive department of Government has certain rules or regulations governing practice before that department. Is or is not that true?

Mr. WALTER. I am sure that is the case.

Mr. KEEFE. I know it is with respect to the departments I have sought to appear before in times past. They presently have the authority, do they not, in each department to make rules and regulations governing the conduct of attorneys or agents or individuals that may appear before them in proceedings pending before executive or administrative agencies of the Government?

Mr. WALTER. If by "conduct" the gentleman means qualifications, that is the case.

Mr. KEEFE. All right, now; we will not go into the question of misconduct or into moral fitness or background or that sort of thing. But at least any department of Government today under the time-honored practice that has been indulged in can make rules and regulations that govern the conduct of individuals, lawyers, agents, or anybody else that appears before that body in matters that are pending?

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot quite understand why it is necessary to have such a very tight piece of legislation as is presented here. I understand what you are trying to do. You are trying to weed out a few fellows who have brought some discredit on the practice before these agencies. But it seems to me that any administrative agency of Government or any executive department of Government presently has the power to control the situation. If they act in behalf of the agency or the executive department or act under existing authority to protect themselves or the public, we would not need all this great technical and complicated machinery that is set up here establishing a Board of Credentials that has very wide, vast authority.

I am in sympathy with the objectives the committee has in mind, but I do agree with those who have criticized this bill that it is giving a vast authority to this Board with respect to a few individuals who may seek to practice. All those who are presently admitted and licensed by the departments will be permitted to carry on without any difficulty at all under the grandfather clause of this bill. So it is only going to deal with individual people who seek to practice within these departments. Is it not perfectly clear, therefore, that we can deal with this problem if the departments themselves want to deal with them under their existing power to prescribe rules and regulations pertaining to the practice by attorneys and agents before these commissions and administrative and executive departments of the Government?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. One of the very reasons for this legislation has been the position taken by all of the bar associations all over the Nation that nobody knows exactly what the qualifications are to practice before every agency. With the dozens and hundreds of agencies that we have, each with the authority to set up its own regulations, nobody knows what the qualifications are for the particular practice in any particular agency. It is felt, through the enactment of this type of legislation, there will ultimately be a mass of uniform regulations so that anybody can come in and know exactly what the regulations are.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly what I am afraid of. An individual who has practiced before one of these agencies and who has sought to be admitted to practice, certainly knows what the rules and regulations are and what he has to comply with in order to practice. You cannot go down to the Treasury Department and appear before any division of the Treasury Department unless you are licensed to practice under the rules and regulations of the Treasury Department.

I doubt if you can do it before any other agency.

I appreciate the diligent effort being made to deal with this problem, but I personally feel we are setting up a new tribunal which is going to make the rules and regulations governing admission covering all administrative agencies of Government and all departments of Government and that the grant of power in this legislation, so far as I am concerned, is a little too great at the present moment. I would want to give this more consideration than I have been able to give in these few minutes that we have been discussing it this afternoon.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

It has been said that under the present rules and regulations they will permit the agency to set up its own requirements.

Mr. KEEFE. That is as I understand it.

Mr. BONNER. What is the purpose of repeating that in this legislation?

Mr. KEEFE. The purpose of it is very clear, may I say to my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. All the agencies have their separate and individual rules and regulations, so that if I want to practice before the Treasury Department, I have to comply with their regulations and rules and if I want to step over and appear before the State Department in another matter, I have to comply with their rules.

If I want to go into the Department of Agriculture, I have to comply with their rules. No one knows what all these rules are. But I found no difficulty in my appearances down here before becoming a Member of Congress, and I do not think there is any great difficulty to be experienced by anybody who wants to appear before any of these departments. These departments have the

power at the present time to control the character and type of practitioners who will appear before those departments.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Under this bill they may still make additional requirements, is that not correct?

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, yes. That is the very purpose of it.

Mr. LANHAM. So a man still will not know any more than he does now?

Mr. KEEFE. He will not know until this board has finally acted. And they will change those regulations from time to time, perhaps.

Mr. LANHAM. But the point I am making is that even with that, these boys can make additional rules and regulations.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there have been some questions raised by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] about who will be permitted to appear before an agency. I would like to call attention to a conversation between the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself last July 6, as it appears in the RECORD. At that time I said:

What about traffic managers?

Mr. WALTER. They are protected under this bill; also representatives of chambers of commerce, boards of trade people, and men of that sort who appear specially in proceedings in the departments.

Mr. GROSS. Must they obtain credentials from anyone in order to be able to appear?

Mr. WALTER. No; they do not have to, unless they are appearing generally. But for the purpose of one hearing or where they appear casually, representing the chamber of commerce of the gentleman's home town or before the Federal Communications Commission, for example, they could appear without credentials.

Apparently if they appear more than casually they are going to have to come under the terms of this proposition. I think that is in contradiction to the gentleman's statement of a while ago that a representative of a farm organization can come in and appear at any time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I think the proposition that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was referring to was on page 2, exemption No. 6, as contained in the bill. It provides that any officer or regular full-time employee of a corporation or other organization may appear on its behalf without complying with the requirements of this law.

In other words, that is one of the exemptions set forth in the law, it being expressly provided that the act shall not apply to that.

Mr. GROSS. That does not take care of the part-time employee.

Mr. KEATING. No. It applies, of course, only to the regular full-time employee. The gentleman is quite correct about that.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure that if, as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania says, we are considering here legislation to take care of "fixers" he would agree with me that it would be wiser to deal with it on the basis of "fixers" and not take in everybody broadside in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and to the further fact that I am a lawyer, I hesitate to make any statement about this bill because I cannot make any favorable remarks concerning this proposal. In short, as the report states, the bill provides for the licensing and disciplining of administrative practitioners. This requires a definition of practice and the method for the disciplining of lawyers and nonlawyers. Provision is made for the maintenance of standards of conduct for such licensed practitioners and for disciplinary proceedings.

When I was a member of the Arkansas State Legislature I recall that many bills were always before the legislature in an effort to protect the lawyers from somebody. Some of the lawyers of the country were always afraid that some nonlawyer was going to take some business away from him. I cannot agree that a good lawyer has anything to worry about just because a person outside the legal profession happens to get some lucrative piece of business that an ordinary lawyer might want.

Mr. Chairman, we all know what this legislation is for; there is no use kidding ourselves about it. This legislation is designed to help a group of people in Washington, D. C., carry on all of the lobbying that is necessary before the agencies of the Federal Government, and they want to be sure that some little peckerwood from down in my State or your State does not come up here tampering with their business.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this was a bill to help the five-percenters?

Mr. TACKETT. This bill is going to help raise the fee above 5 percent.

The American Bar Association or any other great organization—and I am a strong believer in them—cannot truthfully say that this legislation is needed. They know, and I know, that this is not a thing in the world other than a lobbying bill to authorize the lobbying by a select group. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. Chairman, do you not believe that any person in the United States of America who is a good loyal citizen should have the right to come up here on behalf of himself or his neighbors? Oh, they say, Yes; he can come on behalf of himself, true, and participate in any activities before any department of the

Federal Government just as freely as somebody who has passed some certain kind of examination that only the lawyers in the District of Columbia could pass.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. This applies to every State in the Union and any Federal Government agency, does it not?

Mr. TACKETT. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. So, notwithstanding the fact I was once a Massachusetts legislator, if I went down and wanted to appear before the Housing Board I could not unless I were a lawyer.

Mr. TACKETT. No; and even though you were a lawyer you would have to pass an examination. Being a lawyer would not get you in. You would first have to be able to meet the rules and regulations of this great big organization we are proposing to bring into existence by virtue of this bill.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I could not go down there and represent my client unless I were a lawyer or unless I passed some kind of an examination to prove that I was a natural man, or something like that.

Mr. TACKETT. To see whether or not you were qualified. If the gentleman were a nonprofessional he would have to prove that he was a professional before he could do professional business.

Mr. NICHOLSON. But the bill states that I have got to be a natural person.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not know what that means. I am just about as much in the dark now as I was when this debate started.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is there any guarantee that a Government department will proceed according to law?

Mr. TACKETT. The report states that modern government is changing so fast and so rapidly that it is necessary for us to make all these people who appear before this modern Government modern people. They have got to be modern representatives before they can appear before any Federal agency.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Would not this bill require any attorney in any town, city, or county in the United States to obtain credentials before he could practice on behalf of his clients before the local agencies of the Federal Government?

Mr. TACKETT. Right.

Mr. HINSHAW. Whether it be a housing agency, the OPA, or any other agency?

Mr. TACKETT. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, some lawyers in this country seem to think that the lobbying of this country is supposed to be done by lawyers. In the first place, a good lawyer is not worried about

the right to lobby, he is not worried about some little JP out in the country writing some deed that perhaps his office would write if the JP was not there. This bill is going to help a group of people where the Federal agencies of this country are located, especially the lawyers of the District of Columbia, and down in my State the lawyers of Little Rock where the Federal agencies are located within Arkansas.

Mr. Chairman, there is no reason in the world for anyone to vote for this measure.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Would it not be just as reasonable to say that all Members of Congress should be lawyers as it would be to pass this legislation?

Mr. TACKETT. I just cannot believe it is necessary for someone to prove his qualifications in order to do business with a Federal agency. If he is not worth a hoot, the Federal agency will not pay any attention to him anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. BIEMILLER, 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. 4446) to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement he made yesterday before the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, on the subject of social security, and particularly on old-age assistance and old-age pensions.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter to a friend.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in three instances and include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to address the House tomorrow for 1 hour following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LIBERTY VERSUS SOCIALISM

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER]—page 3315 of the Record—as proof that the political issue today is not liberty versus socialism called attention to the fact that General Motors in 1948 made the greatest net profit it had ever made, and in 1949 increased that profit 49 percent.

This, said the gentleman, was "in spite of the socialism that is reported by Republicans to be wrecking our Government and ruining our industry."

It is quite true that the socialism or regimentation so extensively practiced by the preceding and the present administration has not yet extended its blighting hand to General Motors and some other industries.

The beneficial activities of General Motors should be sufficient to convince even a gentleman from Missouri that we should go no farther along the road toward socialism.

If he wants illustrations of what the trend toward socialism can do to the country's economy, all he needs to do is to refer to and consider the administration's program which has dealt with potatoes, eggs, and other commodities. The prices of practically all these commodities have, to the consumer, been high, and in addition the consumer has contributed to the billions of dollars paid others for the production of the necessities of life which he was compelled to purchase.

The gentleman said nothing about the price of coal, a basic fuel upon which many of our industries depend and which is being priced out of the market by the administration's political shenanigans with organized labor. Steel is in a somewhat similar situation.

The administration, by its support to various pension and subsidy plans is raising the price of practically everything in common use and shortly, unless the trend stops, we will not only find ourselves unable to purchase the necessities of life, but we will have ruinous inflation.

The administration and some union leaders would socialize all industry, beginning with the mines, going on to the telephone and transportation industries, and then jumping over into manufacturing.

The unions, though they have millions of dollars in their respective treasuries, always, while telling management how to operate their businesses; while always demanding an increase in wages, never have seen fit to, by practical demonstration, show management its errors; create or purchase a factory and operate it in accordance with the rules it lays down for others.

If Mr. Murray, Mr. Green, Mr. Reuther are sincere and sure of their ground, one of the quickest ways to a solution of all labor troubles would be to combine their cash resources, engage in business, and show the way to industry.

The gentleman from Missouri may, or he may not, condemn private enterprise. The administration all too often seeks to circumscribe its activities.

But, notwithstanding the handicaps it has been forced to meet, it is apparent

from the article to which the gentleman referred, that General Motors Corp. is not only paying its 434,000 stockholders a dividend of \$14.64 per share of common stock but, out of its earnings, it paid taxes of \$580,000,000, which is equivalent to a tax charge of \$13.20 a share on every share of its common stock.

Moreover, 4,204 of its employees received in cash and common-stock bonuses to be paid in annual installments over a period of not more than 5 years amounting to \$49,887,505.

The corporation gave employment to hundreds of thousands of workers many of whom might otherwise have been out of jobs.

Just how many jobs have Murray, Green, and Reuther provided for workers during 1948? What has any one of the three gentlemen had to do with either the production or the sales of General Motors' products which has been of benefit either to the public or to the employees of the corporation?

If General Motors or other industrial corporations could be forced out of existence, would any of the heads of these unions and their associates provide employment? Undoubtedly, they would do what they did before when unemployment increased. They would ask the Federal Government to create jobs including leaf-raking and others of like uselessness, and ask the taxpayer to pay the bill.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

UNITED STATES POLICY IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, this is a report of an inquiry made in Israel in the course of my work on the European Study Mission of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in November and December last, and of subsequent developments.

The strategic area in the eastern Mediterranean continues to be as it has for centuries the crossroads between Asia and the west; hence its vital importance. It happens, too, that this whole area is backward from the point of view of economic and political conditions—as witness, for example, the numerous changes of government in Syria within the last year—feudal conditions of land tenure, and high illiteracy and disease rates. The situation is very well described in a news story by the distinguished roving reporter, Cyrus L. Sulzberger, in the New York Times, of Monday, June 13, 1949, from which I quote:

Arabs with whom this writer has talked and who in no sense can be described as Communist says: "Our countries demand social reform. We are not getting it from our own governments. We did not get it from the British. The United States is the most powerful country in the world today. Yet Washington's diplomatic contacts appear in a large measure to be limited to those who are now in the seats of power in the Arab world. We warn you, they cannot remain there long. There is more ignorance and poverty beside more medieval wealth existing side by side in the Middle East than anywhere in Europe."

The Near East situation is today explosive enough so that it could burst into flame at any time through internal revolt.

The area went through a state of great tension in the period 1947-48 in connection with the efforts of the United Nations to settle the problem of partition of Palestine. This situation erupted into a full-scale Arab attack on Israel after the declaration of Israel's independence on May 14, 1948. Israel was invaded on the north by Syria and Lebanon, on the east by Jordan, and on the south by Egypt. This Arab attack which developed into a full-scale war between the Arab states and Israel continued until armistice agreements were signed with the invading Arab states by Israel in 1949. Since that time, armistice has prevailed in Palestine. The Egyptian forces are in occupation of a narrow strip of land about 24 miles long and 5 miles wide on the coast contiguous to the most settled part of Israel called the Gaza Strip; while the forces of Jordan control the ancient city of Jerusalem as well as most of the rest of Palestine outside of Israel. In addition to the territory assigned by the UN partition resolution, Israel as a result of the armistice agreements holds western Galilee and the new city of Jerusalem, a city which was developed primarily by the Jews during the last 70 years.

The other external factor of major importance is the presence of 726,000 Arab refugees from what is now the territory of Israel and who left that area when the Arab armies began their invasion in the early fall of 1948 at the behest of the fanatical Arab leaders who had sparked the invasion. These refugees are largely concentrated in Arab Palestine outside Israel, in the Gaza Strip referred to above, and in Lebanon and Syria. Their condition is one of privation as the Arab states have refused to accept any major responsibility for them and they have been left largely to international care through the United Nations. The United Nations Economic Survey Commission for the Middle East, appointed by the UN to consider the situation, under the chairmanship of Gordon R. Clapp of the United States, found that there were 652,000 of such cases needing care and maintenance and that this could best be accomplished under a \$54,900,000 program for works projects and care and maintenance to which the United States was invited to contribute 50 percent.

Israel, too, is inundated by refugees; its population has almost doubled since May 1948, and some 90,000 Jewish refugees from Europe, north Africa, and the Arab states are living in canvas tent-camps under conditions of hardship in Israel.

Surprisingly enough the state of tension which I have described is not especially highlighted by the situation in Jerusalem for both Israel and Jordan which divide the city between their forces appear to take it for granted that the United Nations proposal for internationalization is so impractical that it cannot be implemented. The whole machinery of government and administra-

tion and the whole economy of the new city are established as part of Israel and the 95 percent of its population which is Jewish has too freshly in mind its near obliteration by the invading Arab armies in 1948 to take any chances on internationalization. Jordan on its side finds its national aspirations completely inconsistent with internationalization. Protection of the holy places which is so critically important to the whole western world is now being considered in terms of an international regime under the UN control—with perhaps also an international curatorship—specifically safeguarding the rights of the Christian, Jewish, and Moslem faiths and the integrity of their shrines as well as full and convenient access to them, and with both Israel and Jordan guaranteeing those rights under penalty of international sanctions in the event of any violation.

This was the state of affairs which I found when I visited Israel last November. A condition of tension, a condition of the suspension of war but not of peace, a condition of overwhelming problems for the small new state of Israel, of great austerity—far more than is found even in Britain—for the people of Israel, and of real hardship for the Jewish refugees—as indeed it is for the Arab refugees, too. Yet in the midst of this tension and difficulty an event was occurring of the most serious consequence for the peace of the world, for I found that an arms race was in full swing between the Arab states and Israel based upon the widespread shipment of arms to the Arab states by Great Britain; while the Arab press and radio were full of fulminations against Israel, promising a second round in the Arab-Israeli war.

The world had been warned against the danger of an arms race in that area in connection with the action of the Security Council of the United Nations which on August 11, 1949, voted to lift the arms embargo which had been imposed on the Near East by the Security Council's resolution of May 29, 1948. Acting Palestine Mediator Ralph Bunche, commenting at that time, said:

Certainly, should an arms race develop in that area as a result of the lifting of the existing injunction, it would not serve the interests of permanent peace in the Near East.

His comment was directed to the statements of the United States, British, and the French representatives on the Security Council incident to the resolution lifting the arms embargo to the following effect. Senator Austin said:

So far as the United States is concerned, it does not intend to allow the export of arms which would permit a competitive arms race in the area.

And in fact an embargo on arms exports to the Near East had been imposed by the United States as early as December 1947.

M. Chauvel of France said:

I do not think that any country represented here, nor any other country, has the slightest interest in unleashing an armaments race in the Near East or anywhere else.

Sir Terrence Shone of Great Britain said:

Any supplies of arms which we may send would be for the internal security and defense requirements of the states concerned. This, of course, does not mean that we wish anything in the nature of an arms race, to which Mr. Eban made allusion, to develop in the Middle East or anywhere else. Far from it.

At about the same time that this Security Council resolution was passed the Arabs were already threatening a second round of the war against Israel. Thus we find the following statements in the Arab press around that time:

According to Falastin, a popular Transjordan daily paper, and the Near East broadcasting station on August 9, 1949, Dr. Fadel Jamali, former foreign minister and now permanent Iraqi delegate to the UN, stated in Bagdad:

Unless the ministries of education in the various Arab countries plan now to educate a new generation of active youth who will not be satisfied with words alone, there is no doubt but that the Arabs will lose the second round—

Of the war against Israel—
just as they lost the first.

Radio Damascus, on June 27, 1949, stated:

The Arabs have lost the first round of the Palestine war because they followed the advice of the British and the Americans. They will not be so short-sighted in the second round.

On the anniversary of the Arab invasion of Palestine, May 14, 1949, a Cairo paper said to be close to court circles, the Akhbar El Yom, wrote:

The Palestine war is not yet over. Egyptian blood which drenched the soil of Palestine has laid a path along which we are in duty bound to tread to clinch the victory for which our martyrs fought.

After the Syrian-Israel armistice agreement had been concluded, Al Nazzar, a Syrian daily paper, wrote on July 23, 1949:

We would say frankly to all the Arab states and to all the Arab people now that the curtain has finally fallen on what we hope to be the first round of the Palestine struggle—may this armistice be of short duration, during which time we may endeavor to reinforce ourselves and increase our potential in order that we may destroy the dangers which surround us before they succeed in destroying us.

When I returned to the United States on December 28, 1949, I wrote to the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, reporting on these facts and stating that I had checked them in London in December and was satisfied that the British were shipping heavy arms such as naval frigates and jet fighter planes, armored cars, heavy tanks, and automatic rifles to Egypt, Iraq, and Jordan, and perhaps to Syria as well. I raised the question of the grave danger of the misuse of these arms for a renewed assault against Israel and the shattering of the peace of the Near East—instead of as claimed to buttress the defenses of the Arab states concerned. In a frank reply to my letter, a reply which has set in train the vigorous discussion now

going on about this subject, the Secretary of State, while agreeing "that a renewal of the Arab-Israeli conflict would be a tragic development, which the world community must bend every effort to prevent," admitted that the British Government was "furnishing certain categories of arms to Iraq, Jordan, and Egypt, under the treaty arrangements which bind Great Britain to those countries." The Secretary then made the following statement of policy:

It should be recalled that the Arab states are but a part of the Middle East area, a region the security of which, is of great importance to the west. It is desirable that the countries in this part of the world obtain from reliable and friendly sources such arms which they may need for their legitimate security requirements. . . . Arms shipments to the Arab states and Israel should be limited to those necessary for the purpose of maintaining internal law and order by the Government concerned in the legitimate exercise of constituted authority, and for the purpose of providing for reasonable requirements of self-defense.

It is reported that on February 27 last, Israel taking the Secretary of State at his word, requested arms shipments from the United States. The question now arises whether the United States should honor this request and on that point it is understood that the United States has requested full information on the existing status of arms and armaments in Israel. It seems only logical that the United States should also request information on the existing status of arms and armaments in the Arab states as well and also on the shipments made and proposed by Britain since the Security Council acted to lift the arms embargo, and the terms upon which these have been made. For it is unthinkable that our close ally in the effort to maintain international peace—Great Britain—should be feeding the flames of an arms race in the Near East while we stand idly by.

The Secretary of State implied in his letter to me that British shipments were for the purpose of providing for the reasonable requirements of self defense of the Arab states receiving the shipments. Questions of internal security may be laid aside, as jet fighter planes and gunboats let alone heavy tanks are hardly needed to maintain internal security. The question then arises whether the British arms shipments are justified because they are intended to buttress Arab defenses against any threat from the Communist East. It is of course clear from the attitude of the Arab states themselves that the danger of a misuse of these arms for a renewed war against Israel in the Near East is far more imminent than their use against Communist expansion. But aside from that, the effectiveness of any Arab stand against communism without Israel as party to the alliance is highly problematic. In the Arab-Israeli war, Israel, with a population of close to a million, was a match for and indeed repulsed the armies of the Arab states with a population of over 36,000,000. I do not wish to belabor old causes but to mention only that the record of the Arab states in World War II also gives no great assurance in this regard.

The whole world knows the name of Glubb Pasha, commander of the Arab Legion of Transjordan, in the Arab-Israeli war. This commander, an Englishman, discussing the Iraq revolt of 1941 against the British which was in that area almost a mortal wound, said:

The British of course always knew we were going to win the war, but at the time of these operations every Arab was perfectly convinced that Britain was finished for ever, and that it could only be a question of weeks before Germany took over Arabia. The Iraqis were perfectly sure of this or they would not have declared war on us. . . .

In brief, during the 6 weeks before the fall of Bagdad, every Arab was convinced that we were done for. Every Arab force previously organized by us mutinied and refused to fight for us, or faded away in desertions. The men of the Arab Legion alone not only stood firmly by us, but played a most active, energetic, and valuable part in our little campaign.

The Iraqi revolt broke out against Britain on May 2, 1941. At that time Britain was under the German blitz; British forces had just been evacuated from Greece; the Vichy government was installed in France and General Wavell, British commander in the Near East according to Winston Churchill's memoirs said, "I consider the prolongation of fighting in Iraq would seriously endanger the defense of Palestine and Egypt." In the Iraqi revolt it soon appeared that the Nazis were a mainspring, for German aircraft supported the Iraqi effort.

The grim story of the Mufti of Jerusalem—Haj Amin-el-Husseini—has been told time and again. He was not only in the 1941 Iraqi revolt at the behest of the Axis Powers, but made common cause with Mussolini and Hitler as an emigre to Rome and Berlin. For the rest of the war he became the close ally of Hitler and Mussolini, organized propaganda, espionage, and fifth-column activities in the Near East for the Nazi-Fascist Axis, established Arab legions and the Arab Brigade for them, organized Moslems into military units in Axis-occupied countries and in North Africa and Russia, and became a fanatical party to Hitler's campaign of genocide.

This record is to be contrasted with the 26,000 Palestine Jews who fought as a Jewish brigade with the British forces with great distinction throughout the war in its Mediterranean phase.

With respect to the participation by the rest of the Arab states in World War II, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Lebanon did not declare war on Nazi Germany until February 26, 1945, at which time it was a condition precedent for admission to the United Nations. Egyptian forces in the course of the war did patrol and guard duty within Egypt, while the Allies—largely British ground forces and American air forces—spent a billion and a half dollars in Egypt alone.

Turning now again to the rearming of the Arab states, it is most significant to note that while all the Arab states have contributed but \$6,760,347 for the relief of the Palestine Arab refugees, totaling 652,000 who need relief, according to the report of the Clapp commission, during the 13 months from December 1, 1948, to December 31, 1949, of which

Egypt's contribution was \$1,920,050, Egyptian military expenses aggregated approximately 30 percent of her total budget for fiscal 1948-49—50,024,410 Egyptian pounds—\$140,000,000 at the present rate of exchange. This fact is adduced from the testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee within the last few weeks by Hon. George C. McGhee, Assistant Secretary of State, in charge of the Near East. With this figure may be compared an estimated cost of about \$250 for the resettlement of each Palestine Arab refugee, or a total for the 652,000 of about \$163,000,000—just a little more than a year's military expenses for Egypt. The Egyptian arms figure may also be compared with her expenditure of 10,000,000 Egyptian pounds—\$40,000,000—for the same purpose for 1947-48.

This recapitulation of facts regarding the arms race in the Near East shows that it is being fed and nurtured under a completely misguided British policy which appears to have at least the tacit approval of our State Department. The ineffectiveness of Arab forces in the Arab-Israeli war, and their very small role in World War II makes any present expectations of their effective resistance to Communist aggression unjustified, certainly not without the addition of the proven effectiveness of the Israeli forces. We are led also to certain fundamental conclusions as to the course of action United States foreign policy in the Near East should follow. Up to now, the letter to me of the Secretary of State of January 12 last implies in my view that we have been following British policy there, and using British arguments to justify it. British policy is apparently founded on trying to maintain in the Near East British power prestige and superiority, without regard to the actual situation either of the area itself or of Britain herself. Britain appears to be making in the Near East almost a conscious effort to carve it out and retain it as her special preserve for world political purposes, as the area in which she has special interests and special rights with little regard to the general international situation. This the United States cannot afford to permit, let alone follow. A good deal of the military matériel in question might well be part of United States lend-lease, the \$24,000,000,000 balance of which was settled with the British in March 1946 for \$650,000,000 on long-term partial payments at very low interest and with a very generous escape clause. We certainly have a right to consider this factor in assessing the whole British policy of arms sales to the Arab states.

In a previous effort to establish a positive policy for the United States in respect to the Near East, 44 Representatives and 6 Senators on May 18, 1949, introduced House Joint Resolution 427 et sequentia and Senate Joint Resolution 98 calling for the appointment by the President of a Near East Development Commission to investigate and make recommendations on, first, immigration and resettlement of displaced persons and refugees; second, improvement of standards of living, social services and educational opportunities; third, establishment and

development of agricultural and industrial projects to increase productivity; and fourth, improvement of opportunities for technical and university education. At that time it was pointed out by this group that vast potentialities exist in the Near East for redeeming 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 new cultivatable acres of agricultural land; as these areas now being neglected had in ancient times supported great civilizations and great population centers. An estimate of \$500,000,000 was given as the cost of such projects largely to be located in the river valleys of the Jordan, the Tigris, the Euphrates and the White Nile. This policy was not taken up by the administration and while the report of the UN—Ciapp—Mission indicated that political and social conditions are not ripe as yet for large-scale projects of this kind, the United States Near East diplomatic representatives meeting at Cairo recently appeared to indicate that such a program was essential. The sponsors of House Joint Resolution 427 et sequentia had also pointed out that the Near East urgently needs for its development consumer goods, for which it has depended for some decades on the British under the conditions of a feudal type of economy of the very poor and the very rich. The redevelopment of this area could require Israel as a workshop to produce consumer goods—light metals, textiles, hardware, furniture, household appliances and processed foods which the Near East urgently needs.

Accordingly, I suggest for consideration of the Department of State, and the American people, the following six-point foreign policy to be pursued by us in the Near East:

First. Divorcement of the United States from British imperial interests in the Near East; endorsement of the interest of the people of the Christian, Moslem, and Jewish faiths in the security of the holy places and the placing of them under international control, and in the peace, security and economic, political and social development and reconstruction of the Near East.

Second. A review of the situation of arms and armaments in the Arab states and in Israel with a view toward establishing the balanced strategic requirements in that area between them.

Third. A specific request by the United States to Great Britain to refrain from further shipments of arms, aircraft, and naval vessels to the Arab states until the foregoing steps have been accomplished.

Fourth. Consideration by the Security Council of the UN or by a special meeting of the General Assembly (a) of the developing arms race in the Near East, (b) of the situation regarding Jerusalem with a view (i) to establishing a regime for the administration of the holy places there and throughout Palestine, and (ii) to the impracticability of proceeding with the internationalization of Jerusalem.

Fifth. United States insistence on full British cooperation in a renewed drive for peace treaties between Israel and the Arab states.

Sixth. Establishment of the Near East Development Commission, as called for

by the House and Senate resolutions—House Joint Resolution 427 and Senate Joint Resolution 98—and implementation of the work of such commission by the early initiation of point 4 projects, both by the United States and by the United Nations.

Continuation of present policies and present developments by the United States, without seeking corrective action has already involved widespread protest including protests from our principal labor organizations, the A. F. of L. and the CIO. Peace and necessary development in the Near East, hence the protection of that area from communism, will not be earned by a program of inaction in the face of acknowledged facts, any more than peace and freedom were so earned in China. The activation of our Near East policy is essential and affirmative action is called for.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. May I say to the gentleman that when I returned from Israel and stopped in England on my way home I visited the office of the American Ambassador and reported to him the fact that there were many news reports which had indicated that England was arming the Arabs at a very rapid rate, and that the Arab papers were beating the war drums looking to the second round of their fight with the Israeli.

At that time I was sought to be appeased by the representative of the American Ambassador to whom I spoke, who suggested that these so-called statements in the Arab newspapers were nothing more than propaganda, that nothing would result. I think, however, that since that time events have disclosed that the situation is deteriorating rapidly, and that unless our Government does intervene to check the flow of arms war may very well break out.

May I state this further, that I wrote to the Secretary of State, I think about 2 weeks ago, at which time I asked the Secretary of State to check the matter to determine just what was happening. I received a letter from the Secretary's office, signed by one Jack McFall, I think, which indicated that they were considering furnishing arms to the Israeli, as well as to the Arabs, in view of their position of arming the peace-loving countries in the cold war situation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. May I point out to the gentleman that Britain furnishing arms either for blocked sterling which Egypt, Jordan, or Iraq might have tied up in Britain, or on a straight government to government basis, is a far different thing from a small nation like Israel trying to find arms in the United States. There is a difference in the terms of payment and the opportunity for acquisition. Besides, our aim should not be to arm potential belligerents but rather to seek peace.

Mr. YATES. I know the gentleman has made a very comprehensive study of the situation. I wonder whether the gentleman on the basis of his study has been able to determine whether or not the arms which England has been giv-

ing to Egypt have in turn been transhipped in a measure to any of the other Arab countries.

Mr. JAVITS. We are unable to surely ascertain that fact, except that, as I stated, the unusually large amount of the Egyptian budget which is devoted to arms purchases and arming the Egyptian forces indicates the fact that there is adequate potential, either directly or through the Arab League, for Egypt to arm others of the Arab states in the Near East.

Mr. YATES. The reason for my question was that I had recently seen a report in the Christian Science Monitor which indicated that arms were being furnished by Egypt to Iraq and several other of the Arab countries, which would indicate that Egypt can very well be acting as a funnel.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written to Paul M. Herzog, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, calling his attention to the case of Max Perlow, which has been before the Board for some time and has not been adjudicated. I think it is one of the most important cases that has come for trial under the anti-Communist oath under the Taft-Hartley law; and with that I would like to include an editorial from the New York Times and a report from the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOREIGN COMPETITION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I voted for ECA because I believe in its broad objectives. World peace is impossible without world recovery.

In that process, however, I do not feel that the United States should be called upon to make all of the sacrifices.

Out of our accumulated wealth we are giving generously to repair the war-shattered economies of Europe. That should be enough. It is both unjust and dangerous to sacrifice the jobs of American workers in addition, for we cannot bear such a double burden. High taxes and unemployment will not only dry up the aid we are giving to European nations, but will cause grievous harm to our own people. This is happening in New England.

Reciprocal trade was meant to be fair. It was never intended that ECA dollars should subsidize foreign manufacturers and foreign workers to the extent that their products would undersell our manufacturers and workers in the domestic market of the United States.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, released by the State Department in February 1950, provides escape clauses to protect our industries. In the case I have in mind, they are not being

enforced. Unless this gap is plugged up immediately, the breach could widen to the point where our market would be flooded with foreign goods, depressing our own economy and paralyzing the Nation with widespread unemployment.

ECA pump-priming is coming back to haunt us because we are leaning forward on reciprocal trade to the point where it is out of balance, giving foreign industries an advantage over our own.

The December 1949 issue of the Labor Market, published by the United States Department of Labor, reveals that, of the 32 areas of heaviest unemployment in the Nation, 16 are in New England. And the situation has not improved much since then.

There are several factors responsible for this recession. Not the least among them is the academic manner in which our Government doubles in reciprocal trade, over-solicitous of foreign claims, while remaining strangely indifferent to the American workers who have lost their jobs through such policies.

Here is a capsule case, symptomatic of others, which proves the need of tightening up on the administration of reciprocal trade. I will quote in full the letter received from the A. C. Lawrence Leather Co., of Peabody, Mass., under date of February 28, 1950:

DEAR SIR: A rather important section of this company's business is devoted to the production of leather known as chamois, which is produced from sheepskins. This product, as you may know, is used for military purposes, gas straining, and all kinds of civilian use.

For some time we have been subjected to increasingly intense and unfair competition from imported English chamois. The facts in connection with this matter seem to be as follows:

1. After paying ocean freight and duty, English chamois skins can be sold in this country at approximately 25 percent less than prices which are current with us at the present time. Our present prices, incidentally, will not allow us a profit.

2. Raw skins for chamois purposes, apart from those produced in England and Scotland and the United States, come mainly from New Zealand and a few from South America. In spite of the radically reduced prices on English-finished chamois, English tanners are outbidding United States tanners for the suitable raw skins available.

3. It is obvious that the British government is subsidizing the English chamois-tanning industry either directly or indirectly.

It seems apparent that English buying of the raw skins above-mentioned, at higher prices than Americans can pay and the subsidizing of finished chamois which is then sold at about 25 percent under the American product are supported by the continuing flow of ECA dollars to maintain the British economy.

5. Imports of chamois from the United Kingdom totaled in December 1949, 16,453 dozen skins compared with 1,312 dozen in December 1948. Please note the record of imports which clearly portrays the present trend as compared with some years in the past.

6. Lastly, we have in the neighborhood of 100 of our employees working on the production of chamois skins. Needless to say, if this disastrous and unfair English competition continues, we will have to cease making a similar product. The possibility, therefore, is the laying off of 100 or more people.

We shall appreciate anything which you can do to stop the above-described conditions.

If there is anything further which you desire in the way of information, please let us know.

Very truly yours,

A. C. LAWRENCE LEATHER CO.,
STEPHEN PALMER, Vice President.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who opposed ECA in the beginning, on the ground that it was subsidizing British socialism. The majority viewpoint, however, was concerned with restoring British economy—among others—in the interests of world stability and peace. Furthermore, the issue of socialism within Britain, was something for the British people to decide, and there are recent indications that they have decided to check the development of all-powerful government.

My primary concern, however, is the welfare of the American people and I do not propose to assist British socialism in undermining the American home market, with the aid of American dollars and with the aid of a reciprocal-trade program which is negligent in protecting the initiative, efficiency, and thrift of our people.

There is no surer way to commit economic suicide than to subsidize others against ourselves.

I, therefore, request that the Government dust off, read, and enforce the anti-dumping and countervailing duties provisions in article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which will save American industries and American workers from unfair competition in our domestic markets.

How can the British buy raw skins at higher prices than the Americans can pay then add manufacturing and transportation costs, pay the present 15-percent import duty to the United States, and then sell their product at 25 percent less than the same American product here in the United States without subsidies from their own Government?

Impossible.

And where is the money coming from to pay those subsidies? From taxes levied on American workers and manufacturers and given to British by the ECA.

This is cutthroat competition, performed on our own throats.

On this matter of dumping, just look at the record.

In 1939, 11,339 dozen pieces of chamois leather were imported from the United Kingdom to the United States.

In 1949 this had jumped to 54,871 dozen pieces. Of this yearly total, more than half were imported in the last 3 months of 1949, or since devaluation of the British pound.

In paragraph 2 of article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade it states:

In order to offset or prevent dumping, a contracting party may levy on any dumped product an antidumping duty not greater in amount than the margin of dumping in respect of such product. For the purposes of this article, the margin of dumping is the price difference determined in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1.

In paragraph 1b (11) a product is to be considered as being introduced into

the commerce of an importing country at less than its normal value, if the price of the product exported from one country to another is less than—among other comparisons—"the cost of the production of the product in the country of origin plus a reasonable addition for selling cost and profit."

Again, to underscore the discrepancy, the British pay higher prices for raw skins, pay manufacturing and shipping costs, a 15-percent import duty, and then undersell American processors of the same product by 25 percent.

It cannot be done without British subsidies, paid for by American taxpayers, and resulting in loss of business and loss of jobs in the American tanning industry.

To offset this disadvantage, countervailing duties can be imposed on English imports, if the Government of the United States has any interest in protecting the livelihood of its own people.

In paragraph 3, we find this instrument of relief:

The term "countervailing duty" shall be understood to mean a special duty levied for the purpose of offsetting any bounty or subsidy bestowed, directly or indirectly, upon the manufacture, production, or export of any merchandise.

Why is not this countervailing duty being levied against imports of chamois leather from the United Kingdom, in order to give our tanning industry a fair chance?

Just a fair chance, that is all we are asking from our own United States Government.

This it will give if—if it is not lost in the fog of theory. If it is concerned with mounting unemployment among American workers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BARING, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 16, 1950, 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:

1313. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to give effect to the Food and Catering (Ships' Crews) Convention, 1946, adopted at the twenty-eighth (maritime) session of the International Labor Organization, held at Seattle, Wash., June 6-29, 1946"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1314. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to give effect to the certification of Ships' Cooks Convention, 1946, adopted at the twenty-eighth (maritime) session of the International Labor Organization, held at Seattle, Wash., June 6-29, 1946"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1315. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

entitled "A bill to give effect to the Medical Examination (Seafarers) Convention, 1946, adopted at the twenty-eighth (maritime) session of the International Labor Organization, held at Seattle, Wash., June 6-29, 1946"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1316. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949; to the Committee on House Administration.

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. TACKETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4386. A bill to amend section 2 (a) and section 7 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to make failure of registration a continuing offense, and to continue the obligation of officers, directors, and persons acting as such, to comply with the act despite dissolution of a foreign agent; without amendment (Rept. No. 1775). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 513. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6567, a bill to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1783). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. House Joint Resolution 398. Joint resolution relating to cotton and peanut acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 1784). Ordered to be printed.

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. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1110. A bill for the relief of Ann Irene Felkema; with amendment (Rept. No. 1776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2591. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Parisi, Michelina Valletta, Yolanda Altieri, Generosa Tamburi, Carolina Picciano, and Giovanna Turtur; without amendment (Rept. No. 1777). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4903. A bill for the relief of Krikor G. Guiragossian; with amendment (Rept. No. 1778). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7338. A bill for the relief of Asano Teramoto; with amendment (Rept. No. 1779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7410. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kiyoko Tanaka Perez; with amendment (Rept. No. 1780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. June Noda Loman; with amendment (Rept. No. 1781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7609. A bill to grant a renewal of patent No. 59,560 relating to the emblem

of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War; without amendment (Rept. No. 1782). 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. ANGELL:

H. R. 7707. A bill to provide a correctional system for juvenile delinquents proceeded against in the courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 7708. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the Monmouth Consolidated Water Co. certain easements and rights-of-way within the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 7709. A bill to provide for the acquisition, investigation, and preservation of lands to commemorate the historic Fort Caroline settlement, St. Johns Bluff, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R. 7710. A bill to provide that certain vessels shall be subject to the laws relating to steam vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7711. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make a study, and a report to Congress, with respect to the collecting of fees and charges by agencies of the Government for the purpose of raising additional revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7712. A bill to provide nonquota immigration status for legally adopted children of United States citizens and for children coming to the United States for legal adoption by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 7713. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to engage in research and experimentation with respect to gas and dust hazards in manufacturing plants; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 7714. A bill to authorize the General Services Administrator to design and construct a new Federal office building at Chicago, Ill., on land now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 7715. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 7716. A bill to protect the security of the United States by permitting for a limited period the summary termination of employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 7717. A bill to give effect to the Medical Examination (Seafarers) Convention, 1946, adopted at the twenty-eighth (maritime) session of the International Labor Organization, held at Seattle, Wash., June 6-29, 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 7718. A bill to give effect to the Food and Catering (Ships' Crews) Convention, 1946, adopted at the twenty-eighth (maritime) session of the International Labor Or-

ganization, held at Seattle, Wash., June 6-29, 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 7719. A bill to give effect to the Certification of Ships' Cooks Convention, 1946, adopted at the twenty-eighth (maritime) session of the International Labor Organization, held at Seattle, Wash., June 6-29, 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 7720. A bill to provide for the construction of post-office buildings in local communities where the residents purchase bonds in an amount sufficient to finance the construction cost, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 7721. A bill to reestablish a Civilian Conservation Corps; to provide for the conservation of natural resources and the development of human resources through the employment of youthful citizens in the performance of useful work, including job training and instruction in good work habits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 7722. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation, as a part of the National Capital Parks system, the Old Stone House in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 7723. A bill to increase permanently the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 7724. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, as amended, to provide that no payments thereunder shall be made prior to audit by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 439. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the power of Congress to impose income taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. Res. 512. Resolution rejecting Reorganization Plan No. 12 of 1950; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 7725. A bill for the relief of Mr. Attilio Cantoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7726. A bill for the relief of Sisters M. Crocifissa, M. Reginalda, and M. Leonida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 7727. A bill for the relief of Dorrance Ulvin and Guy F. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7728. A bill for the relief of Lyon F. Hibberd and the estate of George T. Erb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 7729. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie M. Gardner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF (by request):

H. R. 7730. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ludwig A. Sternberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 7731. A bill for the relief of the Morgan Foods Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 7732. A bill for the relief of Warren C. Baggett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 7733. A bill for the relief of Sisters Rita Pinto de Carvalho, Maria Leite da Silva, Carmelinda Lopes de Aguiar, Maria Adozinda da Fonseca Melo, Joaquina de Jesus, and Maria Luisa Pinto Carvalho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 7734. A bill for the relief of James Carroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 7735. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant to the Southern California Edison Co. an easement and right-of-way for electric transmission line purposes in the Santa Fe flood-control basin and the San Gabriel River improvement, California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 7736. A bill for the relief of Hans Hauser; 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:

1991. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of Local No. 60 UAW-CIO, Racine, Wis., supporting and urging the adoption of H. R. 1380, the labor extension bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1992. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Nettie R. Austin and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 8, 1950)

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, once more a new day with its golden hours lies before us. We are grateful for a laboring place in thy vineyard.

In work that keeps faith sweet and strong Thou callest us to be fellow laborers with Thee.

In the midst of crushing cares and frenzied fears which characterize these troubled days, may the healing balm of Thy presence restore our jaded souls. Forgive the petulance of our impatience which is revealed in our discouragements, in our hasty judgments, in our childish outbursts, because the kingdom of love and justice and peace seems so long delayed. Strengthen us to play our part in the life of our times, to think clearly, to speak kindly, to act bravely, to walk in the light as Thou art in the light, to keep the faith, and at last to finish our course with the well done of the Master of all good workmen. We ask in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal

of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 15, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4703) relating to the internal security of the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor Management Relations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week and next week.

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLANDERS was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Alken	Hill	Maybank
Anderson	Hoey	Mullikin
Benton	Holland	Mundt
Brewster	Humphrey	Murray
Bricker	Ives	Myers
Bridges	Jenner	Neely
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Connally	Kerr	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dworschak	Lehman	Sparkman
Eaton	Lodge	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	Lucas	Taylor
Flanders	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
George	McClellan	Thye
Gillette	McFarland	Tobey
Graham	McKellar	Tydings
Green	McMahon	Watkins
Gurney	Magnuson	Wherry
Hayden	Malone	Wiley
Hendrickson	Martin	Williams
Hickenlooper		Withers

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LEAHY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DARBY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

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

REMOVAL OF SLUDGE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2205) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for the removal of sludge, which was, on line 9, strike out "with or without competitive bidding."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF CRIME AND CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, many leading citizens of Greater Miami, Fla., have organized the Crime Commission of Greater Miami and have given greatly of their time and money in an effort toward the elimination of crime in that section of the country. The committee, under the presidency of Jack R. Younger and under the supervision of Daniel P. Sullivan, operating director, has done much in the interest of law enforcement. The directors of the commission at its meeting on March 9, 1950, adopted a resolution in support of Senate Resolution 202, to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate to investigate organized crime. I submit for appropriate reference the resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Crime Commission of Greater Miami, Fla., and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, United States Senator from Tennessee, has taken vigorous steps resulting in the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate providing for a fund to be used for the purpose of investigating crime and criminal activities in the United States; and