Itley O. Fowler, Royal City, Va., in place of I. O. Fowler, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Daniel G. Donovan, Monroe, Wash., in place of T. P. Hickman, resigned.

William R. Allhands, Sedro Woolley, Wash., in place of Paul Rhodius, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Benjamin L. Frye, Wardensville, W. Va., in place of M. W. Orndorff, retired.

Robert J. Stoetzer, Wellsburg, W. Va., in place of J. V. Emig, retired.

Robert W. Curry, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., in place of S. J. Richter, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Robert C. Davenport, Okauchee, Wis., in place of M. O. Bartelme, retired.

Fred J. French, Prescott, Wis., in place of William Murray, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 30, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, daily Thou art revealing Thy greatness and Thy goodness. Grant that in these revelations we may see more clearly that Thou art able and willing to give us all that Thou hast promised and confer upon us everything we need.

May we never yield to that devastating mood of fatalism and defeatism which makes us feel that our faith is vain and that all our plans and efforts to build a nobler civilization will be futile.

We pray that we may be loyal coworkers with Thee and with one another. Inspire us with clear vision and undaunted courage. Give us a faith which casts out fear and a hope which defies despair.

To Thy name, through Christ our Lord, we give all the praise. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4029. An act to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes.

DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

Mr. VINSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 4071) to provide allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services, to suspend certain provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House today. I ask unanimous consent that that special order be transferred over until tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Friday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

GENERAL MACARTHUR

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the haste with which President Truman apologized to General MacArthur proves that the President was wrong when he ordered MacArthur to withdraw his letter to the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The almost unanimous approval which the American people are giving to General MacArthur's action prove that he was absolutely right in every respect.

Mr. Speaker, when? Oh when is the President going to be strong enough to rid himself and the country of Dean Acheson and his tribe? Everybody even a wayfaring man knows that Acheson's foreign policy whatever it may be has brought us into a bloody war. This war has potentialties that have brought terrific unrest to our people everywhere. It threatens the foundations of the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that political advantage is the measuring rule that the President and all of his White House cohorts apply to their every action.

It should not require a national election to convince them of their folly. Many American boys will die on the battlefield in the meantime.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WILSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

WHO GETS US INTO WARS?

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, last night a Democrat from another body opened his political campaign in Maryland by making a great plea to the people to elect him again and stated that the Republicans are isolationists, that they were against aid to Korea, that they were for cutting off aid to Greece and Turkey, and they were against the North Atlantic Pact and also China.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman knows the rules. He should not refer to Members of the other body.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair is just saying to the gentleman to proceed in order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that when we got into World War I the President of that day was elected on the plea that he would keep us out of war. The Democrats got us into World War I. When we got into World War II the President at that time said:

I promise you mothers again and again and again your sons will not fight on foreign soil.

Who got us into World War II? A Democrat. Who is responsible for getting us into the Korean war? Nobody but the President of the United States—a Democrat. Congress had no say in it whatever. With the war record of the Democrats in the past 35 years is it not dishonest to say the Republicans are responsible for this war record of the Democratic Party. I say it is dishonest, dishonorable, and an untruth of the greatest magnitude. Are you satisfied with the aid given to Russia by Uncle Sam to the tune of over $12,500,000,000 in lend-lease? Are you satisfied with the two and one-half billion of American dollars you gave to China, besides the American lives lost in delivering the goods to China? Are you satisfied with the great national debt of $260,000,000,000 created by the inability of the Democrats to run the country economically? Are you satisfied with the Democratic high taxes? Are you satisfied with the Democratic high prices? Are you satisfied with Democratic waste and extravagance? If you are satisfied with this bad situation then give the Democrats credit. Are you satisfied to have your sons killed in Korea? For what? If you want to get out of war and keep out of war beware of New Deal, Fair Deal, "raw-deal" Democrats. Americans, a word to the wise is sufficient.

THE LATE CHARLES G. BINDERUP

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.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House the death of a former Member of this body, the Honorable Charles G. Binderup, who served with distinction in the Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses.

Mr. Binderup was elected on the Democratic ticket from the then Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska.

Charles G. Binderup was born in Horsens, Denmark, March 5, 1873. He came

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

to America as a child of 6 months. His parents settled in Nebraska. Mr. Binderup was a life-long resident of my hometown, Minden, Nebr. He engaged in business in Minden for many, many years. He was extremely well-known and had many friends.

Mr. Charles G. Binderup was an energetic citizen, a good speaker, and was intensely interested in the economy and politics of the country. As a Member of Congress, he was widely known for his work in connection with our monetary system. He gave special attention to all the problems of agriculture and actively and successfully promoted the expansion of irrigation.

Mr. Binderup died at Minden, August 19, 1950, at the age of 77.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for every Member who served here with Mr. Binderup in expressing our sorrow at his passing. We extend to his wife and daughters our deepest sympathy.

MRS. HENRY DOORLEY

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. 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.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in his remarks, yesterday, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] listed as a member of the advisory board of the Committee for Constitutional Government the name of Mrs. Henry Doorley, wife of the editor of the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald. For the benefit of the Members of the House I would like to further identify this estimable lady. Mrs. Henry Doorley is the daughter of the late, great Senator from Nebraska, the Honorable Gilbert M. Hitchcock, who served the Democratic Party long and brilliantly in both Houses of Congress. Need I remind the Members that Senator Hitchcock was the author of the party platform on which Franklin Roosevelt was elected in 1932 but which, after he was inaugurated, he immediately threw into the ashcan. He led the fight for the Federal Reserve Bank and other forward looking legislation in the administration of Woodrow Wilson. The capture of his beloved party by the New Deal was a bitter disappointment to him. Since his passing his daughter has striven mightily to carry out his ideals and his passion for constitutional government.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 9176.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE AMBROSE J. KENNEDY

Mr. SASSCER. 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 Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of the death of a former colleague with whom many of the now sitting Members served in this body. Day before yesterday the Honorable Ambrose J. Kennedy, a former Member of this House from Maryland, died of a cerebral hemorrhage. All who knew Mr. Kennedy were saddened by his passing. He was an outstanding figure for years in Maryland life and in Maryland politics. I had the privilege of serving in the Maryland Senate with him some years ago. He served there with fidelity and ability. He later served as parole commissioner of Maryland and was a member of the city council of his home city. He came here with a background of valuable experience. While in this body he was chairman of the Committee on Claims, and the ranking member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. Mr. Kennedy was a forceful, able Member of the House; a man of keen intellect. He had a keen intellect and genial personality and commanded the affection and esteem of his fellow Members. His passing will be a distinct loss to his State and to the Nation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SASSCER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with my friend in his expression of sorrow in the passing of Mr. Kennedy. He was one of the most striking personalities that I ever met. Everyone who served with him will remember not only his outstanding ability and his devotion to duty, but also that beaming friendship and that open countenance and that fine mind that he entertained for everyone. I join with the gentlemen in expressing to Mrs. Kennedy and the loved ones he left behind my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. SASSCER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of my very good friend, Ambrose J. Kennedy, has brought me deep sorrow. I know Ambrose Kennedy and members of his family intimately, although I did not have the privilege, as some of you had, of serving with him. But I did have the honor of being one of his constituents. He was known throughout his district as a man of courage and great ability. He was devoted to the interest and betterment of the people he represented and possessed a most unusual knowledge and grasp of the problems of his congressional district and State.

He was not only a friend and an outstanding Representative to his constituents but served also in a national capacity in Congress. He assumed his first public office when he became a member of the city council and in 1926 was elected to the State senate. While a member of the senate, he was appointed parole commissioner by Governor Ritchie. In 1932, he became a Member of Congress and was returned to the House of Representatives in 1934, 1936, and 1938. He was ranking member of the District of Columbia Committee and could have been chairman but gave up the chairmanship to retain the chairmanship of the Claims Committee. He was an advocate of improved municipal government for Washington. He became known as a real friend of the District, and was instrumental in putting through legislation which gave the District employees a holiday each Saturday. During the Seventy-fifth and Seventy-sixth Congresses, he was chairman of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the House District Committee and in that capacity, handled all of the tax bills. He successfully put through legislation giving sabbatical leave to all the teachers in the District of Columbia.

He had the admiration and respect of all who knew him and, particularly, the Members of Congress from Maryland who were so intimately associated with him. His sudden passing at the early age of 56 has ended a very useful and worth-while career. The Nation has lost an exponent of those principles of sound government which must be preserved if our democracy is to survive. I shall miss Ambrose Kennedy for I had great confidence in him and great respect for his opinion.

I am sure that the Members of the House join with me in expressing my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kennedy, to her children, and to his relatives and many friends.

THE LATE EARL CADDOCK

Mr. JENSEN. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed and beloved friend, Earl Caddock, has gone to his reward. Earl Caddock was a gentleman of the highest order, a good husband and father, and loyal friend. Earl Caddock was not only a former champion wrestler of the world; he was the ideal of many American boys, for he lived as clean as he wrestled. He was not only a champion wrestler, but he was a champion of fair play and of our Christian religion. I knew him well and admired him for all his fine qualities. He served his country with honor and credit in World War I. I grieve with his good wife and family and a great multitude of friends in Iowa and all over America. God rest his soul.

WAR

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have before me what I think is the picture of the year. It shows a portion of that famous Alexandria Light Infantry marching off to war again. The title of the picture, which appeared in the Times-Herald this morning, says "Daddy's little girl does not want him

to say good-by," and this big staff sergeant is carrying his daughter in the line of march.

I was deeply touched by this picture because it seemed to me to be evidence of the fact that all of us are groping for an answer to this question of war. We know that history is not on our side when we prepare and build up great armies. War has never been the answer. War never brings peace. Think of it, these young men marching off to war a second time in less than 10 years. Bungled foreign policy by an inept Democratic administration is responsible.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the time has not come for us to spend more time on our knees looking to the Master for leadership and direction. Prayer could be the way to a just and lasting peace if we sincerely believe it. Let us try.

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

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCARTHY. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. RANKIN. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

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

DISPOSING OF GOVERNMENT LOTS IN ST. MARKS, FLA.

Mr. PETERSON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8028) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the remaining Government lots in the town site of St. Marks, Fla.

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. PETERSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7302) to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes:

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. 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. 260]

Angell	Kearney	Powell
Barden	Kee	Quinn
Barrett, Wyo.	Keefe	Rabaut
Blackney	Klein	Regan
Bolton, Ohio	Larcade	Rivers
Buckley, N. Y.	Latham	Roosevelt
Bulwinkle	McCulloch	Sabath
Cooley	McMillen, Ill.	Sadowski
Crook	Macy	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Davenport	Martin, Iowa	Shelley
Davies, N. Y.	Mason	Sikes
Davis, Wis.	Miller, Calif.	Smathers
Dawson	Morgan	Smith, Kans.
Dingell	Morrison	Smith, Ohio
Durham	Moulder	Whitaker
Engel, Mich.	Murdock	Wier
Gamble	Murray, Wis.	Williams
Gillette	Nixon	Winstead
Gore	Norton	Withrow
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Konski	Yates
Hart	Pace	
Hébert	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	
Hoffman, Mich.	Pfeiffer, William L.	
Holifield	Phillips, Tenn.	
Johnson		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 360 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SASSCER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include a resolution.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times entitled "That Children May Live."

Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. STOCKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article appearing in the Brooks-Scanlon Pine Echoes.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter written to a constituent.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter he received and his reply thereto.

Mr. HERLONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech by his colleague, Mr. GEORGE SMATHERS.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include a resolution by the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therewith a resolution.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an interview with Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as carried in the United States News and World Report under date of August 11, 1950. It may slightly exceed the rule with reference to the length of such extensions of remarks, but I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding, the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

REGISTRATION, CLASSIFICATION, AND INDUCTION OF CERTAIN MEDICAL, DENTAL, AND ALLIED SPECIALISTS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9554) to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9554, with Mr. HARDY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to announce to the Committee that when the House concludes the consideration of this bill H. R. 9554, and after it has been passed by the House, I will ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a companion bill, S. 4029, and offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the provisions of the House bill as perfected and passed by the House.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has the support of the Department of Defense. As a matter of fact, it is what you would call a department bill. It has the approval of the American Medical Association. It has the approval of the Dental Association. And if the committee will bear with me, I think I can give you the salient points in this bill so that each and every one of you can understand what the objectives and purposes of the bill are.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. It also has the approval of the osteopaths and others in the so-called allied professions?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, the Army, Navy, and Air Force have a pool of 30,000 physicians and 12,000 dentists in their Reserve components who can be called to active duty.

The problem here is to provide a fair and orderly system of priorities under which medical, dental, and related personnel will enter military service.

It is in the best American tradition of fair play that those who have rendered little or no service, and who are otherwise qualified, should be the first to serve. There are a number of doctors and dentists who have given no service at any time. On the other hand, the vast majority of doctors and dentists now on the Reserve rolls have already served their country faithfully and with distinction.

In an endeavor to furnish a more satisfactory solution to the problem, the bill now under consideration was introduced, which proposes to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 in this regard.

The bill authorizes the President to require the special registration of all male medical, dental, and allied specialist categories under the age of 45. It authorizes the induction of qualified individuals from this group and makes them liable for military service for a period not to exceed 21 months.

Those who are members of the Reserve components would be exempted from such induction and registration. However, this provision does not affect the authority of the President to call members and units of the Reserve components to active duty under the provisions of other laws.

During World War II, Congress established what was known as the Army specialized training program and the Navy V-12 training program. These programs were established to meet the critical need for professional men in the armed services.

The trainees under each of these programs were enlisted in the Army or the Navy and paid $50 per month. All of the expenses connected with this training, such as tuition, books, rooms, food, laboratory fees, and so forth, were paid by the Government. Of course, each trainee was deferred from active duty while he was undergoing such training.

The Army had some 20,000 individuals enrolled in its ASTP doctor program. Twelve thousand and five hundred of these entered on active duty, and 1,000 were discharged for physical or other reasons. This left 6,500 who were enrolled as students at Government expense and paid by the Government who never served on active duty. The program was stopped at the end of hostilities so that not all of those 6,500 in the program finished their education at Government expense. Two thousand of these did not graduate from the course because they failed scholastically or for other reasons. However, 4,500 did complete their studies. Of these 4,500, the Surgeon General of the Army estimates that approximately 1,500 would not now be suited for active duty due to physical or other disqualifying factors. That leaves us with about 3,000 men who were trained fully or partially under the ASTP program who are now eligible for active duty as doctors.

Some 7,734 persons were likewise enrolled in the ASTP program for the study of dentistry. Of this number, 1,984 served on active duty, and 474 were discharged upon graduation because of physical disability or other reasons.

Some 5,276 received partial training at Government expense and of this number, 4,651 were discharged from the program but continued to study for their degrees. Some of these served in the Army, others failed their examinations, and others are not physically qualified. It is estimated that approximately 2,500 dentists will be subject to induction under the provisions of this bill, who were deferred from military service during World War II and who received a portion of their training at Government expense.

In the Navy V-12 doctor program, 11,176 persons were trained wholly or in part at Government expense. Five thousand, eight hundred and seventy-two have already served at least 2 years in the Navy, leaving 5,304 without service. Of these 1,429 are presently in the Naval Reserve and are now subject to call to active duty.

This leaves 3,875 who were enrolled in the program. One thousand, two hundred and sixty-two of these did not complete their studies because of physical or scholastic reasons. There are now, at the most, some 2,613 individuals who have completed their studies as doctors who would be subject to induction under the provisions of this Act.

In the V-12 dental program, 3,185 participated, of whom 2,164 served on active duty, leaving 1,021 who have not served on active duty. Of this number, 122 are now in the Dental Corps Reserve and subject to call. Of the remaining 899 who were separated without service, 397 were separated for academic, physical or other reasons, leaving 502 who would be subject to induction under the provisions of this bill, assuming they can pass the physical requirements.

Now, these doctors and dentists, if they had less than 90 days of active duty, are the first who will be subject to induction under the provisions of the proposed legislation, along with other doctors and dentists who were not trained at Government expense, but who, nevertheless, were deferred, throughout the war, from military service.. It is only proper that the first to be called, if induction is necessary, are those who received part or all of their training at Government expense, together with those deferred from service because of their professional studies.

The second group to be eligible for induction are those persons who participated as students in the ASTP or V-12 programs, and those who were deferred from military service while completing their studies who served more than 90 days, but less than 21 months in the armed services.

The third group are those who did not have active service during World War II, but who were not trained at Government expense, nor deferred because of being medical or dental students.

The fourth group include all doctors and dentists under the age of 46 who are not in the Reserve, and not included in the previous groups mentioned, but have had active service in the Armed Forces since 1940 in excess of 21 months. These people, should it become necessary, will be taken in the reverse order of their length of active service.

Now, how many doctors and dentists will we need? The Department of Defense has advised us that there were, as of July 1, 1950, 6,226 doctors in the armed services, or an average of 3.5 doctors per 1,000 men. On the basis of increased combat needs which will increase the ratio to 4.5 doctors per 1,000 men, and on the basis of an armed strength of 2,500,000 men, we were advised that the armed services will require 11,250 doctors, or approximately 5,000 more doctors than are now on active duty.

There are at present 2,358 dentists on active duty, on the basis of 2 dentists per 1,000 men—and while the ratio of dentists to armed strength will not be increased, it is estimated that a total requirement of 5,000 dentists will be needed for 2,500,000 men. Thus, the armed services will need approximately 2,650 more dentists.

Therefore, it is apparent that most of the medical and dental personnel required for the armed services can be substantially provided from the pool of those who were either trained wholly or in part at Government expense, or who were deferred from active service because of the pursuit of such training, at their own expense.

It is felt to be in the public interest to provide for the deferment of certain individuals essential to the national interest and for other compelling reasons. Accordingly, the bill authorizes the President to establish rules and regulations governing such deferment.

To insure an adequate flow of new physicians, dentists, and allied specialists to meet the Nation's needs in the future, the bill provides for the annual deferment of premedical and predental students in a number at least equal to the present level of such male students.

As a means of coordinating this whole program with the professions concerned at National, State, and local levels, and to insure that the Director of the Selective Service System has the benefit of advice from outstanding authorities, a National Advisory Committee would be established. The members would be selected from outstanding individuals in medicine, dentistry, and allied sciences.

Under the present provisions of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, the Career Compensation Act, physicians and dentists who volunteer for active duty with the Armed Forces or the United States Public Health Service receive an additional $100 a month. Because of the wording of this legislation the Reserve officers and National Guard officers receiving orders to accompany their units on active duty are not eligible to receive the additional pay. This is indeed unjust. The bill, therefore, has been amended so as to permit these officers to qualify for such additional benefits, but persons inducted under the au-

thority of the proposed legislation will not be entitled to the extra pay.

In order that the talent available to the Armed Forces in the fields of medicine, dentistry, and the allied sciences may be distributed efficiently among the three military services, the Secretary of Defense may now detail such personnel between the three services as required. Officers so detailed often desire to further their careers in the service to which detailed. The bill, therefore, authorizes the Secretary of Defense to effect these transfers under the following conditions: The individual officer must request the transfer himself; both the service from which he is to be transferred, and the service he is to enter must concur. Provisions are made for protecting the promotion, seniority, retirement, and leave rights and benefits of officers who are transferred under this authority.

I think that all Members of the House will agree that the comprehensive treatment which the bill gives to this important subject furnishes a satisfactory basis upon which the Congress can enact sound legislation.

To sum up, we now have 6,226 doctors and 3,358 dentists on active duty in the armed services. By July 1, 1951, we will need a total of 11,250 doctors, and 5,000 dentists.

Thus, it is our belief that this legislation will provide the means by which the armed services will obtain 5,000 more doctors, and 2,650 more dentists.

The proposed legislation will expire on July 9, 1951—on the date the present Selective Service Act expires. Before that date, the Committee on Armed Services will review the entire Draft Act, as well as the proposed legislation.

We believe we have prepared and presented to the House a fair and equitable solution to a very difficult problem. I sincerely hope the House will enact this legislation speedily.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Would the distinguished chairman point out why 2,000 of them failed?

Mr. VINSON. I am unable to say for all of them.

Mr. SHORT. Due to physical disability and academic requirements.

Mr. VINSON. That is right, many of them due to physical disability.

Mr. DONDERO. Has any attempt been made to determine whether or not doctors and dentists could be obtained by voluntary enlistment without the necessity of drafting?

Mr. VINSON. I stated at the very outset of my remarks that there were some 30,000 physicians and 12,000 dentists in the Reserve components. The very purpose of this bill is to deal fairly with these professional people. The purpose of the bill is to distribute the requirements so that those who are in the Reserve components will not have to bear all the burden, in view of the fact that we have a large number who were educated and deferred at Government expense who have rendered no service whatsoever.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. I believe the record will show that of these 3,000 who were thus educated but who have rendered no service, individual letters were sent to all of them asking if they would volunteer their services with the result that only about 150 came into the armed services.

Mr. DONDERO. That was the information I desired.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I find there is some misgiving in the minds of some Members as to the justice of picking out a certain class or a certain group of professional men to be taken in. I have received many letters from my boys, and they are just as fine as any to be found anywhere. I am sure the chairman can say a few words of reassurance in the problem they present. It is this: During World War II there were skilled men, many specialists who were confined to merely routine desk jobs. They want to feel sure that if these men are taken in that their skill in their profession will be used and that their time will not be wasted warming a chair. Was that question gone into?

Mr. VINSON. That was discussed yesterday, and we had the assurance of the medical corps heads that when they call doctors they are going to be used for their professional qualifications.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am glad to have that assurance.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I am very happy that the gentleman from Kansas asked that question, because we all know there were grave abuses in the last world war. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], chairman of the subcommittee, found a lot of doctors sitting out in the desert doing nothing when we had an acute shortage of them back home. They were doing housekeeping work, administrative work, and so forth. We have been assured that that mistake will not be repeated.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This system will be very much better, will it not, insofar as the Veterans' Administration is concerned? Because a very great many of the doctors in the Veterans' Administration are Reserve doctors and might be taken into the service. And I think you are also working out a system whereby veterans' hospitals can be utilized and there will be no interference with the work there.

Mr. VINSON. Let me impress this upon the membership. One of the factors I emphasized at the very outset is to provide a fair and orderly system of priorities under which medical, dental, and related personnel will enter the military service. We have, as I pointed out, a large reservoir of reservists, but we want to deal fairly with them, to distribute this obligation and to see that those whom the Government has educated contribute something for the education that the Government gave them, in addition to their deferment.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for two questions.

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. First, will this bill actually give a priority on drafting these ASTP students over men who have had some service, say just under 21 months?

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will read the bill, we set up the priority, and these ASTP are the first ones.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The first ones to be called.

Mr. VINSON. They are the first ones to be called.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Why did you fix 21 months' service?

Mr. VINSON. Because that is the service requirement in the draft act.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I am speaking about the 21 months as applying as an exemption to those who had served under 21 months in World War II.

Mr. VINSON. The whole thing is tied in with the system of the draft, which is 21 months for the armed services.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. There was some exclusion if they had served, as I understand if a doctor had served 21 months during World War II, am I correct on that?

Mr. VINSON. If a boy has had over 21 months he falls in the fourth category, or he would probably be a Reserve officer and, of course, that is taken into consideration if he is called to active duty.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. If he had served just under 21 months he would be next in order in the category of the ASTP priority; is that right?

Mr. VINSON. If you will read the bill——

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I have read the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Then the gentleman saw that one who serves between 90 days and 21 months is in the second category.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I note that on page 2 the date August 16 for membership in the Reserve components is stricken out. Officers in the Reserve are apparently omitted from the provisions of the bill. It would appear to me that all of those ASTP and V-12 personnel could by seeking commissions evade the provisions of this bill unless the Armed Forces by regulation provided they are going to treat all the medical men equitably, whether they are officers or whether they are draftees. What about that?

Mr. VINSON. Let me say that we are hoping when this bill passes it will not be necessary to draft any doctors. We hope they will volunteer and join the reserves. We say to you, "If you do volunteer and join the Reserves then you get the extra pay of $100" which the

Career Compensation Act gives to doctors.

Mr. VORYS. Then the committee has not solved one problem and that is to set up some equitable way of calling to active duty officers in the Reserve components?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, we have. We have set it up in the priorities fixed in the bill. That is the order in which they will be called. Of course, it is true that a great many doctors have been ordered to date in the Reserve. There are a great many in the Navy. When this bill becomes law and they go to administering it, they may well have enough volunteers joining from those liable to induction from the ASTP and V-12 programs to enable the departments to give deferments to those doctors who have been ordered to active duty up to date.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. The departments have stated to us in committee that it will be their policy to so administer this law as to relieve the pressure on the Reserve doctor who has heretofore seen service during the war?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

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

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

Mr. ELSTON. I think it should be pointed out that the passage of this act makes it possible for the service to call up the draftees first?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. ELSTON. At the same time, if the services want to do so they can call the Reserve officers, regardless of the provisions of this act?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; under another provision of law. The Departments have assured the committee they are going to try to carry out the intent of the Congress that the law benefit the Reservists who have been ordered to active duty.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. If a young man was not educated under either one of the Army or Navy specialized schooling acts and went into the Regular Army and later on was discharged and attended medical school under the GI bill of rights, where would he come?

Mr. VINSON. He falls in the fourth category. It is in the bill where he would fall.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. What happens to a man who served in active service in the Infantry for 2 years, then was transferred to a medical-training unit, and for 2 years served in that ASTP unit?

Mr. VINSON. Then becomes a doctor?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. He has not rendered any service in his capacity as a doctor. He falls in class No. 2.

Mr. JUDD. It says on page 4, under "Fourth priority":

> Those not included in the first and second priority who have had active service in the Army.

That does not mean service only as a medical officer, does it? It means any kind of service?

Mr. VINSON. While we had reference to medical service, it is possible that it could include all types of active service.

Mr. JUDD. The language is ambiguous then. It ought to be spelled out better if it includes other active service than as a medical officer.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman. I think the proper construction is that it includes all service subsequent to stated periods.

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

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

Mr. BONNER. I was interested in that part of the gentleman's explanation dealing with Reserve officers who had lengthy service during World War II, and this bill relieving the pressure on them.

Mr. VINSON. It enlarges the over-all pool from which these doctors can be ordered to active duty, and thus it is bound to have its effect on those reserves with long service.

Mr. BONNER. Those officers whom the gentleman mentioned as already having been called up, who can show that their being called into service brings about a hardship on themselves and the community in which they serve, will they then be deferred or relieved from duty even though they have been called when this bill begins to function?

Mr. VINSON. The department is going to try to interpret this bill so that it will be carried out like it is written. Of course, strictly speaking, every one of these Reservists could be made to serve who received orders to serve to date; but in administering this they are going to try to grant deferments, if it is possible to do so, to those who have already actually received a notice to report, and let those who contributed nothing be called instead.

Mr. BONNER. It would be possible for a Reserve officer who has been called to ask for deferment until they begin to function under this?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, he could ask for deferment.

Mr. BONNER. The department would be expected to grant that deferment?

Mr. VINSON. The department could grant it.

Mr. BONNER. The department would be expected under this bill to grant it?

Mr. VINSON. I would not say they would be expected to, but they would at least be required to give consideration to it.

Mr. BONNER. In cases where hardship can be shown.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

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

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

Mr. COLMER. Right along that line of discussion with the gentleman from North Carolina, reference was made to those Reserve officers with long service. What about Reserve officers with not-so-long service?

Mr. VINSON. The bill does not apply to reservists, as such.

Mr. COLMER. Do I understand from that that a Reserve medical officer with less than 21 months actual service could be subject to call under the draft rather than under his reserve status?

Mr. VINSON. No. We are not calling up under this law those in the Reserve. We call them up under another provision of law.

Mr. COLMER. Active or inactive?

Mr. VINSON. Active or inactive. They are not called up and they do not have to register.

Mr. COLMER. I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice on page 5 that the President shall establish a national advisory committee, which goes on down to the States.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Do I understand that in the selection of these physicians—and you do not expect to get enough physicians from this V-12 or ASTP program to supply the needs of the military—that the State Advisory Board will indicate what physicians should go within that particular State?

Mr. VINSON. We discussed that fully in the committee, and it is hoped it can be worked out along the same line as during World War II.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That was a good program.

Mr. VINSON. Certainly. Therefore the House can understand that the National Advisory Committee is set up to consult and aid in the administration of this law and to take into consideration the civilian needs of every community.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. One further question. I think the committee has done a good job in bringing this bill out. I am in favor of it.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would like to ask this question: Did the committee make any further survey of the number of physicians with 4.5 to each 1,000 of men in peacetime here at home that the Army presently requires?

Mr. VINSON. It is 3.5 in peacetime, and they feel their military needs will have to go to 4.5 now.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman understands that in the military we have strong, healthy men, and for civilian practice in the States they average about one physician to 500 people; old men and people who are sick. There is a waste of manpower in the military that ought to be corrected. I called attention to that many times in the past, and I still say and maintain and can prove that the military wastes medical and professional manpower to an extent that is a disgrace to the service.

Mr. VINSON. No doubt there is some justification for the gentleman's statement; but you must bear in mind that we are at war in Korea, and your casualty lists run high.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Four and five-tenths doctors is not enough then.

Mr. VINSON. You must bear in mind there will be 2,500,000 men under arms, and you must bear in mind that the civilian dependents of the armed forces also have some call on these doctors. In normal times we say there should be 3.5 per 1,000. When war comes we think we are justified in the manpower use going up to 4.5, and in the dentists we take 2 dentists per 1,000 men.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the field of action 4.5 per 1,000 is not enough.

Mr. VINSON. I grant you that that is the very reason for this National Advisory Committee. We want to get what we need, but we do not want to have more just to waste manpower.

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

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

Mr. CAVALCANTE. With reference to the shortage of doctors in the United States, I wish to make this observation to the distinguished gentlemen of this committee, that despite the fact that the population of the United States has increased approximately 20,000,000 people since 1940, the number of medical students admitted to medical schools and graduated in the United States was less in 1949 than in 1939. I have those statistics and they are available. That poses a very serious situation and shows the obvious necessity for adopting legislation such as is before us today.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. I would like to congratulate the gentleman upon the many helpful answers that he has given and just to say this, in connection with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Cavalcante, has said: I believe we have the same number of doctors in the United States today that we had when we had a population of 73,000,000 people.

Mr. VINSON. Well, as I have stated, we have, in the United States, today 201,000 medical doctors. That is the whole population.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the gentleman this question, as to those who come in the fourth category on page 4? Does the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services anticipate that those who in class 4 will be called up, or does the gentleman think that those in the first three categories will be sufficient to meet our needs for some time?

Mr. VINSON. They may possibly come from class 4, but the bulk of them will come out of the other classes.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Of the 29,000 doctors who are in Reserve components, are all of them receiving compensation as Reserve officers?

Mr. VINSON. No. Some are on inactive status, and some on active.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman does not have a breakdown as to how many in each category?

Mr. VINSON. I do not.

Mr. JUDD. Those who have been receiving compensation, I think should be called first; is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. Of course they will.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. REES. As I understand this, the National Advisory Council will function only with respect to those who have not yet joined the Armed Forces?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. It will not have anything to do with one who joins the Reserves.

Mr. REES. But after the doctor is in the service, the advice of this Board will not apply?

Mr. VINSON. It will have something to do with all the medical men who are coming in either through the draft or through the Reserve, because there will be a hesitancy on the part of the draft board to draft, if the Reserves in a particular community all had been called to the service.

Mr. REES. But after a doctor has been called into the service, then will this board have any authority to act with respect to his being released?

Mr. VINSON. No, they will have nothing to do with it because he is controlled by the military and he will have to make his peace with the military.

Mr. REES. And the advice of this board will not be in effect?

Mr. VINSON. No; he is in the service.

Mr. REES. This legislation of course comes at a time after a number of doctors have gone into the service. I have in mind a doctor who has just gone into the service, who has several dependents and has requested that he not be called because of dependents and for other reasons. This legislation is not going to affect him at all, is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. It will affect him in this way: If they get enough men and this man who is in the Reserve and has rendered service of at least 21 months or longer in a previous war, they might say, "We can afford to defer you or grant you a furlough now because we have somebody to take your place." But that is a question which addresses itself to the military.

Mr. REES. In other words there is nothing in this legislation to affect that problem?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I think the answers that the gentleman has given pretty well answer the question I had in mind. I commend the gentleman and his fine committee for bringing out this legislation. I think it is very much needed.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Why should they require 4.5 doctors per thousand men?

Mr. VINSON. Because the people who administer the law and who have charge of the health of the armed services estimate that is what they need. I do not know whether it is right or wrong, and I do not think any of us is in a position to say it is too high or too low. All we want to do is to see that every man that is brought into the medical service performs the duties for which he is brought in, and that the medical force of the armed services is not overstaffed.

Mr. JUDD. Of course there probably are a few days during and following a battle when some such proportion is needed, but the great bulk of the time fewer doctors are needed than in civilian life. They do not have women to treat, they do not have old people, and they do not have children to care for, which is most of a civilian doctor's work.

Mr. VINSON. I will have to say to the gentleman that I do not know whether four and a half is right or three and a half is right, but I have to rely on the people that we charge with the health of the Armed Forces.

Mr. JUDD. It is just about three times as many doctors per thousand in the Army as among the civilian population.

Mr. VINSON. It is highly incumbent that the health of every man be closely scrutinized, and that he be given the best medical care and attention possible.

Mr. JUDD. There is no doubt about that.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. When a man is injured on the firing line and a doctor is needed, that doctor has to be there. He may not be needed any other time in the week except the one day, but when you need him you must have him there. It is unthinkable that we have men wounded and not have adequate medical care.

Mr. JUDD. That is certainly true. The doctors should be where the men are wounded; but the services usually have too many sitting around here in the United States without adequate work to do.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. It is quite similar to a police department or a fire department. Most members of the fire department sit around the station, but they have to be on tap if a fire breaks out. While I think there have been grave abuses in the past and a lot of wasted manpower, as far as the medical profession is concerned, and I think we did have an improper balance in the last global conflict, nevertheless it is necessary to have these doctors present or in reserve or on tap, just as you must have a police department or a fire department, whether they are working every hour of the day or not.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. That figure, 4.5, is not the average for the continental United States. It is the over-all average for home and abroad. In Korea it will be much higher than 4.5.

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

Mr VINSON. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It has been pointed out on the floor and in the press that very few boys who were trained at Government expense have enlisted or volunteered. Naturally, there has been an inference that there is a lack of patriotism. From the letters which I have received I have gained the impression that it is not a lack of patriotism, but that these young men who were trained want to volunteer, but the only thing they want to be assured of is that others will be used also and that they will not be called upon to bear the burden while others stay home and get the profit. I think that this bill will give them that assurance and that when this bill is passed they will volunteer.

Mr. VINSON. There is no doubt about it. I call attention to an amendment that has been put in by the committee. Every volunteer will get $100 a month more than the pay of the rank that he carries. If they are drafted they do not get that. I do not think many of them will be drafted. I think all of them will join the Reserve, and then they will be called in.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. With reference to legislative draftsmanship and clarification of this bill——

Mr. VINSON. I suggest you address that remark to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], because he is an expert on draftsmanship.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Very well, I will do so.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to follow the gentleman from Georgia, the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee, because he explains everything so clearly, so thoroughly. However, I do want to make a few observations.

If there is an absolute necessity for increasing the number of doctors and dentists in the armed services, no one can deny the propriety of the proposed legislation. The ones in the service must have the best attention possible. However, I do not believe there is any Member of Congress who knows, solely upon his own knowledge, whether there is need at this time for an increase in the number of doctors and dentists. The only thing we can do is to take the word of the military even though frequently their judgment is not the best. They say that it is needed. I subscribe to what the gentleman from New Mexico said; I believe there is no lack of patriotism by any of the doctors or dentists of the country. I believe they are a great deal like most Members of Congress; they are bewildered; they are confused; they do not know whether the plan of this administration is to have an all-out mobilization of all our people or not; they do not know the plans of the military or our State Department.

Most of us are going back to our districts within a few days and we will be asked many questions by our confused and bewildered people. They are going to ask us, for instance: What did the President of the United States mean on June 1, just 24 days before the attack on South Korea, when he said, "The world is closer now to permanent peace than anytime in the last 5 years." The people are going to ask another question: How is it that after $50,000,000,000 has been spent by this Nation for armament we found our boys reduced to fighting on a beachhead because of lack of equipment?

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Since this Congress has not declared war according to the Constitution of the United States, we shall have to assume that whatever war we are in is a war created by the United Nations, and we could account for it to that extent.

As to the facts and figures cited as to the number of doctors the United States asks to enlist and bring in to give our soldiers the comfort and protection to which they are entitled, what does he have to say, or can any Member produce any figures as to the number of doctors that these other 52 nations who belong to the United Nations will produce in connection with this conflict known as a peace action? I am interested in knowing how many doctors they will send.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Illinois made the statement that we had spent $50,000,000,000 in preparation for war. The gentleman knows that in the last 5 years this administration has appropriated $92,500,000,000 for war, and then they try to blame it on the Republicans because they have not got the things the Democrats need now to fight a war. Why, it is a terrible situation coming in here and trying to make people believe that we are responsible for the situations the Democrats find themselves in.

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

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he has anything constructive to offer. This committee was legislating here in a very orderly way with contributions being made from Members on both sides of the aisle. This procedure has been interrupted and politics injected into the debate. I think it is to be regretted that politics should be injected into the debate on this legislation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers lots of criticisms—but does not try to be constructive. I suggest he cease criticizing all the time and offer something constructive.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to let me answer that?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Not at this moment.

I may say that I hope there never comes a time when if mistakes are made attention cannot be called to them without being accused of politics. We should call attention to mistakes in order to benefit by them in the future. If our responsibility as Members of Congress is merely to come in here and acquiesce when we know there are mistakes being made and accept them without any honest criticism I think that it would work to the detriment of the country.

Another thing the people are going to ask you when you go back home is: What is the policy of this administration in regard to China, a nation that fought for 4 years during the last war against Japan our enemy before we got into it. China, a nation that has been our friend for over a century, helping us drive onward for peace.

Another question they are going to ask you is: What is going to happen when our boys drive the Reds north of the thirty-eighth parallel? What will be the policy of the State Department then?

We are going to be asked why the President suppressed the news of General MacArthur when about everyone rightfully believes General MacArthur knows more about the Far East than any American.

Another thing they are going to ask you about is the Un-American Activities Committee and our beloved Republican Senator from Wisconsin, JOE MCCARTHY. They are going to ask you a great deal about that and it is going to be tough for some of you to answer. I know what I am going to say. I am going to say: "I do not know whether Senator MCCARTHY has always used the right tactics. Who is immune from making an occasional mistake? I do not know whether he has used the right vehicles, but I do know" and these are the facts "that since Senator MCCARTHY and our Un-American Activities Committee members started to work Alger Hiss is on the way to the penitentiary, Judith Coplon is on the way to the penitentiary, Dr. Fuchs is out of the country and has been convicted in England, another one of our atomic experts has been indicted, Gubitchev is out of the country, Harry Bridges is on the way to the penitentiary."

So I say to the Members here, when you go back home the people are going to ask you those questions. A few misinformed and misdirected people are attacking Senator MCCARTHY and members of the Un-American Activities Committee, but the fact remains that a lot of people are on the way to the penitentiary. Even our own State Department came in before a congressional committee and said there were 291 fired from the State Department, including 91 that were thrown out for moral reasons.

So I repeat, these are some of the things you are going to have to answer when you go back home. I just received from a constituent an article from London from which I quote the following:

Russia and Communist Poland are among Britain's best customers for machine tools, a study of British trade figures showed today.

The others are Australia, South Africa, and India. In the first 7 months this year, Britain sent machine tools worth $1,208,000 to Russia, and other tools worth $1,277,000 to Poland. More shipments of tools worth $366,000 went to Czechoslovakia. Shipments of machine tools to equip new Russian factories during the first 7 months this year were more than four times those of the same period last year and 15 times those of 2 years ago.

The question is going to be asked why Great Britain, our ally, a country to which we have sent much aid, is sending these special tools over to our communistic enemy in order for them to make tanks and so forth to be used against our boys in South Korea. I could go on indefinitely in regard to some of these questions that many of my friends are going to have to answer, but I think I have said enough so that you may safeguard yourselves when you do get back to your various districts.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to straighten out the RECORD in reference to a question by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. He asked the question if all service was to be counted. Reading section 4, all service would be counted. I answered that it would be just the medical service. All service would be counted under that section.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, there is not a great deal to be added after the explanation of the bill by the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services. I do believe that the bill is in such shape it will do justice as between the various categories affected by the bill.

The fact that this is discriminatory legislation is frankly admitted by the committee. It singles out one profession, and its allied professions, and provides for their induction into the service where others of their own age group are not inducted. I think it should be stated that the American Medical Association and the other associations affected by the bill have endorsed it. They recognize the need for medical service to the extent they are willing to accept this discriminatory legislation in the public interest.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma. In view of the needs of the time, is it the position of our committee that this legislation is proper and will be sustained under the constitutional authority of the Congress to raise and maintain an Army?

Mr. KILDAY. We so believe. While we regard it as being discriminatory, we think it is clearly within the provision of the Constitution which provides that the Congress shall raise and maintain an Army. You cannot maintain an Army without adequate medical personnel. We had similar legislation during the war period. That was gone into rather thoroughly and I for one on the committee contend it is within the provisions of the Constitution.

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

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

Mr. CLEMENTE. As an added inducement, is it not a fact when doctors are called into the armed services they are given at least a first lieutenant's grade?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. I point out the fact that it is discriminatory, because when you come to try to explain the provisions of this bill as other provisions of law may affect other groups, you cannot reason this out on a logical basis, because this is an individual group that is picked out of the population, subjected to special obligations and services, and entitled to certain privileges and advantages.

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

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

Mr. VORYS. Is not it one of the great distinctions then that they sought and obtained deferment from combat service?

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, that is in the bill. The least that they received is deferment from combat service; others received far more than that. They received all the compensation received by the combat soldier, but in addition they received their education for the most expensive profession to which a man could aspire in the United States. They received full and complete education, or some material portion of it.

The categories which we have set up require, first of all, that he either received Government assistance in acquiring his education or was deferred from combat duty while he pursued his education, and we say that the man who had less than 90 days service is first to go and the man who had 90 days or more, but less than 21 months of active duty, is the next. The third are those who had no military service. In the fourth category are those who have had service, and we place those into groups depending upon the number of months of service which they had, and then those with the lesser number of months of service shall be called first. I do not know how it could be placed on a more equitable basis.

Mr. VORYS. Has the gentleman any assurance that the armed services will apply approximately that same equitable procedure to those who have Reserve commissions? If this is successful, it might be that there would be no doctors to be inducted, because they would all get commissions. Are they going to be treated equitably?

Mr. KILDAY. When we come to the Reserves, we must remember, in the first place, that you are dealing with a group which has voluntarily submitted itself to military orders by joining the Reserves. They have received pay of their rank for 4 full days a month by attending the so-called drill period, and with your professional personnel that drill period has not amounted to much more, perhaps, than discussion of medical subjects between medical officers. But, then, throughout these years, since the time they were separated or whenever they entered the Reserves, they received compensation. It is our hope that it is the desire of the department to so administer the law as to place the lesser burden on those that had the longer service. Whether that can be done in every instance, we do not know, because you cannot get specialists when you take your young men in the V-12 or the ASTP program. Practically none of them have been out long enough to be real, outstanding specialists. But, as I say, there I think we have to go to the older groups if the men in the armed services are going to get the kind of care to which they are entitled and the adequate specialist's care from men in the profession who require long education, training, and experience.

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

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

Mr. DOLLIVER. Was there any testimony before the committee in connection with this bill revealing what the average cost of the V-12 program and the ASTP program for the training of physicians amounts to?

Mr. KILDAY. We asked for that information and at the time the witness appearing before the committee did not have it with him. He was to supply it. I do not know whether it was supplied. I will have to ascertain.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I wonder if we could obtain that information.

Mr. KILDAY. I understand that has not as yet been received. But, we did inquire into it. It was not available in the committee room but they promised to furnish us the information.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I asked that question of the Surgeon General and we were unable to get that information, so it has not been worked out as to what it cost to train a V-12 or ASTV student.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think it would be of great interest, and it ought to be in the RECORD.

Mr. KILDAY. I think so. I assure the gentleman it will be quite considerable. It is not a small amount of money.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, you know that he gets $50 a month in addition; plus he gets his tuition, his laboratory fees, his books, and all of those other things.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. PRIEST. I have learned within the last day that 20 doctors in my own district, who served from 2½ to 4 years during World War II, have received what they consider a conditional notice alerting them that they might be called within 21 days. I think the minimum service of that group was 2½ years and the maximum service 4 years. I was wondering if under the terms of this bill, assuming it is passed and becomes effective immediately, it would affect the men in that particular category.

Mr. KILDAY. The bill itself does not in any wise affect any man in the Reserves. It has been announced as being the policy of the Department so to administer the bill as to reduce the pressure now on the persons in the Reserve.

The question was brought up as to whether the inductions under this bill might not be postponed while these men were being processed and receiving their commissions and so on. The Department—and I think properly so—stated that they could make no commitment and that would depend upon the casualties in Korea and the absolute necessity for the medical personnel to be there were needed.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. GUILL. After talking with the distinguished chairman of your committee the day before yesterday, I called General Robertson and found out since that he had talked with your committee. But he made the statement to me that if in a community you could get one of these chaps whose education has been paid for by the Government, to go ahead and volunteer that then for every volunteer they would scratch off one of the Reservists; that is, that it would reduce the quota. Is that correct, sir?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I do not know. But of course when you increase the pool by this legislation, then in the administration of it more consideration can be given to those who have already served and are Reservists.

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to my colleague from Texas that after all these are doctors you are dealing with. They are akin. I think we can leave it to the medical profession to take care of their own. They have done a very good job up to now.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. It is a fact, though, that this bill will have some effect on the Reserves, because of the very thing that the chairman of the committee pointed out, when the distinguished gentleman from Georgia just mentioned that it will reduce the pressure on the Reservists by making these other men available?

Mr KILDAY. Certainly. We had all three of the Surgeons General before us at one time. They committed themselves that it would be the policy of the department in the administration of the bill to relieve the pressure upon the Reservists by reason of the availability of this additional pool of men who have not had service as against those Reserves who have seen service, in many instances long service.

Mr. HARRIS. Did I understand the gentleman to say a few moments ago that you and the committee were not able to obtain information as to the cost of educating the men under the V-12 program?

Mr. KILDAY. It is to be supplied. They did not have it with them at the time. They have agreed to supply it, but we have not as yet received it. I feel that you can be sure that it is quite a considerable amount of money in each individual case.

Mr. HARRIS. That is what I understand, that is the reason I asked the question.

Mr. KILDAY. It is no small amount. Medical education is the most expensive education that a man can get.

Mr. HARRIS. Did the committee learn any information as to what was the extra cost for the Government to educate these men, as compared to the average person who is not being educated under a program of this kind?

Mr. KILDAY. We did not go into that, but my experience has been that it always costs the Government more to do anything than it costs anybody else.

Mr. HARRIS. I think it would be interesting for the gentleman and his committee to find out just how much that is.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. Will the gentleman explain why this age limitation was placed at 45, rather than, let us, say, at 50 or even 40?

Mr. KILDAY. The Senate bill places the age at 55 so that if our bill passes in its present form, that matter will be before the conference to be settled as between 45 and 55. It was felt by our committee that 45 would be adequate, and that they would be younger men, and that the matter of the administrative detail would be reduced by having the younger men who could be assigned to more categories or classes of service, either in the field or aboard ship; and also that a larger proportion of men 45 and under would be physically qualified for the various services that they might be required to perform.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. In fact, the Surgeons General of the services said that the age of 45 was sufficient; did they not?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; there were sufficient men within that age bracket, and the larger percentage of them would be qualified for the various duties that might be expected of medical men in the armed services. But, as I say, that will probably be a matter for the conferees to agree upon.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. Does the Committee on Armed Services have any figures or estimates as to the number of doctors and dentists needed at the present time?

Mr. KILDAY. If we go to 2,500,000 in the armed services, then we need 11,000. There are 6,000 plus in the armed services, so that we need an increase of something like 5,000. There are probably 5,000 plus available within the first two categories.

Mr. HOEVEN. Can the gentleman tell us how many men it is anticipated can be taken in under the various categories?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not believe it is possible from the information that we had, or were able to get from the Department as between the first two categories.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak just a minute with reference to the overall effect of this bill. It is my opinion that if this bill is adopted substantially in its present form it will never be necessary to draft a single doctor or dentist. I think they will volunteer under its provisions. The bill in its present form does not limit the date upon which the man must enter the Reserves. That is where we want him. We want him in the Reserve so that there can be an orderly calling to duty of the men in accordance with the needs of the service, together with the Advisory Committee protecting the civilian population as to the availability of medical service for the civilian population.

The provision of the Career Compensation Act, which grants $100 a month additional pay to doctors who volunteer for service will be a sufficient incentive together with the provision that if a man waits until he is drafted, he is not going to get that additional compensation. I regard that as completely just and basically necessary in legislation of this type. Had the provision of the Career Compensation Act, which was reported by the subcommittee of which I was chairman during the present Congress, not been based on voluntary service I assure you the committee would never have included it. It has never been the contention that he would get, in addition to his education at Government expense, a commission, rather than serving in the ranks, a commission as first lieutenant or lieutenant, junior grade, and not second lieutenant or ensign, and then, in addition, $100 more than the same rank in any other service of the Armed Forces. If he is going to wait to be drafted, then he will have to take the consequences. If we retain those provisions in the legislation in its final form, I will predict that the day after this legislation becomes effective you will have enough doctors on your Reserve roll to fill all of your needs without ever inducting a single one.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I might point out to the gentleman that thus far this bonus that has been offered has been no inducement to bring doctors into the service. Is that not right?

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot quite agree with the gentleman on that. I think it had a very beneficial effect on the regular services.

Mr. GAVIN. How many of them volunteered?

Mr. KILDAY. Those have been in the regular service. The inducement heretofore has been in the regular service, and it has had very beneficial effect on the service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

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

Mr. KILDAY. The fact that there were many men who liked the medical services, but who had families and could

not afford to indulge in the occupation they like best, because of their families, have now been able to take up this service on account of the additional compensation.

Mr. GAVIN. Would you give us the number who have actually volunteered since this incentive was offered?

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. REES. As I understand it, this legislation described as a draft bill is not altogether a draft bill, but it is a measure that sets forth the privileges of those who join the services voluntarily, who are in the medical profession.

Mr. KILDAY. That is right.

Mr. REES. So that it is not a drafting of doctors into the service, but it simply sets forth the privileges they will enjoy by volunteering.

Mr. KILDAY. I think it will accentuate the need that exists, as well as setting out the advantages. It calls attention to the fact that there is extreme need, and that these things are available to them if they come in voluntarily.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has referred to this National Advisory Committee. On reading the bill, I find that it deals solely with reference to the drafting of medical personnel. If the letter of the law were followed, they could not advise on any other subject. So, if the plan works out as the gentleman has suggested and no doctors are drafted, the Advisory Committee will be doing nothing with reference to the needs of the community or the order of calling up the reserve officers in that community.

Mr. KILDAY. The testimony, of course, indicates that the department would be disposed to use those committees in almost identically the same manner as the voluntary boards were used during the last war. I think they called them local procurement boards. In that connection, those boards did consider the availability of men according to the civilian demands in the territory. I have every confidence that this will be administered more or less along that line.

Mr. VORYS. Why should not the proper language be put in here to give these advisory boards the status which the gentleman indicates?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman should address that question to the chairman of the committee. He and I did not fully agree on that particular feature.

Mr. VINSON. This bill does require every one to register, even though he may not be inducted. No doubt this National Advisory Committee will function like it did during the last war. It will be of some aid and assistance in helping the department to know who should be called up, and what the hardships would be in a community.

Mr. VORYS. What is the point of just hoping it is going to work that way? Why does not the proper language provide for that?

Mr. VINSON. If anyone is drafted, it is probable that some of them will be drafted because all of them will have to register, then the Board will function.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. If this committee needs any assistance, it is already provided for in the National Security Resources Board. Provision is made for the allocation of personnel.

Mr. KILDAY. That is true, of course the National Security Resources Board has control over personnel as well as other resources.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDEN. Referring to page 3, section 2, where it provides that those who have had 90 days or more but less than 21 months—in the administration of the act is it the intention of your committee that there shall be any distinction between a man who served 4 months and 20 months?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know what the answer to that would be. The provision is only that it is more than 90 days or less than 21 months.

Twenty-one months, of course, is the period of service required of any man drafted. If he had less than the required number of months he does not qualify for deferment under the Draft Act. What the policy would be I cannot infer.

Mr. VINSON. I may say to the gentleman that under this bill authority is given to the President to establish priorities.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. KRUSE. I call the gentleman's attention to section 3 on page 5. What is contemplated in regard to deferment of premedical and predental students?

Mr. KILDAY. We have stated that it is the sense of Congress that the President should establish categories for their deferment. We did not feel that we could establish deferment by law for any particular class of students but that when we had stated the intent of Congress that was as far as we could go.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I still cannot figure out what happens in the case I described earlier of a man who had 2 years of combat service, was shot up, and then went into the ASTP program and got 2 years of assistance in his medical education. According to the language in the bill it seems to me he is going to be called up because he did not serve subsequent to the date of his training.

Mr. KILDAY. He got his training under the GI bill of rights.

Mr. JUDD. The first part under ASTP. Probably the remainder under GI bill of rights, I do not know.

Mr. KILDAY. He got the benefit of the GI bill of rights.

Mr. JUDD. He had 2 years of combat service before he went into the ASTP program. Does this bill cover him?

Mr. KILDAY. Under this bill it does.

Mr. JUDD. What class would he fall into?

Mr. KILDAY. He would fall into class 4.

Mr. JUDD. But class 4 says those not included in the first and second priority. He was included in the first priority.

Mr. VINSON. He is not in the first or the second because he had 21 months.

Mr. JUDD. But the language under the first and second refers only to active service. "Subsequent to the completion of his training." He did not have any service after the completion of his training; his service was before.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. If the gentleman will indulge one more question on my part, I have received a number of letters regarding medical officers of the forty-third National Guard who are being inducted into service. They are concerned about the $100 per month. I understand that it has now been hooked up with this bill by section 2. Can the gentleman answer that?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; the Comptroller General has decided that the Career Compensation Act did not apply to the granting of $100 a month to a National Guard or Reserve officer when called to active duty with or without his consent. The officer in the National Guard subjects himself to military orders and is in the service just as firmly so the committee overrode the Comptroller General and placed the provision in section 2 of the bill providing that commissioned officers of the Reserve components called to active duty, with or without their consent, shall be entitled to the benefits of section 203 of Public Law 351, and get the $100 a month.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I take this time principally to ask some questions of the majority side or the minority side. I first make a brief statement. This bill, while not too well drawn, will have my support. The purpose of the bill is plain, it is to get these doctors who were educated at the expense of the Government into military service. But I would also point out that some of these boys would now be in the service but their service was terminated by the Armed Forces. When the war was over they were told they were not needed; they were told they were not wanted. Naturally they went into practice for themselves. Another thing I would recall to your mind is that the passage of this bill will not solve the problem as far as the medical problem is concerned. You are going to get those who have had this training, but I think you have placed your estimate too high as to how many you are going to get, because many of them are going to be disqualified because of physical and other reasons.

May I ask how many medical men the armed services will need? Is there anyone who can answer that question?

Mr. BROOKS. I can answer the gentleman. It depends on the extent to which military activities go. If this thing in Korea is called off or stopped it means, of course, there will be less. If hostilities increase they are going to need more.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman has not answered my question of how many medical men the armed services will need.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not think the armed services themselves know.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then, can the gentleman tell me how many medical men are already in the armed services? Does the gentleman have the information as to the number of medical men who are now in all branches of the armed services?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. Some 6,000 doctors and some 2,700 dentists. I gave that in my statement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Now in the service. How many more is it anticipated they will need?

Mr. VINSON. About 5,000 doctors and about 2,500 dentists.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. So in this bill you get 1,500 or 2,000 medical men. You still need 3,000, which you are going to have to go out and get from the Reserves.

I think it should also be pointed out that some of the Reserve officers are complaining about being called back into service because they had had 2 or 3 years of active military duty. When they were discharged they went into the active Reserves by choice. They were getting paid for some drill work, they were to get, I believe, a pension after some 30 years of half their regular pay. They were in the Reserves for a purpose. Now, a war comes along and they say, "Well, I have had my service. Do not call me."

Of course, you must make some allowance for that situation. This bill calling physicians into the service will not solve some of the problems you will have in the country. There are areas in which only 1 doctor is serving 2,500 people. The doctor may have been educated by the Government. When it comes to the time to call him into the service, you will have your communities that will say, "We have only 1 doctor for 2,500 people. Are you going to take him away and leave us without a doctor?"

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

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I think it is very important to set up this advisory committee. That committee worked very well in World War II. It was voluntary. The doctors on that committee served without compensation and I think they did an excellent job in deciding what doctors should be retained for community needs and what doctors might be available for the service. If the same kind of committee is set up again I think there will be no trouble at all so far as the needs of the various communities are concerned.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They will get a replacement for that man that they take into the service. That should be done.

Here is another point I want to make to the committee. It seems to me there has been too much waste of manpower in the armed services as far as physicians are concerned. They are not being used to the fullest advantage.

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

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time to pay tribute to the thousands of men in the medical profession who rendered outstanding and patriotic service during World War II. They rendered service without complaint and in many cases, at great sacrifice. Much of that service was heroic for which little credit was received.

This is a rather drastic measure. I am informed it has the endorsement and suppport of the American Medical Association. I am advised this organization believes that, in view of the present crisis, it is fair and equitable.

There has been some criticism in the press, and also voiced on the floor of the House today that doctors have not volunteered for service as promptly as those who head the Armed Forces feel they should. I think this is answered to a great degree by those doctors who spent considerable time in the service, who feel that doctors who had training at the expense of the Government ought to be given first chance to serve. I also feel quite definitely that when the doctors and the dentists of this country are convinced of the real need of their services, there will be no difficulty in securing enough doctors and dentists to take care of the needs and requirements of the Armed Forces. I am sure many Members of this body are familiar with complaints that in too many instances during the recent war services of doctors were not effectively and fully utilized.

I hope if this legislation is made effective, there will be a complete understanding between the doctors and dentists who are called and those persons who are in charge of the leadership of the Armed Forces with respect to the proper utilization of the services of the men who are trained in the medical profession.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, it is neither my desire nor intention to trespass upon the time or patience of the Committee at this hour. But, in the words of the prophet, I wish we would "come and reason together."

Mr. Chairman, it is exceedingly difficult, if not next to impossible, to write a general or universal formula that will deal out justice to all individuals. Certain Members of this House know my position when it comes to drafting men. It is not a pleasant thing in peace or even in time of war. But, sometimes exigencies and necessities drive us to do things that we do not like to do.

I know that there may be some inequities in this bill. I doubt if absolute equality will be dished out to everybody, but I think we all will appreciate the forthrightness and the frankness and the honesty of our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] when he did not hesitate to admit openly that this legislation is more or less discriminatory.

Your Committee on Armed Services does not like to draw lines of distinction between different classes of our citizens. Here is a man who has gone through law school, or through engineering, or he is an expert scientist who has, perhaps spent many years and many thousands of dollars in acquiring his education. He is drafted into the armed services; perhaps sent up into the front lines to face the fire, and even forced to give his last full measure of devotion. If he is lucky enough to escape with his life and he comes back home, he is going to have to rehabilitate himself. He is going to have to take up where he left off. He is not going to feel too kindly toward members of the medical profession or even Members of Congress who pay some other fellow citizen $100 a month extra and even give him a safer berth, particularly when you consider those who were fortunate enough to escape combat service during the last war, who were granted all the rights, privileges, and prerogatives and paid not only the same as every enlisted man received but who were given the most expensive education that any man has ever received.

After holding extensive hearings and considering all the factors involved, and particularly after listening to the Surgeons General of all the branches of our armed services, we were driven to the inevitable and undeniable conclusion that the only way we could get a sufcient number of men in the armed services, in times of peace, who could render adequate medical care to service members of the different branches was to give them an added inducement.

Of course, this time we are drafting them all. I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Texas, there is not much logical reason or, I might even say, justice, in giving additional pay or incentive to any particular group of our citizens.

I might just take one moment to point out here that maybe there is a person who believes more in private enterprise and individual initiative than I do, but I have never met him. I am going to issue a warning that if we have socialized medicine in this country it will be brought on by some of the ill-advised, if not unfair, practices of the American Medical Association.

I am not going to yield to any Member of the House of Representatives in praising the doctors and standing up for them. Ye Gods, when we get a pain in the head or in the foot or in the middle of us we are glad to see them—we are not always very happy when the bill comes in—but I know the service that they render. A little nephew of mine from his boyhood days has wanted to be a doctor. He is the apple of my eye. He has finished three years of premedical

school and has been admitted to medical school. I am glad that he has been able to make the grade, in spite of the high I. Q.'s required.

I have literally dozens, if not scores of young men who have graduated from colleges and universities, not only in my district but throughout my State and all over the country who are most eager to get into medical school. But they cannot get in. I dare say every Member of the House of Representatives has many applicants in his own district who want to get into medical school while we are preaching an acute shortage of doctors. Why cannot they get in? Who has created the monopoly? Who wants the high fees? Who is responsible for our present predicament?

I trust the Members on this side of the aisle will not think I am talking like a wild-eyed radical or a Socialist when I say it is high time that the medical profession, honorable and valuable as it is in this country, puts its own house in order.

We have been forced, I say, out of sheer necessity in the exigency of this situation to bring in this legislation, and with the gentleman from Texas, a good Democrat, I join him as the only Republican left in my State. JOE BRYSON of South Carolina says they are just saving me for seed corn. Sometimes I wonder whether it is ever going to sprout. But I think maybe it will, before too long.

But I agree with my friend from Texas in not even trying to justify certain provisions of this bill. I am going to hold my tongue when certain sections of it are read, and I will perhaps choke on my Adam's apple when I try to swallow parts of it, as the gentleman from Georgia will. He has a stronger constitution than I have.

He smiles, but he does not like some of the provisions in the bill. But we are in a great crisis. I think if the Members of this House could have sat with the members of our committee and listened to all of the testimony and evidence, or if you will take the time to read the full report, you would agree that, under all the circumstances, it is just about the best thing we can do at this time.

If there is any wrong committed, if there are any mistakes made, I am sure the gentleman from Georgia, astute and resourceful as he is, after his brief experience of 36 years in this House, after knowing just a little about human nature, out of his broad mind and philanthropic heart, will be most willing to listen, consult, and advise with any of you and bring in any additional measure to correct or rectify any wrongs that may have been perpetrated.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we vote on the bill and pass it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time, 2 minutes, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] to speak out of order.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I urge the Congress to enact excess profits tax legislation now, effective on excess profits earned after the start of the Korean war. We are told that the administration and the tax committees of the Congress would like to wait until next year to enact an excess profits tax on the ground that more study is required to develop a perfect excess profits tax. The contention of those who insist, as I do, on enactment of an excess profits tax effective for the last half of this year is that we are sending the boys to fight now, we are spending the money now, and profits, because of rising prices and inflation and war conditions, are running through the ceiling now with dangerous effects on the economy. If we wait until next year these profits will escape excess profits taxation. It is strange that the Senate Finance Committee should produce a tax increase bill raising nearly $3,000,000,000 from individuals, bearing heavily upon those in the lower income brackets, and at the same time should increase corporate taxes by only a half billion. It is true that the accelerated payment of corporate taxes is estimated to yield a billion and a half in a year but the actual tax on corporations in the bill now being debated on the Senate floor will produce only $320,000,000 additional in fiscal year 1951. Corporate profits were the last to be taxed in World War II and the first to be relieved of taxes after the war.

An important economic reason for curbing excessive profits through taxes now is that it would be one of the best anti-inflation measures we could take. Unless the working man can be assured that these profits will be subjected to just taxation, he will inevitably demand substantial wage increases in the next few weeks and months. Why? Because the cost of living has increased substantially since his last wage increase and because the corporations have the profits with which to pay these wage increases. You cannot ask labor to accept wage stabilization now while giving corporations the go ahead to jack up prices and reap unprecedented war profits.

The amendment that Senator O'MAHONEY and Senator CONNALLY are pressing in the Senate to the pending tax bill, H. R. 8920, and which I propose in the House, is a simple, workable and justifiable addition to the pending bill. Basically it simply reactivates the excess profits tax of World War II, a tax which was never repealed but merely suspended. It is brought up to date by the proposed amendment. A 4-year base, 1946–49 is substituted for the World War II base of 1936–39. Because of the super-normal profits earned by corporations during this 4-year period as a result of the liquidations of war-accumulated demand for consumer goods, and business expansion, we propose to use 80 percent of the average 1946–1949 profits as the base. Still retained, of course, is the alternative of the invested capital base as in the World War II law. The rate of tax proposed is 85 percent of excess profits after allowing for all exemptions and deductions and a $10,000 specific exemption for small companies, and an additional $10,000 exemption for new companies formed since 1945 using the invested capital base in calculating the tax. These specific exemptions will assure new and small, independent business that this tax will not be an excess burden.

It should be kept in mind that the proposed amendment merely reactivates the existing World War II excess-profits tax which is still in the tax code. There is nothing new or novel or unworkable about this amendment. Furthermore, the amendment directs the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to make an intensive study of excess-profits taxation and to bring forth suggested perfecting amendments for the Congress to consider early in the year. These amendments, if adopted, could be made retroactive to July 1 of this year, the effective date of the excess-profits tax. Businessmen, accountants, and lawyers are generally familiar with the excess-profits tax of World War II. It worked during World War II and it could work equally well in the present emergency.

Estimated excess-profits-tax liability—Proposed amendment to H. R. 8920

Proposed base for excess-profits taxation, 80 percent of 1946–49 average ($28,900,000,000)	23.1
Exemptions at $10,000 "specific" and $10,000 for each new business	3.0
Subject to normal and surtax only	26.1

Excess-profits-tax addition to total tax at 85-percent rate is 40 percent of excess (i. e., 85 percent less 45 percent normal and surtax).

If profits in taxable year aggregate:	Yield resulting from excess-profits tax will be:
$26,100,000,000	0
$28,100,000,000	$ 800,000,000
$30,100,000,000	$1,600,000,000
$32,100,000,000	$2,400,000,000
$34,100,000,000	$3,000,000,000
$36,100,000,000	$3,800,000,000
$38,100,000,000	$4,600,000,000
$40,100,000,000	$5,400,000,000

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side, and I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"(i) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, except subsections 6 (j) and 6 (o), the President is authorized to require special registration of and, on the basis of requisitions submitted by the Department of Defense and approved by him, to make special calls for male persons qualified in needed—

"(A) medical and allied specialist categories who have not yet reached the age of 45 at the time of registration, and

"(B) dental and allied specialist categories who have not yet reached the age of 45 at the time of registration.

Persons called hereunder shall be liable for induction for not to exceed 21 months of service in the Armed Forces. No such person who, on August 16, 1950, is a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces shall, so long as he remains a member thereof, be liable for induction under this subsection, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority of the

President under any other provision of law to call to active duty members and units of the Reserve components. No person in the medical, dental, and allied specialist categories shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection after he has attained the forty-sixth anniversary of the date of his birth.

"(2) In registering and inducting persons pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President shall, to the extent that he considers practicable and desirable, register and induct in the following order of priority:

"First. Those persons who participated as students in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy, and those persons who were deferred from service during World War II for the purpose of pursuing a course of instruction leading to education in one of the categories referred to in clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection who have had less than 90 days of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to the completion of or release from the program or course of instruction (exclusive of the time spent in postgraduate training).

"Second. Those persons who participated as students in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy, and those persons who were deferred from service during World War II for the purpose of pursuing a course of instruction leading to education in one of the categories referred to in clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection who have had 90 days or more but less than 21 months of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to the completion of or release from the program or course of instruction (exclusive of the time spent in postgraduate training).

"Third. Those who did not have active service in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to September 16, 1940.

"Fourth. Those not included in the first and second priority who have had active service in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to September 16, 1940. Inductions of persons in this priority shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President which may provide for the classification of such persons into groups according to the number of full months of such service which they have had and for the induction of the members of any such group after the induction of the members of any other such group having a greater number of full months of such service.

In the selection of individuals from among the categories established by subsection (1) for induction, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment of any individual whose deferment is found to be equitable and in the national interest, taking into consideration the length of his previous service in the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard and the Public Health Service) of the United States, the extent of his participation in the Army specialized training program or similar program administered by the Navy, reasons of hardship or dependency, and the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

"(3) It is the sense of the Congress that the President shall provide for the annual deferment from training and service under this title of numbers of premedical, and predental students at least equal to the average numbers of male premedical, and predental students in attendance at colleges and universities in the United States during the years 1945 to 1950 as determined by the Director.

"(j) The President shall establish a National Advisory Committee which shall advise the Selective Service System, and shall coordinate the work of such State and local volunteer advisory committees as may be established to cooperate with the National Advisory Committee, with respect to the selection of needed medical and dental and allied specialist categories of persons as referred to in subsection (i). The members of the National Advisory Committee shall be selected from among individuals who are outstanding in medicine, dentistry, and the sciences allied thereto, but it shall not be mandatory that all such fields of endeavor be represented on the committee.

"(k) (1) Clause (3) of subsection 203 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.) is amended by striking out the words 'volunteered and' and 'volunteer and.'

"(2) Subsection 203 (b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 is amended by striking out '*Provided further*, That the commissioned officers described in subsection (a) (3) of this section shall be entitled to receive the pay provided by this subsection only during periods of volunteer service:'."

SEC. 2. Section 202 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"(g) Under such regulations as he shall prescribe, the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the President is authorized to transfer between the armed services, within the authorized commissioned strength of the respective services, officers holding commissions in the medical services or corps including the Reserve components thereof. No officer shall be so transferred without (1) his consent, (2) the consent of the service from which the transfer is to be made, and (3) the consent of the service to which the transfer is to be made.

"(h) Officers transferred hereunder shall be appointed by the President alone to such commissioned grade, permanent and temporary, in the armed service to which transferred and be given such place on the applicable promotion list of such service as he shall determine. Federal service previously rendered by any such officer shall be credited for promotion, seniority, and retirement purposes as if served in the armed service to which transferred according to the provisions of law governing promotion, seniority, and retirement therein. No officer upon a transfer to any service from which previously transferred shall be given a higher grade, or place on the applicable promotion list, than that which he could have attained had he remained continuously in the service to which retransferred.

"(i) Any officer transferred hereunder shall be credited with the unused leave to which he was entitled at the time of transfer."

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 11, strike out "on August 16, 1950."

On page 2, line 13, after the word "for", add the words "registration or."

One page 4, line 18, strike out the word "greater" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "lesser."

On page 5, line 9, add a comma after the word "premedical" and insert the following: "preosteopathic, preveterinary."

On page 5, line 11, strike out the word "average."

On page 5, line 11, after the word "premedical" add a comma and insert the following: "preosteopathic, preveterinary."

One page 5, line 13, strike out the word "during" and substitute the word "at."

On page 5, line 14, strike out the words and figures "years 1945 to 1950" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "present level."

One page 6, strike out lines 4 through 13, inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 203 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, commissioned officers of the Reserve components called or ordered to active duty with or without their consent, shall, if otherwise qualified, be entitled to the benefits of section 203 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress."

On page 6, line 20, strike out "2" and substitute in lieu thereof "3."

On page 1, following line 24, add the following new sections:

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, where any person who served on active duty as a doctor or dentist in the United States Army, Navy, or Air Force Medical Corps during World War II, thereafter has been, or shall be, recalled to active duty as a doctor or dentist in the Armed Forces of the United States, such person may, under regulation prescribed by the President, be promoted to such grade or rank as may be commensurate with his medical or dental education, experience, and ability.

"SEC. 5. No person inducted under the provisions of this act shall be entitled to the benefits of the provisions of section 203 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress.

"SEC. 6. For the purposes of this act, the term 'allied specialist categories', shall include but not be limited to veterinarians, bacteriologists, biochemists, radiation chemists, organic chemists, parasitologists, pathologists, pharmacologists, biophysicists, radiation physicists, optometrists, pharmacists, occupational therapists, chiropodists, osteopaths, physiologists, radiobiologists, serologists, virologists, sanitary engineers, industrial hygienists, medical statisticians, industrial engineers, dietitians, psychologists, entomologists, psychiatric social workers, nutritionists, laboratory officers.

"SEC. 7. This act, except for section 2, shall terminate on July 9, 1951."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD: Page 8, line 22, insert a new section 7 as follows:

"That the second sentence of section 4 (a) of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'Any citizen of a foreign country, who is not deferrable or exempt from training and service under the provisions of this title (other than this subsection), shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this title if, prior to his induction into the armed forces, he has made application to be relieved from such liability in the manner prescribed by and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President; but any person who makes such application shall thereafter be debarred from becoming a citizen of the United States and shall be taken into custody and deported.'

"SEC. 8. The amendment made by this act shall be in effect with respect to all citizens of foreign countries who have heretofore applied or who hereafter apply, under section 4 (a) of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, for relief from liability for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

"Renumber section 7 as section 9."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment on the ground that the amendment is not germane to the bill which is to provide for special registration of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories and does not embrace the subject matter which the gentleman is seeking to add to the bill by his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia reserve a point of order or make the point of order?

Mr. VINSON. I reserve the point of order to give the gentleman from Montana an opportunity to express his views; but I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that these bills have been referred to the Armed Services Committee, and it is the hope of the committee to get around to giving the gentleman from Montana and the authors of the other bills a hearing just as soon as we can. We have been very busy on three or four very important bills since these bills were introduced. No doubt the committee sympathizes with them, and no doubt will try to deal with this amendment of the draft act, but we just have not had time to do so. I assure the gentleman from Montana that we will try to give him a hearing and to hear the other Members, because we have the same objective in view.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the importance of the subject matter covered by this amendment I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my sentiments about the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and to tell him that I respect his integrity and sincerity, that I know he will do everything possible to help remove this road block in the Selective Service Act of 1948. The gentleman will recall that I and a number of others went to see him about getting action on this. The gentleman has expressed his entire sympathy with this proposal. I believe, Mr. Chairman, despite the point of order raised that the point of order is not good against this particular amendment, but I will refer to that at a later stage in my remarks.

I wish to call the attention of the House again to material which I received from the State of Montana relative to this particular proposition and indicate as sincerely as I can just how important this seeming little amendment is.

According to the present Selective Service Act of 1948 it is possible for an alien who is forced to register like every other eligible person in this country, to legally claim exemption from serving in the Armed Forces of the United States. This has been done by aliens in different parts of the country. I cannot see why some people in that category should enjoy a privilege superior to that enjoyed by an American. Therefore I have introduced a bill from which this amendment is taken along with various other Members, including the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARST], the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GUILL], and others. We are all desirous that this action be considered, if at all possible, at this time.

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

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

Mr. FORD. I would like to compliment the gentleman for bringing this matter to the floor of the House and getting some assurance from the chairman of the committee that this kind of legislation will be reviewed by his committee and undoubtedly acted upon favorably in the near future.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, as far as the point of order is concerned, the present bill we are considering, H. R. 9554, is, as I read it, a bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948. Of course, it picks out a special category, but the bill itself, as a whole, I think is open. I believe that on the basis of the fact this is a bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 the amendment which is being offered for the same purpose should be considered germane at this time.

May I ask the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, if he will give us a little more than a hope, a definite promise that the committee will take action on this particular amendment this week?

Mr. VINSON. I may say to the distinguished gentleman that if the House is in session the remainder of the week or if the House is in session where we can get around to it, after we call up a conference report on the bill, I am perfectly willing to have a hearing on it. No doubt as a result of the hearing some amendment to the Draft Act dealing with this subject can be worked out. There are several phases to it that cause a little concern because when you refer to displaced persons, the bill which the gentleman is sponsoring says they shall be deported. Deported where? Where are you going to send them? Out into the ocean?

We will give the gentleman a hearing. We are sympathetic with the premise, but I cannot say whether the hearing will be tomorrow because I may not be able to get a hearing tomorrow. We are all in sympathy with the purpose the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to express my thanks again to the gentleman from Georgia. Insofar as the matter of deportation is concerned, I do not think that would be so much our business as it would be to make known specifically that as far as the intent of this Congress is concerned these people who will not assume the obligations that Americans have to assume should be deported from this country and should not be allowed to breathe freedom's air here.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think it is entirely proper that the gentleman has brought this particular issue to the floor of the House at this time. As he mentioned, I was the author of a similar bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The original bill, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. At least one of them. I, for one minute, would not want to concede that this amendment is anything but germane, but if the Chair should rule against us I hope the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services will do everything that reasonably can be done to give us a chance to be heard before this session of the Congress adjourns.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARST. I have a letter here from a constituent, Mr. Ray Cahill, in which he makes the following statement:

> My son, who is 22 years old, has to submit to the draft without any recourse, and, consequently change the entire course of his life. While a displaced person when called for the draft can stand up to the draft board and refuse to report for a physical examination, and openly declare that he will not become a citizen and refuses to fight for the United States. He does all this in spite of the fact that we, the taxpayers, fed and clothed him and transported him over here at our expense.

Will this particular amendment that the gentleman has offered cover that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It certainly will. I may say to the gentleman that the bill that he has introduced will likewise cover the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be adopted so that this inequity in the Selective Service Act can be corrected. I ask, also, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order raised by the gentleman from Georgia not be sustained.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Montana desire to be heard?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that the point of order is germane because the bill under discussion is to amend the Selectice Service Act of 1948 and my amendment has for its ultimate objective the same purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

It is true that the bill mentions the Selective Service Act of 1948; however, it amends it in a certain specific manner and in certain specific categories.

The Chair is inclined to believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman

from Montana goes far beyond the scope of the bill now before us and therefore sustains the point of order.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHORT: Page 5, line 9, after the word "of", insert "optometry students and"; page 5, line 10, after the word "preveterinary", insert "preoptometry"; page 5, line 12, after the word "preveterinary", insert "preoptometry."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply includes preoptometrists along with the preosteopaths, preveterinarians, premedical and predental students.

Mr. VINSON. There is no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: Page 2, lines 4 and 7, after "age of", strike out "forty-five" and insert "fifty"; page 2, line 20, after "attained the", strike out "forty-sixth" and insert "fifty-first."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment. That just changes the age.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is all it does. It just establishes a larger group to call from.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. 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. HARDY, 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. 9554) to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is 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 bill was passed.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4029) to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"(1) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, except subsections 6 (j) and 6 (o), the President is authorized to require special registration of and, on the basis of requisitions submitted by the Department of Defense and approved by him, to make special calls for male persons qualified in needed—

"(A) medical and allied specialist categories who have not yet reached the age of 55 at the time of registration, and

"(B) dental and allied specialist categories who have not yet reached the age of 45 at the time of registration.

Persons called hereunder shall be liable for induction for not to exceed 21 months of service in the Armed Forces. No such person who, on August 16, 1950, is a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces shall, so long as he remains a member thereof, be liable for induction under this subsection, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority of the President under any other provision of law to call to active duty members and units of the Reserve components. No person in the medical and allied specialist categories shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection after he has attained the fifty-sixth anniversary of the date of his birth and no person in the dental and allied specialist categories shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection after he has attained the forty-sixth anniversary of the date of his birth.

"(2) In registering and inducting persons pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President shall, to the extent that he considers practicable and desirable, register and induct in the following order of priority:

"First. Those persons who participated as students in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy, and those persons who were deferred from service during World War II for the purpose of pursuing a course of instruction leading to education in one of the categories referred to in clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection, who have had less than 90 days of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to the completion of or release from the program or course of instruction (exclusive of the time spent in postgraduate training).

"Second. Those persons who participated as students in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy, and those persons who were deferred from service during World War II for the purpose of pursuing a course of instruction leading to education in one of the above categories, who have had 90 days or more but less than 21 months of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to the completion of or release from the program or course of instruction (exclusive of the time spent in postgraduate training).

"Third. Those who did not have active service in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to September 16, 1940.

"Fourth. Those not included in the first and second priority who have had active service in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to September 16, 1940. Inductions of persons in this priority shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President which may provide for the classification of such persons into groups according to the number of full months of such service which they have had and for the induction of the members of any such group prior to the induction of the members of any other such group having a greater number of full months of such service.

In the selection of individuals from among the categories established by subsection (i) for induction, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment of any individual whose deferment is found to be equitable and in the national interest, taking into consideration the length of his previous service in the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard and the Public Health Service) of the United States, the extent of his participation in the Army specialized training program or similar program administered by the Navy, reasons of hardship or dependency, and the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

"(3) It is the sense of the Congress that the President shall provide for the annual deferment from training and service under this title of numbers of premedical and predental students at least equal to the numbers of male premedical and predental students in attendance at colleges and universities in the United States at the present levels, as determined by the Director.

"(j) The President shall establish a National Advisory Committee which shall advise the Selective Service System and shall coordinate the work of such State and local volunteer advisory committees as may be establishd to cooperate with the National Advisory Committee, with respect to the selection of needed medical and dental and allied specialist categories of persons as referred to in subsection (i). The members of the National Advisory Committee shall be selected from among individuals who are outstanding in medicine, dentistry, and the sciences allied thereto, but except for the professions of medicine and dentistry, it shall not be mandatory that all such fields of endeavor be represented on the committee.

"(k) (1) Clause 3 of subsection 203 (a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (P. L. 351, 81st Cong.) is amended by striking out the words 'volunteered and' and 'volunteer and'.

"(2) Subsection 203 (b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 is amended by striking out 'Provided further, That the commissioned officers described in subsection (a) (3) of this section shall be entitled to receive the pay provided by this subsection only during periods of volunteer service:'."

SEC. 2. Section 202 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"(g) Under such regulations as he shall prescribe, the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the President is authorized to transfer between the armed services, within

the authorized commissioned strength of the respective services, officers holding commissions in the medical services or corps including the Reserve components thereof. No officer shall be so transferred without (1) his consent, (2) the consent of the service from which the transfer is to be made, and (3) the consent of the service to which the transfer is to be made.

"(h) Officers transferred hereunder shall be appointed by the President alone to such commissioned grade, permanent and temporary, in the armed service to which transferred and be given such place on the applicable promotion list of such service as he shall determine. Federal service previously rendered by any such officer shall be credited for promotion, seniority, and retirement purposes as if served in the armed service to which transferred according to the provisions of law governing promotion, seniority, and retirement therein. No officer upon a transfer to any service from which previously transferred shall be given a higher grade, or place on the applicable promotion list, than that which he could have attained had he remained continuously in the service to which retransferred.

"(i) Any officer transferred hereunder shall be credited with the unused leave to which he was entitled at the time of transfer."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 4029 and insert the provisions of H. R. 9554, as amended, as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"'(i) (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, except subsections 6 (j) and 6 (o), the President is authorized to require special registration of and, on the basis of requisitions submitted by the Department of Defense and approved by him, to make special calls for male persons qualified in needed—

"'(A) medical and allied specialist categories who have not yet reached the age of fifty at the time of registration, and

"'(B) dental and allied specialist categories who have not yet reached the age of fifty at the time of registration.

Persons called hereunder shall be liable for induction for not to exceed 21 months of service in the Armed Forces. No such person who is a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces shall, so long as he remains a member thereof, be liable for registration or induction under this subsection, but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority of the President under any other provision of law to call to active duty members and units of the Reserve components. No person in the medical, dental, and allied specialist categories shall be inducted under the provisions of this subsection after he has attained the fifty-first anniversary of the date of his birth.

"'(2) In registering and inducting persons pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, the President shall, to the extent that he considers practicable and desirable, register and induct in the following order of priority:

"'First. Those persons who participated as students in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy, and those persons who were deferred from service during World War II for the purpose of pursuing a course of instruction leading to education in one of the categories referred to in classes (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection who have had less than 90 days of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to the completion of or release from the program or course of instruction (exclusive of the time spent in postgraduate training).

"'Second. Those persons who participated as students in the Army specialized training program or similar programs administered by the Navy, and those persons who were deferred from service during World War II for the purpose of pursuing a course of instruction leading to education in one of the categories referred to in clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection who have had 90 days or more but less than 21 months of active duty in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to the completion of or release from the program or course of instruction (exclusive of the time spent in postgraduate training).

"'Third. Those who did not have active service in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to September 16, 1940.

"'Fourth. Those not included in the first and second priority who have had active service in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, or the Public Health Service subsequent to September 16, 1940. Inductions of persons in this priority shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President which may provide for the classification of such persons into groups according to the number of full months of such service which they have had and for the induction of the members of any such group after the induction of the members of any other such group having a lesser number of full months of such service.

In the selection of individuals from among the categories established by subsection (i) for induction, the President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may precribe, to provide for the deferment of any individual whose deferment is found to be equitable and in the national interest, taking into consideration the length of his previous service in the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard and the Public Health Service) of the United States, the extent of his participation in the Army specialized training program or similar program administered by the Navy, reasons of hardship or dependency, and the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

"'(3) It is the sense of the Congress that the President shall provide for the annual deferment from training and service under this title of numbers of optometry students and premedical, preosteopathic, preveterinary, preoptometry, and predental students at least equal to the numbers of male premedical, preosteopathic, preveterinary, preoptometry, and predental students in attendance at colleges and universities in the United States at the present level as determined by the Director.

"'(j) The President shall establish a National Advisory Committee which shall advise the Selective Service System, and shall coordinate the work of such State and local volunteer advisory committees as may be established to cooperate with the National Advisory Committee, with respect to the selection of needed medical and dental and allied specialist categories of persons as referred to in subsection (i). The members of the National Advisory Committee shall be selected from among individuals who are outstanding in medicine, dentistry, and the sciences allied thereto, but it shall not be mandatory that all such fields of endeavor be represented on the committee.'

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 203 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, commissioned officers of the Reserve components called or ordered to active duty with or without their consent, shall, if otherwise qualified, be entitled to the benefits of section 203 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress.

"SEC. 3. Section 202 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"'(g) Under such regulations as he shall prescribe, the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the President is authorized to transfer between the armed services, within the authorized commissioned strength of the respective services, officers holding commissions in the medical services or corps including the Reserve components thereof. No officer shall be so transferred without (1) his consent, (2) the consent of the service from which the transfer is to be made, and (3) the consent of the service to which the transfer is to be made.

"'(h) Officers transferred hereunder shall be appointed by the President alone to such commissioned grade, permanent and temporary, in the armed service to which transferred and be given such place on the applicable promotion list of such service as he shall determine. Federal service previously rendered by any such officer shall be credited for promotion, seniority, and retirement purposes as if served in the armed service to which transferred according to the provisions of law governing promotion, seniority, and retirement therein. No officer upon a transfer to any service from which previously transferred shall be given a higher grade, or place on the applicable promotion list, than that which he could have attained had he remained continuously in the service to which retransferred.

"'(i) Any officer transferred hereunder shall be credited with the unused leave to which he was entitled at the time of transfer.'

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, where any person who served on active duty as a doctor or dentist in the United States Army, Navy, or Air Force Medical Corps during World War II, thereafter has been, or shall be, recalled to active duty as a doctor or dentist in the Armed Forces of the United States, such person may, under regulations prescribed by the President, be promoted to such grade or rank as may be commensurate with his medical or dental education, experience, and ability.

"SEC. 5. No person inducted under the provisions of this act shall be entitled to the benefits of the provisions of section 203 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress.

"SEC. 6. For the purposes of this act, the term "allied specialist categories" shall include, but not be limited to, veterinarians, bacteriologists, biochemists, radiation chemists, organic chemists, parasitologists, pathologists, pharmacologists, biophysicists, radiation physicists, optometrists, pharmacists, occupational therapists, chiropodists, osteopaths, physiologists, radiobiologists, serologists, virologists, sanitary engineers, industrial hygienists, medical statisticians, industrial engineers, dietitians, psychologists, entomologists, psychiatric social workers, nutritionists, laboratory officers.

"SEC. 7. This act, except for section 2, shall terminate on July 9, 1951.'

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

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

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 363, nays 1, answered "present" 1, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

YEAS—363

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Battle
Beall
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentsen
Biemiller
Bishop
Boggs, Del.
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bolton, Md.
Bonner
Bosone
Breen
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Burdick
Burke
Burleson
Burnside
Burton
Byrne, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Case, N. J.
Case, S. Dak.
Cavalcante
Celler
Chatham
Chelf
Chesney
Chiperfield
Chudoff
Clemente
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Cox
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
D'Ewart
Dollinger
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Doughton
Douglas
Doyle
Eberharter
Elliott
Ellsworth
Elston
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fellows
Fenton
Fernandez
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gilmer
Golden
Goodwin
Gordon
Gorski
Gossett
Graham
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Gregory
Gross
Guill
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Hare
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Harvey
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Heffernan
Heller
Herlong
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Howell
Huber
Hull
Irving
Jackson, Calif.
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
James
Javits
Jenison
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karst
Karsten
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kennedy
Keogh
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Kruse
Kunkel
Lane
Lanham
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lichtenwalter
Lind
Linehan
Lodge
Lovre
Lucas
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McDonough
McGrath
McGregor
McGuire
McKinnon
McMillan, S. C.
McSweeney
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marsalis
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miles
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morris
Morton
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Nicholson
Nixon
Noland
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Passman
Patman
Patten
Patterson
Perkins
Peterson
Philbin
Phillips, Calif.
Pickett
Poage
Polk
Potter
Poulson
Preston
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Rankin
Redden
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Rich
Richards
Riehlman
Robeson
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Sadlak
Sanborn
Sasscer
Saylor
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Scudder
Secrest
Shafer
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sims
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Staggers
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Stigler
Stockman
Sullivan
Sutton
Taber
Tackett
Talle
Tauriello
Taylor
Teague
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Tollefson
Towe
Trimble
Underwood
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Weichel
Welch
Wheeler
White, Calif.
White, Idaho
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Okla.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodhouse
Woodruff
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—1

Marcantonio

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hedrick

NOT VOTING—65

Angell
Barden
Barrett, Wyo.
Blackney
Blatnik
Bolton, Ohio
Boykin
Bramblett
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Christopher
Crook
Crosser
Dingell
Durham
Eaton
Engel, Mich.
Gamble
Gillette
Gore
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Johnson
Kearney
Keefe
Klein
Larcade
Latham
McCulloch
McMillen, Ill.
Macy
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Miller, Calif.
Morgan
Morrison
Murray, Wis.
Norton
O'Konski
Pace
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Pfeiffer, William L.
Phillips, Tenn.
Plumley
Powell
Quinn
Regan
Rivers
Roosevelt
Sabath
Sadowski
St. George
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Sikes
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Ohio
Werdel
Whitaker
Wier
Williams
Withrow
Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Smathers with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Crook with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Dingell with Gillette.
Mr. Sadowski with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Bramblett.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Powell with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Wier with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 9554 was passed were vacated, and that bill laid on the table.

AMENDING CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 833, Rept. No. 3023), 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. 9320) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, and such motion to recommit may contain instructions germane to the bill or committee substitute.

AMERICAN-MEXICAN TREATY ACT OF 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3934) to amend the act of May 13, 1944 (43 Stat. 108), as amended, relating to the United States-Mexican boundary, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 3018)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3934) to amend the Act of May 13, 1924 (43 Stat. 118), as amended, relating to the United States-Mexican boundary, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this

Act may be cited as the 'American-Mexican Treaty Act of 1950.'

"TITLE I—AUTHORIZATIONS FOR CARRYING OUT TREATY PROJECTS

"SEC. 101. That the Secretary of State, acting through the United States Commissioner, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico (herein referred to as the 'Commission'), in connection with any project under the jurisdiction of the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, is authorized: (a) to purchase, or condemn, lands, or interests in lands, for relocation of highways, roadways, railroads, telegraph, telephone, or electric transmission lines, or any other properties whatsoever, the relocation of which, in the judgment of the said Commissioner, is necessitated by the construction or operation and maintenance of any such project, and to perform any or all work involved in said relocations on said lands, or interests in lands, other lands, or interests in lands, owned and held by the United States in connection with the construction or operation and maintenance of any such project, or properties not owned by the United States; (b) to enter into contracts with the owners of the said properties whereby they undertake to acquire any, or all, property needed for said relocation, or to perform any, or all, work involved in said relocations; and (c) for the purpose of effecting completely said relocations, to convey, or exchange Government properties acquired or improved under clause (a) above, with or without improvements, or other properties owned and held by the United States in connection with the construction or operation and maintenance of said project, or to grant term or perpetual easements therein or thereover. Grants or conveyances hereunder shall be by instruments executed by the Secretary of State without regard to provisions of law governing the patenting of public lands.

"SEC. 102. The United States Commissioner is authorized to construct, equip, and operate and maintain all access roads, highways, railways, power lines, buildings, and facilities necessary in connection with any such project, and in his discretion to provide housing, subsistence, and medical and recreational facilities for the officers, agents, and employees of the United States, and/or for the contractors and their employees engaged in the construction, operation, and maintenance of any such project, and to make equitable charges therefor, or deductions from the salaries and wages due employees, or from progress payments due contractors, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine to be to the best interest of the United States, the sums of money so charged and collected or deducted to be credited to the appropriation for the project current at the time the obligations are incurred.

"SEC. 103. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for the use of the Commission, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the Treaty of February 3, 1944, and other treaties and conventions between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, under which the United States Section operates, and to discharge the statutory functions and duties of the United States Section. Such sums shall be available for construction, operation and maintenance of stream gaging stations, and their equipment and sites therefor; personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; services, including those of attorneys and appraisers, in accordance with the provisions of Section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C., sec. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $100 per diem and the United States Commissioner is hereby authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, to employ as consultants by contract or otherwise without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and the civil-service laws and regulations, retired personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States, who shall not be required to revert to an active status, and who shall be entitled to receive, as compensation for such temporary service, the difference between the rates of pay established therefor and their retired pay during the period or periods of such temporary employment; travel expense, including, in the discretion of the Commissioner, expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the activities of the Commission which may be necessary for the efficient discharge of the responsibilities of the Commission; hire, with or without personal services, of work animals, and animal-drawn and motor-propelled (including passenger) vehicles and aircraft and equipment; acquisition by donation, purchase, or condemnation, of real and personal property, including expenses of abstracts, certificates of title, and recording fees; purchase of ice and drinking water; inspection of equipment, supplies and materials by contract or otherwise; drilling and testing of foundations and dam sites, by contract if deemed necessary; payment for official telephone service in the field in case of official telephones installed in private houses when authorized under regulations established by the Commissioner; purchase of firearms and ammunition for guard purposes; and such other objects and purposes as may be permitted by laws applicable, in whole or in part, to the United States Section: *Provided*, That, when appropriations have been made for the commencement or continuation of construction or operation and maintenance of any such project, the United States Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 3679, 3732, and 3733 of the Revised Statutes or any other law, may enter into contracts beyond the amount actually appropriated for so much of the work on any such authorized project as the physical and orderly sequence of construction makes necessary, such contracts to be subject to and dependent upon future appropriations by Congress.

"SEC. 104. The United States Commissioner, in order to comply with the provisions of articles 12 and 23 of the treaty of February 3, 1944, between the United States and Mexico, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande below Fort Quitman, Texas, is authorized to acquire, in the name of the United States, by purchase or by proceedings in eminent domain, the physical properties owned by the Imperial Irrigation District of California, located in the vicinity of Andrade, California, consisting of the Alamo Canal in the United States, the Rockwood Intake, the Hanlon Heading, the quarry, buildings used in connection with such facilities, and appurtenant lands, and to reconstruct, operate and maintain such properties in connection with the administration of said treaty.

"SEC. 105. Funds heretofore appropriated to the Department of State under the heading 'International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico' shall be available for the purposes of this title: *Provided*, That authorizations under this title shall apply only to projects agreed upon by the two Governments in accordance with the treaty of February 3, 1944.

"TITLE II—DOUGLAS-AGUA PRIETA SANITATION PROJECT

"SEC. 201. That the Secretary of State is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to the conditions provided in this title, to enter into an agreement with the appropriate official or officials of the United Mexican States for the operation and maintenance by the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, of the Douglas-Agua Prieta sanitation project, located at Douglas, Arizona, and Agua Prieta, Sonora, Mexico, heretofore constructed by the said Commission, which agreement shall contain such provisions relating to a division between the two Governments of the costs of such operation and maintenance, or of the work involved therein, as may be recommended by said Commission and approved by the Government of Mexico and by the Secretary of State on behalf of the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That no such agreement shall be entered into until the governing body of the city of Douglas, Arizona, has given assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of State that it will so long as such agreement remains in force, contribute an equitable proportion, as determined, by the United States Section of said Commission, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, of the costs of such operation and maintenance allocated to the United States.

"SEC. 202. There is authorized to be appropriated to the United States section, International Boundary an Water Commission, United States and Mexico, such sums as may be necessary to defray such costs as may accrue to the United States arising out of any such agreement for the operation and maintenance of such project: *Provided*, That funds heretofore appropriated to the Department of State under the heading 'International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico', shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of this title: *Provided further*, That any moneys received from the United Mexican States under the terms of any such agreement shall be available for expenditure in connection with any appropriations which may be available or which may be made for the purposes of this title: *And provided further*, That moneys received from the city of Douglas, Arizona, pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be available for expenditure in connection with any appropriations which may be available or which may be made available for the purposes of this title.

"TITLE III—CALEXICO-MEXICALI SANITATION PROJECT

"SEC. 301. That the Secretary of State is authorized, subject to the conditions provided in this title, to enter into an agreement with the appropriate official or officials of the United Mexican States for the construction, operation, and maintenance by the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, of a sanitation project for the cities of Calexico, California, and Mexicali, Lower California, Mexico, which agreement shall contain such provisions relating to a division between the two Governments of the cost of such construction and operation and maintenance, or of the work involved therein, as may be recommended by the said Commission and approved by the Government of Mexico and by the Secretary of State on behalf of the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That no such agreement shall be entered into until the governing body of the city of Calexico, California, has given assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of State that, so long as such agreement remains in force, the city of Calexico will contribute an equitable proportion, as determined by the United States Section of said Commission, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, of the costs of such construction, operation, and maintenance allocated to the United States.

"SEC. 302. There is authorized to be appropriated to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, such sums as may be necessary to defray such costs as may accrue to the United States arising out of any

such agreement for the construction, operation, and maintenance of such project: *Provided*, That funds heretofore appropriated to the Department of State under the heading 'International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico', shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of this title: *Provided further*, That any moneys received from the United Mexican States under the terms of any such agreement shall be available for expenditure in connection with any appropriation which may be available or which may be made available for the purposes of this title: *And provided further*, That moneys received from the city of Calexico, California, pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be available for expenditure in connection with any appropriations which may be available or which may be made available for the purposes of this title."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill.

JOHN KEE,
JAS. P. RICHARDS,
A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD,
JOHN M. VORYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TOM CONNALLY,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
H. C. LODGE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3934) to amend the Act of May 13, 1924 (43 Stat. 118), as amended, relating to the United States-Mexican Boundary, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

S. 3934, the original Senate bill, contained only what is now Title I. The House version of Title I is substantially the same as the original Senate bill. This title, and Titles II and III, were originally before the House in H. R. 6304. H. R. 6304 itself is a combination of three bills referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 6304, as originally introduced, contained only what is now Title I. Title II, the Douglas-Agua Prieta project, was originally introduced as H. R. 7691. Title III, the Calexico-Mexicali project, was originally introduced as H. R. 6031. The Committee on Foreign Affairs combined the substance of all three bills and reported one bill—H. R. 6304—with three titles. The Senate bill was passed in lieu of H. R. 6304, after striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the provisions of H. R. 6304 as reported.

The conferees have retained the House provisions of Title I, but have agreed to modifications of language which, for the most part, clarify the provisions of Titles II and III without altering the substance. In effect, these changes provide that the United States section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, shall, with the approval of the Secretary of State, determine the equitable share of costs of operation and maintenance to be paid by the cities of Douglas and Calexico. In the House version, the determination of cost rested with the Secretary of State.

Under existing law, the municipalities bear the full cost of operating and maintaining these projects. However, a tremendous increase in population has taken place in the Mexican cities. Agua Prieta is now about three or four times larger than Douglas, its adjoining American city. Mexicali is now about 12 times larger than Calexico, its American neighbor. When the projects were planned, the cost to be paid by the United States cities was determined on the current estimates of population growth on both sides of the border. The Mexican cities have grown faster than their United States neighbors, and the rate of increase could not be foreseen. Because of this, it may become necessary for the Federal Government to assume a part of the burden until it can settle with Mexico the share to be paid by the Mexican cities.

In the House version, the municipalities would operate and maintain the projects. The conference agreement places this responsibility on the International Boundary and Water Commission. In both sanitation projects, the American municipalities concerned will make an "equitable contribution" for operation and maintenance. This would have been true in the House version. This principle has not been changed in the conference agreement.

As for operation and maintenance by the International Boundary and Water Commission rather than by the municipalities, the conferees agreed that a more efficient use of the projects would result from Commission operation and maintenance than from municipal operation and maintenance. The cities do not have adequate staffs to service the projects adequately. When official dealings with the Mexican cities are necessary—almost a certainty in projects of this type—the municipalities are not adequately equipped, and, as a matter of international law, have no authority. Such dealings are in law and fact international. The International Boundary and Water Commission is equipped to do this. For these reasons, the conferees concluded that operation and maintenance by the Commission was preferable.

JOHN KEE,
JAS. P. RICHARDS,
A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD,
JOHN M. VORYS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORM OF NATIONAL BUDGET AND DEPARTMENTAL ESTIMATES: GOVERNMENTAL ACCOUNTING AND AUDITING METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9038) to authorize the President to determine the form of the national budget and of departmental estimates, to modernize and simplify governmental accounting and auditing methods and procedures, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be recommitted to the committee of conference.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, this is merely referring the conference report, which we had up yesterday, back to the committee of conference?

Mr. DAWSON. That is right, sir.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I hope that the gentleman will insist upon the the position which has been taken against the Senate amendment, which would practically abrogate the rights of the appropriating committees of the Congress.

Mr. DAWSON. I have an idea how the House feels about it. I shall follow the wishes of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON. And I further ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

PHILIPPINE PROPERTY ACT OF 1946

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8546) to amend the Philippine Property Act of 1946.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain this bill?

Mr. CARNAHAN. This bill will allow the Philippine Alien Property Custodian to clear up his cases by June 30 of next year, and it provides that claims will then have to be filed in the United States courts rather than in the courts of the Philippines.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, there are 90 more days given for filing claims in the Philippines, and then the suits must be filed in the United States.

Mr. CARNAHAN. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. And it has a unanimous report, I believe.

Mr. CARNAHAN. That is right.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder to what date that 90-day provision will carry?

Mr. CARNAHAN. Ninety days after the date that this act would go into effect.

Mr. TABER. When will the 90 days begin to run and when would it end?

Mr. CARNAHAN. After the enactment of this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the final proviso of section 3 of the Philippine Property Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 418) is hereby amended to read as follows: "*And provided further*, That any suit authorized under the Trading

With the Enemy Act, as amended, with respect to property vested in or transferred to the President of the United States, the Alien Property Custodian, or any officer or agency designated by the President of the United States hereunder, which at the time of such vesting or transfer was located within the Philippines, shall after July 4, 1946, be brought, in the appropriate court of first instance of the Republic of the Philippines, against the officer or agency hereunder designated by the President of the United States with such right of appeal therefrom as may be provided by law, but suits with respect to such property shall after 90 days from the enactment of this act be brought only in the courts of the United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR LOSSES AND DAMAGES INFLICTED UPON THE PORTUGUESE TERRITORY OF MACAO

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9484) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the settlement of claims for losses and damages inflicted upon the Portuguese territory of Macao by United States armed forces during World War II in violation of neutral rights.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this involves only the small payment of $200,000 to a country which was of great help to the allied cause during the last war. The Portugal Government was a friendly neutral and generously gave us airports which permitted us to prosecute the war. This is but a belated acknowledgment of our indebtedness.

Mr. CARNAHAN. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay the sum of 1,172,762.39 patacas with interest at the rate of 71.49 patacas daily from December 31, 1949, to the date of payment to the Government of Portugal in full and final settlement of claims for losses and damages inflicted by United States Armed Forces upon persons and property in the territory of Macao during World War II in violation of neutral rights; and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $202,559.52 together with such additional sums as may be necessary, due to any increase in the exchange rate or to the accumulation of interest, to carry out the terms of the settlement.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST EDWARD A. RUMELY

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT CITING EDWARD A. RUMELY

The House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, created by the House of Representatives under House Resolution 298 of the Eighty-first Congress, was authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of (1) all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation; and (2) all activities of the agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation.

The Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and its executive secretary, Edward A. Rumely, have registered and reported as lobbyists under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act since October 7, 1946. Since that date the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., has reported spending approximately $2,000,000. One of the chief functions of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., is the distribution of books and pamphlets presenting one side of national legislative issues. In the period 1937 to 1944, prior to the enactment of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946, the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., distributed some 82,000,000 booklets, pamphlets, and other pieces of literature, or at the rate of about 12,000,000 pieces a year.

The Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., accepts two types of contributions:

1. Those under $490.
2. Those over $490.

Contributions under $490 are accepted in any form; i. e., cash, check, for the general fund of the committee, or for specific purposes, like distribution of copies of John T. Flynn's book, The Road Ahead.

Contributions of more than $490 are accepted in only one form, i. e., for specific purposes. Anyone wishing to give the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., more than $490 must state the specific purpose for which the contribution is to be used, and that purpose must be to distribute one or more of the committee's pamphlets, books, and so forth. The Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., then applies the term "sale" to such contributions and does not report them as contributions under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

Our study of this organization indicates very clearly that its most important function is the distribution of books and pamphlets in order to influence legislation directly and indirectly. It attempts to influence legislation directly by sending copies of books, pamphlets, and other printed materials to Members of Congress. It attempts to influence legislation indirectly by distributing hundreds of thousands of copies of these printed materials to people throughout the United States.

Of particular significance is the fact that Edward A. Rumely and the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., in recent years have devised a scheme for raising enormous funds without filing true reports pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. This scheme has the color of legality but in fact is a method of circumventing the law. It utilizes the system outlined above whereby contributions to the Committee for Constitutional Government are designated as payments for the purchase of books, which are transmitted to others at the direction of the purchaser, with both the contributor of the money and the recipients of the books totally unaware of the subterfuge in most cases.

The establishment of a separate category of money received from the sale of books and pamphlets benefits the Committee for Constitutional Government in that it permits it to accomplish distribution of propaganda at reduced expenses.

The distribution of printed material to influence legislation indirectly by influencing public opinion is the basic function of the Committee for Constitutional Government. If a person gives a sum of money to the Committee for Constitutional Government to help them in their work, this money must bear the expense of distribution of the printed material. On the other hand, when a contributor makes his contribution under the guise of a purchase of books and pamphlets, and distributes them himself, the distribution is accomplished without expense to the Committee for Constitutional Government.

A Committee for Constitutional Government pamphlet Octopus on the Potomac, indicated that the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., is well aware of the savings inherent in this method of operation. It noted that—

"A telephone girl * * * could mail out 1,000 or more * * * folders in a few days during her slack time.

"Use the * * * folder as a 'tuck-in' in mail to suppliers, place bulk quantities at meetings of service clubs. Professional men may welcome receiving bulk quantities to distribute from their reception rooms. Some firms have mailed thousands of such enclosures when sending dividend checks to stockholders."

Because of the refusal of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., to produce pertinent financial records, this committee was unable to determine whether or not the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., is evading or violating the letter or the spirit of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act by the establishment of class or contributions called "Receipts from the sale of books and literature," or whether they are complying with a law which requires amendments to strengthen it.

The policy of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., of refusing to accept contributions of more than $490 unless earmarked for books, etc., may also involve: (1) Dividing large contributions into installments of $490 or less, and causing the records of the Committee for Constitutional Government to reflect receipt of each installment on a different date, and/or causing the records of the Committee for Constitutional Government, to give credit for the several installments, to various relatives and associates of the actual contributor. (2) Causing the Committee for Constitutional Government's records as to "contributions" to reflect less than the total amount of contributions actually received, by labeling some part of such funds as payments made for printed matter.

Because of the refusal of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., to produce pertinent financial records, this committee was unable to determine whether or not the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act requires amendment to prevent division of large contributions into installments, or to prevent the crediting of contributions to others than the real contributor, or to prevent the use of other subterfuges.

Some of the booklets and pamphlets distributed by this lobby are as follows: The Road Ahead, by John T. Flynn; Why the Taft-Hartley Law, by Irving G. McCann; Compulsory Medical Care and the Welfare State, by Melchior Palyi.

Postal cards, dodgers, and leaflets are used to stimulate contributions to aid the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., distribute these books. These solicitations tie the books in with legislation. For example:

(a) A postcard, set forth in the record as exhibit A of the committee's proceedings under the date of June 27, 1950, soliciting mass purchases of The Road Ahead, states that "if you and others help distribute to millions this eye-opening book, they will see the perils ahead and reverse our movement into socialism."

(b) A leaflet, set forth in the record as exhibit B of the committee's proceedings under the date of June 27, 1950, entitled "Rent Control Plunderbund," sets out arguments against rent control, notes that "rent control is one step leading to socialism in the United States of America. Read The Road Ahead if you want to know the entire story. * * * Send this folder to others and help accomplish wide distribution. * * * Write for a quantity of these folders and send one to your councilman, to your mayor, your Congressman and Senator; and to your State legislators. Send them with a brief note expressing your own opinion; distribute them to friends, members of service clubs, to tenants and landlords, fellow employees or stockholders; to your physician, dentist, and lawyer; mail a copy to the editor of your newspaper."

(c) A leaflet set forth in the record as exhibit C of the committee's proceedings under the date of June 27, 1950, entitled "Our Medical Schools—Will They Be Next? S. 1453 Would Set Pattern for Nationalization of All Professional Schools," gives arguments against this bill (which is also H. R. 5940), the so-called Emergency Professional Health Training Act of 1949. This leaflet notes that many phyisicians have reexamined their position on this bill—

"Such reappraisal has been sharply stimulated by John T. Flynn's current book, The Road Ahead * * * (which) leaves no room for doubt as to the inevitable destination of our present course. If every thinking person could be induced to read this book, to use it as a text, and to tell his Senators and Congressmen what he expects of them, it might turn the tide."

(d) A leaflet set forth in the record as exhibit D of the committee's proceedings under date of June 27, 1950, entitled "Compulsory Medical Care and the Welfare State," contains quotations in praise of this book and a reprint of an editorial, Sugar Coated Tyranny. The editorial notes that the book "is of primary importance to American today. * * * Armed with such material as is included between the covers of Compulsory Medical Care and the Welfare State, you may be able to ward off this calamity."

This book was not published by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., but is being distributed by that group.

(e) A leaflet set forth in the record as exhibit E of the committee's proceedings under the date of June 27, 1950, entitled "Why the Taft-Hartley Law?" outlines the nature of the book, which favors that law. I note:

"As soon as the book comes from the presses, free distribution must be made to top-level, opinion-molding groups such as 16,000 editors and publishers of daily and weekly newspapers—religious, labor, farm, etc.—to Members of Congress, to 7,000 State legislators and governors, to 40,000 farm leaders, 1,700 presidents of universities, etc."

A note at the bottom of the order form reads:

"Purchase of educational literature to educate public opinion in upholding constitutional principles on which our free enterprise system rests, is legitimate corporate expenditure."

(f) A leaflet set forth in the record as exhibit F of the committee's proceedings under the date of June 27, 1950, entitled "Wagner Act Should Be Repealed" states five reasons why this law should be repealed, then advertises Labor Monopolies—or Freedom, by John Scoville, which shows why you cannot have both.

The leaflet continues:

"Express your convictions to your Senators and Congressmen. Enclose with your letter a copy of this leaflet. Also send them the book, Labor Monopolies—or Freedom."

(g) A confidential memorandum set forth in the record as exhibit G of the committee's proceedings under the date of June 27, 1950, entitled "Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., and Fighters for Freedom, Memorandum, Confidential, Not for Publication," instructs the reader to circulate the book The Road Ahead and to make The Road Ahead dominate national thinking and do its important job soon after the next session of Congress opens.

These leaflets and memoranda, coupled with the books themselves, are evidence that their distribution by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., constitutes an attempt by that organization to influence legislation, directly and indirectly. It is submitted that the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities and the Congress are entitled to know the identity of the large financial backers of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc. The mere identification would not in any way restrict or curb the activities of this organization, but would permit the Congress to know the source of the indirect pressures created by this distribution. That knowledge will put the Congress in a better position to evaluate those pressures.

The reports filed by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., do not identify the bulk purchasers, nor do they disclose the respective amounts of such bulk purchases. The House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities has obtained comparable information from other organizations, including some which are not registered and do not report under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, but the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities has been unable to obtain from the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., this kind of information. It has also been unable to obtain information as to loans made to the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., in connection with certain of its publications.

The chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities issued and caused to be served a subpena duces tecum on said Edward A. Rumely, directing him to be and appear before the said Select Committee on Lobbying Activities on June 6, 1950, at 10 a. m. and to bring with him such records of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., as would disclose the identity of all persons for whom $500 or more had been received in a given period whether under the name of "contributions" or "purchases" of books and pamphlets between the period January 1, 1947, and May 1, 1950, and then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee on Lobbying Activities. The subpena duces tecum served upon Edward A. Rumely is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"To: Benedict F. FitzGerald:

"You are hereby commanded to summon Edward A. Rumely, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., to be and appear before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable FRANK BUCHANAN is chairman, and to bring with him such of the records of said committee as indicated:

"(1) the name and address of each person[1] from whom a total of $1,000 or more has been received by the committee during the period January 1, 1947, to May 1, 1950, for any purpose, including, but not limited to (a) receipts from the sale of books, pamphlets, and other literature, (b) contributions, (c) loans;

"(2) as to each such person[1] the amount, date, and purpose of each payment which formed a part of the total of $1,000 or more, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Tuesday, June 6, 1950, Room 362, Old House Office Building, at the hour of 10:00 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of May 1950.

"[SEAL] Frank Buchanan
"FRANK BUCHANAN, *Chairman.*

"Attest:
"RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk.*"

The said subpena duces tecum was served on Edward A. Rumely by Benedict F. FitzGerald, Jr., counsel for the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. The return of the service of the subpena, endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures, as follows:

"Served on Edward A. Rumely at the offices of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City, on Friday, May 26, 1950, at about 5 p. m. by delivery in hand to the said Edward A. Rumely, by the undersigned.

"BENEDICT F. FITZGERALD, JR.,
"Counsel, House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities."

Pursuant to said subpena, Edward A. Rumely appeared before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities on June 6, 1950, but failed and refused to produce certain records called for in the subpena duces tecum, and as a result of such refusal the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities was deprived from receiving information concerning a matter committed to said committee. The record of the proceedings before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities held on Tuesday, June 6, 1950, during which the said Edward A. Rumely refused to furnish certain material pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is set forth in part as follows:

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE
ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES,
"Washington, D. C., Tuesday, June 6, 1950.

"The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:40 a. m., in the caucus room, Old House Office Building, Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN (chairman) presiding.

"Present: Representatives BUCHANAN, LANHAM, ALBERT, BROWN, and O'HARA.

"Also present: Benedict F. FitzGerald, Jr., committee counsel.

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brown, if you will yield for just a moment, I would like to record here the fact that we have a quorum present, and I shall announce the members of the committee and make acknowledgment of that fact as a part of the record.

"Mr. LANHAM, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. O'HARA, and myself. A quorum is thus present.

"The CHAIRMAN. Will you be sworn, Mr. Rumely?

---

[1] Includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other organization or group.

"Do you swear that the statements you make to the committee will be the truth, the whole truh, and nothing but the truth, so help you God, to the last great day?

"Mr. RUMELY. I do.

"TESTIMONY OF EDWARD A. RUMELY

"The CHAIRMAN. Give your name and address, please.

"Mr. RUMELY. Edward A. Rumely, R-u-m-e-l-y.

"The CHAIRMAN. What is your official connection with the Committee for Constitutional Government?

"Mr. RUMELY. I am executive secretary.

"The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been with this committee, sir?

"Mr. RUMELY. Since it was founded in 1937.

"The CHAIRMAN. Where are your official offices located?

"Mr. RUMELY. 205 East Forty-second, New York City.

"The CHAIRMAN. Are you or your organization registered under the Lobbying Act?

"Mr. RUMELY. We are, under protest.

"The CHAIRMAN. Under protest?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. A subpena was issued on the 25th day of May 1950, by authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, commanding Benedict F. FitzGerald, Jr., committee counsel, to summon you to be and appear before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the House of Representatives, of which I, Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, am chairman, and to bring with you such of the records of the Committee for Constitutional Government as indicate: (a) The name and address of each person from whom a total of $1,000 or more has been received by the Committee for Constitutional Government during the period January 1, 1947, to May 1, 1950, for any purpose, including, but not limited to (A) receipts from the sale of books, pamphlets, and other literature; (B) contributions; (C) loans; (b) as to each such person the amount, date, and purpose of each payment which formed a part of the total of $1,000 or more.

"I have before me a copy of the subpena. Do you have your subpena with you?

"Mr. RUMELY. I do; right here.

"The CHAIRMAN. Will you examine the subpena to determine whether or not it is an exact copy?

"Mr. RUMELY. This is a photostat of the subpena that was issued.

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes, that is a duplicate.

"The CHAIRMAN. The copy is the same.

"Mr. RUMELY. It is a copy of the same subpena.

"The CHAIRMAN. And you are here in response to the subpena?

"Mr. RUMELY. I am here in response to the subpena.

"The CHAIRMAN. And you are ready to produce these records before the committee, as stated in the subpena?

"Mr. RUMELY. I am going to produce a part of the records and withhold a part.

"The CHAIRMAN. Of course, this subpena was served upon you by Benedict F. FitzGerald, Jr., Committee Counsel, on the 27th day of May, which I believe was on a Saturday; at what hour, do you recall?

"Mr. RUMELY. 4:45. I agreed to accept it at that time. Friday—I think it was Friday.

"The CHAIRMAN. Friday, at 4:45?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. You are now before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities at the time and place stated in the subpena; is that not a fact?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Did you bring with you the records of the Committee for Constitutional Government?

"Mr. RUMELY. I brought a portion of the records that we will supply the committee. There are certain areas that you ask information on, which I believe are outside of your power. I would like to make a statement, while I am under oath and subject to cross-examination.

"The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute, sir. What did you not bring?

"Mr. RUMELY. The names——

"The CHAIRMAN. As to points (a) and (b)?

"Mr. RUMELY. I brought all on point (a).

"The CHAIRMAN. That is the receipts from the sale of books?

"Mr. RUMELY. No, sir; not receipts from the sale of books. If you will allow me to make the statement——

"The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask you as to what you did bring, first.

"In other words, you have brought everything under section (a)?

"Mr. RUMELY. No. One moment. Section (a)——

"The CHAIRMAN. The names and addresses?

"Mr. RUMELY. No; not receipts from the sale of books, or the identity of purchasers of books. I don't mind giving the total income, but not the identity of the purchasers of books and literature.

"Mr. LANHAM. Do you have the records called for by the subpena in your custody and/or in your office?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

"Mr. LANHAM. Do you refuse now to comply with the orders of the committee directing you to produce these books and records—do you have them with you?

"Mr. RUMELY. I have information on the people who contributed——

"Mr. LANHAM. We didn't ask you for information. We asked you for books and records.

"Mr. RUMELY. We have transcripts.

"Mr. LANHAM. Do you have the books and records with you this morning in court—before the committee?

"Mr. RUMELY. I haven't them here. My auditor brought some.

"Mr. LANHAM. Do you have them here and are you ready to produce them for the committee?

"Mr. RUMELY. No; I do not have the books of account. We have the transcripts of them.

"Mr. LANHAM. I asked you whether you had the documents called for in the subpena, here before the committee this morning?

"Mr. RUMELY. I have a portion of the documents called for.

"Mr. LANHAM. You do not have all of the documents?

"Mr. RUMELY. I do not have all of the documents.

* * * * *

"Mr. BROWN. I would like for him to make a statement as to why he feels the way he does. If the committee is in error, we should know it. We have a right to have his views, what he is going to furnish, and what he feels he shouldn't furnish.

"Mr. RUMELY. May I have the opportunity of making a statement, while I am under oath, and subject to cross-examination?

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. BROWN asked a question, as to what you brought with you.

"Mr. BROWN. And I asked for a statement explaining what he brought and what he didn't bring.

"Mr. LANHAM. I object to his reading any statement until he has produced the records that the committee has asked for. He is in contempt of the committee until he does produce those records, and I object to his reading any statement until he has accounted for the production of those records.

"Mr. BROWN. I am really amazed and ashamed that this committee will not permit any citizen to say he is furnishing certain material requested and why he cannot, or he feels he should not, furnish other material.

"Mr. LANHAM. I do not object to his stating what he is supplying. I want him to state that, but object to his making a long statement.

"Mr. BROWN. I think we should be proud of our great democracy, of our great Republic, and of the way this committee has been conducted this morning.

"Mr. LANHAM. He just wants to use the committee as a sounding board.

"Mr. BROWN. I am afraid the committee has been used as a sounding board.

"The CHAIRMAN. May we have order, please.

"Mr. LANHAM. As long as he is in contempt of the committee——

"Mr. BROWN. I don't know that he is in contempt.

"Mr. LANHAM. I object to his reading any statement.

"Mr. BROWN. I don't know whether he is in contempt of the committee.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. BROWN asked you a question, Dr. Rumely. I would like to have you give an answer to the question. Will you state it again?

"Mr. BROWN. Yes. I would like to know what records you are willing to produce, and what records you feel you should not produce, and the reason therefor?

"Mr. RUMELY. I am willing to produce the records of all contributions of $1,000 or more within the period designated; I am willing to produce the records of all loans within the period designated, except a few that related to the promotion of The Road Ahead, and advertising Fighters for Freedom, which has nothing to do with lobbying. I am not going to produce the names of people who bought books because, under the Bill of Rights, that is beyond the power of your committee to investigate.

* * * * *

"Mr. BROWN. It is your contention that, inasmuch as you are in the publishing business, that, as a publisher—I want you to get this question very clear: Is it your contention that as a publisher, operating under a constitutional guaranty of the freedom of the press, that you are perfectly ready and willing to submit to this committee any information, any records that you may have, which you feel, or which the committee may feel, after you have had an opportunity to explain, in any way would come under the purview of the Lobby Registration Act, or under the purview of this committee, but that you do not feel you can be compelled to report to anyone as to your activities as a publisher, only as it may be in the direction of influencing legislation?

"Mr. RUMELY. That is true. That is an exact statement of our position.

"Mr. BROWN. In other words—and I think the press of the country should pay attention to this—the Congress has a right to investigate and to look into, under this resolution, the activities of any publisher when it comes to attempting to influence legislation—perhaps the postal rate bill might be a perfect example—but that no one in the Congress has the right to inquire into the certain field that has been held sacred under the constitutional freedom of the press, that is your right to publish books, magazines, newspapers, or whatever it is that you may publish legally, so long as they are not subversive or against the best interests of the United States.

"Mr. RUMELY. That is exactly the position.

* * * * *

"Mr. LANHAM. I can't agree with the gentleman. There is no question of freedom of the press, at all, involved here. Here is a lobby organization whose primary purpose is that of influencing legislation. Then, incidentally, they turn to trying to influence legislation indirectly by trying to help form public opinion. That, too, is no doubt perfectly legitimate; but it seems to me that if an organization, whose primary purpose

is stated to be that of lobbying, incidentally engages in the publication of books to influence public opinion, especially where the record will show, as I believe it will in this case, the accepting of payments, of contributions, of not more than $490, and anything above that being used to purchase books, it seems to me that certainly is subterfuge in the collection of funds for lobbying purposes, and I think that is what the record will show.

* * * * *

"Mr. LANHAM. Could we get back to the question at issue?

"Mr. BROWN. We have been right on it; dead center.

"Mr. LANHAM. You refuse to produce for the committee this morning the names of persons to whom you have sold these publications?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you don't want to furnish to the committee the names of those who purchased these books?

"Mr. RUMELY. No. We think that is beyond your power to inquire into.

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. I would be very pleased if you would furnish to the committee those records that you have this morning. You have refused to give the names of people who have purchased books?

"Mr. RUMELY. I will give you, Mr. BUCHANAN——

"The CHAIRMAN. Under the terms of the subpena that has been issued to you.

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is all I wish to comment on at this time.

"Mr. RUMELY. I want to read one sentence——

"The CHAIRMAN. Will you turn that over to the committee——

"Mr. RUMELY. I will turn that over to the committee if you will let me make one statement, read one sentence.

"Mr. O'HARA. Why can't he make his statement?

"The CHAIRMAN. I would like to see what he has.

"Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, this committee cannot accept anything conditionally. If he is ready to produce, all right.

"Mr. RUMELY. I am depending on your good grace.

"(Some documents were passed to the chairman.)

"The CHAIRMAN. We will let him make a statement.

"Mr. BROWN. Certainly, there is such a thing as a constitutional guaranty.

"Mr. LANHAM. Not until he produces the records——

"The CHAIRMAN. In other words, these two sheets here are all that you care to furnish at this time in answer to the subpena; is that right?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes; that is right.

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. But you have not furnished the committee with the complete list of things that you were subpenaed to furnish?

"Mr. RUMELY. I have not furnished the committee the list of buyers of our books and a few loans we made to publish the books.

"The CHAIRMAN. And you still refuse to furnish us with that information?

"Mr. RUMELY. I have been advised by counsel not to do that.

"The CHAIRMAN. You may file your entire statement.

* * * * *

"Mr. BROWN. * * * The gentleman has mentioned a certain cross-examination I made of Mr. Goodman, who is secretary, I think, of some CIO housing committee, in connection with certain housing legislation activities. The pamphlets to which he referred were pamphlets in direct support of housing legislation and housing proposals then before the Congress. They were not books or booklets of general information. They were used primarily and only for the purpose of being distributed among those individuals who wished them, and were also presented to Members of the Congress in argument as to why housing legislation should be enacted. Therefore, I think they come generally under the lobby law.

"Mr. Rumely, if you have any booklets similar to that, in which you have set forth the reasons why certain legislative proposals before Congress should be enacted, or certain legislative proposals should be defeated, and you have sent those out over the country wholesale, either as gifts or through other organizations, then I think this committee has an absolute right to demand information on them.

"Mr. RUMELY. We have issued no such books.

"Mr. BROWN. However, if your publication field were——

"Mr. RUMELY. We have issued no such books.

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. At this point, will you permit the Chair to interrogate the witness?

"You have in your own statement stated that you have published the Constitution of the United States, by Thomas James Norton, and The Road Ahead, by John T. Flynn. Two additional books, not mentioned by you, were published and distributed: Compulsory Medical Care, by Melchior Palyi; and Why the Taft-Hartley Law, by Irving B. McCann. In your own statement, you admit publishing those and distributing them.

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes, sir; we are distributing them.

"The CHAIRMAN. To whom?

"Mr. RUMELY. The McCann book isn't yet printed, but we will be distributing it in 4 or 5 weeks.

"The CHAIRMAN. To whom?

"Mr. RUMELY. We have about 10,000 orders on hand.

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, that is the purpose of the subpena——

"Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Rumely, you say you already furnished to the committee everything except the names of the purchasers of your books and those who have made loans for the purpose of publishing books?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes, sir. Just for the express purpose of publishing the book or printing ads on Fighters for Freedom. It has no relation to lobbying.

"Mr. ALBERT. Has the committee got all of your other records except those; does the committee have in its possession all other records except those?

"Mr. RUMELY. Your committee has; yes. All that you asked for, except you will find in my statement what was excepted, and what I have told you is a fact, that we have declined to give the names of the quantity purchasers of the books; 90 percent, 95 percent, are bought in quantities of 1 to 10; but, for example, a doctor in the West with a big clinic, he bought a few thousand copies of John Flynn's book, and wrote to all his patients of 10 years, "If you will write me a postcard, I will send you a copy." If I drag his name in—he isn't lobbying. The FBI bought a big bunch of the Constitution book. How would they feel? They wanted their agents to know what was legal. How would they feel if we reported they were engaged in lobbying?

"Mr. ALBERT. It is not a question of how they feel. It is a question of fact. We are trying to find out what you have done and what you intend to do.

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

"Mr. RUMELY. They got 350 copies.

"Mr. LANHAM. If the doctors bought this book that you say you were publishing, against socialized medicine, they would be lobbying.

"Mr. RUMELY. No. May I tell you what the book is? The book is a result of a 6-month study in Europe by one of the greater European economists, to see what happens under compulsory medical care in every country. There isn't one word about socialized medicine in this country. It is a study of what happened in Europe.

"Mr. LANHAM. You distributed because you want to discourage that sort of legislation, and a doctor, if he were to distribute it, would be getting it from you for that purpose, would he not?

"Mr. RUMELY. We distribute it because we want to preserve private industry. I do it with enthusiasm, because I worked as a medical intern under the Bismarck system, and I know how disruptive that kind of medicine can be.

"Mr. LANHAM. I agree with you on socialized medicine. I am not in favor of it. But the point is, if you distribute this book, and if the doctors buy it and distribute it, they are engaged in lobbying, in an attempt to influence legislation.

"Mr. RUMELY. They are certainly not. If building informed public opinion is lobbying, then our whole conception of freedom is wrong. There is a copy of that book here. Look at it.

"Mr. LANHAM. I don't want to see it now. I am dealing with principles. You are attempting to influence, indirectly, legislation that is now pending before Congress.

"Mr. RUMELY. You have no right to go against—go into the field in which public opinion is made; you are out of bounds."

* * * * *

Thereafter, Edward A. Rumely appeared further before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities voluntarily in response to a request for such appearance by the chairman on Tuesday, June 27, Wednesday, June 28, and Thursday, June 29, 1950. Throughout the proceedings on said dates a quorum of the committee was present.

At the June 27 hearing Edward A. Rumely described the lobbying activities of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., in part as follows:

"Mr. RUMELY. Our lobbying consists of going out with a viewpoint to the country and informing people and letting the people talk to their Members of the Congress.

"The CHAIRMAN. The grass-roots approach?

"Mr. RUMELY. It is helping people get the facts on which to do their thinking.

* * * * *

"Mr. LANHAM. That seems to indicate pretty well that they are engaged in lobbying [indicating letter].

"Mr. RUMELY. We don't deny that.

"Mr. LANHAM. I think you said you registered under protest.

"Mr. RUMELY. We don't come down to Congress. We went back to the people and told them what would happen if we got a contingent of our population housed by the party in power. Ninety-five percent would vote to keep the 'ins' in; the housing would be expensive; it would disrupt our free-enterprise system. What we put out was sound information.

"Mr. ALBERT. May I ask a question here, Mr. Chairman?

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. ALBERT.

"Mr. ALBERT. Does your organization take a positive stand on definite legislative proposals, such as rent control, the Taft-Hartley law, compulsory health, for instance?

"Mr. RUMELY. When the Taft-Hartley law was under discussion we published Labor Monopolies or Freedom, which we distributed; we distributed 250,000 copies. All Members of Congress got a copy. It went to publishers. People who could take opin-

ion that way, and mint it into small coin to distribute to others.

* * * * *

"Mr. RUMELY. We try to supply the public such sound information that they will come to the right conclusions and uphold the right things.

"Mr. ALBERT. Didn't you tell me a minute ago that the book that you wrote, Labor Monopolies or Freedom, was placed on the desks of every Member of Congress?

"Mr. RUMELY. I think Mr. Frank Gannett paid for that distribution. Frank Gannett sent a copy to every newspaperman in the United States because he was impressed with the contents of the book. If I recall right, he included the Congressmen in his personal distribution.

* * * * *

"Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Rumely, I have here a letter dated April 1950, on the stationery of the Committee for Constitutional Government, addressed to 'All Members of Congress, on the Taft-Hartley law.'

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

"Mr. DOYLE. I will ask you to look at that and identify it, and then state if that isn't one of the techniques you used to influence Members of Congress? It is over your own signature. I received it through the mail, the United States mail, from your office.

"You identify it, don't you?

"Mr. RUMELY. That, certainly, i a letter that we put out."

* * * * *

In the course of his testimony on June 28, 1950, Edward A. Rumely refused on several occasions to furnish information in response to questions addressed to him. The record of the proceedings on June 28, 1950, during which such refusals occurred is set forth in part as follows:

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, passing on, I want to show you a carbon copy of a letter under date of June 16, 1949, to the Honorable RALPH W. GWINN, Congressman from New York. This letter purports to have been drawn by Willford I. King, chairman of your organization.

"Is that not his letter?

"Mr. RUMELY. That is his letter.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. And I direct your attention to paragraph 2 thereof. It says:

" 'It was fine of you to go along with us to see J. Howard Pew. He is certainly a very able and public-spirited gentleman. I believe your presence was extremely beneficial.'

"Is that Mr. J. Howard Pew, from Pennsylvania?

"Mr. RUMELY. It is.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. And he is one of your contributors, Mr. Rumely?

"Mr. RUMELY. He has bought books; and I am not going to give you information on that.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You refuse to answer that question?

"Mr. RUMELY. I refuse to answer that question.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to conclude with the letter from Mr. Rumely to Mr. Fletcher, of February 9, 1950, in which he discusses The Road Ahead, and he says that the industry of America has bought books, such as The Road Ahead to saturate the community and make a long-time imprint on its thinking.

"Mr. RUMELY. That is right. We are going to do that in Cleveland, Toledo, in Buffalo, in Rochester, in Niagara Falls, in Dallas, and we are going to do it in just as many cities as we can put a full-page ad into the paper—you must help stop socialism in America—and we will send it, if we can get the money to do it, a book into every fifth home, a copy of The Road Ahead, into every fifth home.

"I dined, the night before I came here, with a good woman from Toledo; she gave $2,000——

"Mr. FITZGERALD. What is her name, Dr. Rumely?

"Mr. RUMELY. I am not going to give you her name.

* * * * *

"Mr. RUMELY. We print books. Book publishing is as much under the protection of the first amendment as the printing of newspapers.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. If the committee would like to have it, I have a long brief on that subject, on the first amendment, showing that the freedoms guaranteed by the first amendment are not absolute; they may be the subject of governmental inquiry or control in the interest of restraining abuses within the constitutional ambit of governmental activity.

"What we have proposed to do is not to stop Dr. Rumely from producing any of his propaganda. It is merely to make inquiry into it and see what he is doing, so that his activities will be placed in the 'goldfish bowl.' There is no restraint whatsoever.

* * * * *

"Mr. DOYLE. May I ask this, please: Those exhibits that I referred to, those were also mailed to Members of the Congress?

"Mr. RUMELY. Certainly. I mailed them to all Members of the Congress, to all Washington correspondents, to all editors of daily newspapers, to all periodical publications, and to a few other smaller groups.

"Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I have two other questions along that line:

"When these books are purchased, under your theory, the purchasers do not know in advance to whom those books may be mailed by you?

"Mr. RUMELY. Most of the purchasers buy them, 90 percent, to be shipped to themselves; they know darn well whom they are going to give them to.

"Mr. DOYLE. Then you send them to the purchaser?

"Mr. RUMELY. Or the purchaser may say, "I want this group sent to farm leaders," and if he designates it, as his choice, we will make the mailing.

"Mr. DOYLE. You use the list in your office? If he says "farm leaders," then you use the list in your office?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes. So they don't get duplicates.

"Mr. DOYLE. But he doesn't have the list?

"Mr. RUMELY. He can have it, if he wants it. He designates it.

"Mr. DOYLE. But he doesn't name the particular persons to whom you mail those books?

"Mr. RUMELY. He mentions a particular group of persons. For example, this book, Compulsory Medical Care, we have one donor who has paid to send 15,550 libraries a copy of that book.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. What was that?

"Mr. RUMELY. I won't tell you.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You refuse?

"Mr. RUMELY. Certainly, I refuse to tell you.

"Let me finish.

"I am looking around now for another donor to send a copy to 15,000 editors, because we wish that book to hit the editors on the same day that the library gets it, because the editor may be moved to say something about it, and build up interest in it.

"Therefore, I am holding back the distribution of 15,500 to the libraries, until I can find some generous, public-spirited organization or person to pay for the distribution to the newspapers.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you actually publish this book?

"Mr. RUMELY. We publish it.

"The CHAIRMAN. In your headquarters—do you have a printing press?

"Mr. RUMELY. No; we hire the printing done outside.

"The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you are just the distributor of the material?

"Mr. RUMELY. All publishers—only a few have printing presses—generally, they can buy it much more cheaply than they can print it.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. In regard to the attack upon the committee, on the ground that they do not have any authority, I want at this time to offer for the record, borne out by evidence, that the committee is fully within its rights.

"In the recent case of *Oklahoma Press Publishing Co.* v. *Walling*, supra, the validity——

"The CHAIRMAN. Is this a Supreme Court decision?

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes; 327 U. S. 186. A subpena requiring a publisher to disclose the source and receipt of advertisements was upheld against the same constitutional objections asserted here.

"The breadth of Congress' right of inquiry, and specifically its right to find out the source of an individual's or corporation's receipt of funds as against the same constitutional objections raised here, is also demonstrated by the recent cases against the Hollywood writers, Lawson and Trumbo, certiorari denied April 10, 1950. These cases established that a congressional committee may compel disclosure of one's political beliefs and associations. Surely, Edward A. Rumely is not entitled to a greater immunity from disclosure of the names of the purchasers of the literature of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

"Mr. HALLECK. Counsel may be right about his legal conclusions, but, after all, there is an issue drawn that cannot be settled here.

"Mr. RUMELY. You cite me for contempt and bring me to trial, and you will get an education on the Bill of Rights.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rumely, will you permit Mr. HALLECK to continue.

"Mr. HALLECK. All I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, was that I have no objection to counsel putting that in the record, but whatever legal issue may be raised by the refusal of Dr. Rumely to give to the committee the name of persons who bought books, it is a matter that will have to be settled in the courts; obviously, it can't be settled here.

* * * * *

"Mr. DOYLE. That is one of the purposes of the committee, Dr. Rumely, to get the honest facts, whatever they are.

"Mr. RUMELY. I am perfectly willing to give everything except one thing. I haven't withheld anything, except the names of the buyers of our books. Those, you can't have."

On June 29, 1950, Edward A. Rumely further refused to answer a number of questions addressed to him in the proceedings before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. The record of these proceedings during which such refusals occurred are set forth in part as follows:

"Mr. FITZGERALD. As a matter of fact, Mr. Rumely, your organization did subsequently handle the program for a constitutional limitation on individual income tax, did it not?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes. We did that, all along; we have led on that, for the whole country, for a long period of time.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You have been the one that has been out in front on that one?

"Mr. RUMELY. I won't say we have been out in front, but we have put out much printed matter. One year we reached 650,000 people.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. How long have you had that program?

"Mr. RUMELY. Since 1942, I think.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. To get into another subject, Mr. Rumely, I notice that the book, Labor Monopolies and Freedom—you publish that?

"Mr. RUMELY. We did.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. And distribute it?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. It deals specifically with several legislative proposals. The general thesis of that book is shown in the following quotation on page 152:

" 'What we should do is to repeal all Federal labor laws on wages, hours of labor, collective bargaining, minimum wages, etc., and abolish all boards, bureaus, and commissions that result from these laws.'

"Then with regard to collective bargaining it states:

" '* * * the abuse to be eliminated is collective bargaining itself * * *.'

"Mr. RUMELY. That is right.

"The CHAIRMAN. Is that the platform of the Fighters for Freedom?

"Mr. FITZGERALD. No; those are excerpts from the Committee for Constitutional Government publication, Labor Monopolies and Freedom.

"Mr. RUMELY. John W. Scoville wrote the book. That is his opinion. We don't censor every line in a book we publish.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. In your appearance before this committee on June 6, 1950, one of the members of this committee stated:

" 'If you have any booklets similar to that, in which you have set forth the reasons why certain legislative proposals before Congress should be enacted, or certain legislative proposals should be defeated, and you have sent those out over the country wholesale, either as gifts or through organizations, then I think this committee has an absolute right to demand information on them.'

"You replied: 'We have issued no such books.'

"Mr. RUMELY. That is right.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask you——

"The CHAIRMAN. What member of the committee made the interrogation?

"Mr. FITZGERALD. That was transcript of hearing, June 6, page 62, I think Mr. Brown made that remark.

"You replied: 'We have issued no such books.'

"Mr. RUMELY. That is right.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, I ask you, Mr. Rumely, has the Committee for Constitutional Government received more than $500 in any one calendar quarter for the purpose of distributing copies of that book?

"Mr. RUMELY. I can't tell you now; but that book does not come in the classification that you are trying to place it in. The passage is simply a passage relating to this man's opinion that labor monopoly is just as bad as business monopoly; and when the Government encourages labor monopoly, it is engaging in a wrong economic policy. That isn't legislation; that is a general economic principle.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Will you produce the records set forth in the subpena of June 6, 1950, so that this committee may make its own independent determination on that subject?

"Mr. RUMELY. Give me the passage that you refer to.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. The question was, Has the Committee for Constitutional Government received more than $500 in any one calendar quarter for the purpose of distributing copies of that book Labor Monopolies or Freedom?

"Mr. RUMELY. I would like to see the passage.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. That isn't the question.

"Mr. RUMELY. Before I answer the question, I would like to see the copy; where is the reference?

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Page 152.

"The CHAIRMAN. That has no reference to the question.

"Mr. DOYLE. I would say this: that the text of the book speaks for itself. I don't thing it is subject to any interpretation by the witness.

"Mr. O'HARA. He has a right to look at it.

"Mr. DOYLE. Sure he has. The book speaks for itself.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. The question is, Has the Committee for Constitutional Government received more than $500 in any one calendar quarter for the purpose of distributing copies of this book?

"Mr. RUMELY. Probably.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. What is that?

"Mr. RUMELY. Probably; yes.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. State the names, dates, and amount as best you remember them.

"Mr. RUMELY. I can't.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Why can't you?

"Mr. RUMELY. I don't carry in my mind the purchasers.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Will you get the names for us?

"Mr. RUMELY. I am maintaining that that book is not a direct influence on legislation, and, therefore, is privileged as other books that we publish.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You refuse to give access to any records pertaining to the distribution of this book?

"Mr. RUMELY. I do.

"Mr. LANHAM. What is that book?

"The CHAIRMAN. You have engaged in mass distribution, through the Committee for Constitutional Government, have you not?

"Mr. RUMELY. I put out 250,000 copies of that.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. What is the date of publishing of this book, Labor Monopolies or Freedom—1946, is it not, Doctor?

"Mr. RUMELY. 1946.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. I am attempting to establish the position of the witness very clearly, with reference to specific persons and specific books as well as generally.

"The CHAIRMAN. As to mass distribution?

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. The question of whether the witness should be cited for contempt for refusal to produce documents and answer questions should, in my opinion, be based on a very clear, complete record.

"What about the book, Why the Taft-Hartley Law, by McCann?

"Mr. RUMELY. That isn't published yet.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. The Road Ahead?

"Mr. RUMELY. The Road Ahead, I have told you all along, we put out 600,000. I am not going to give you the names of the people who bought it.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Don't you feel The Road Ahead deals with specific legislation?

"Mr. RUMELY. The Road Ahead deals with stopping the march into socialism and the destruction of our form of Government.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. I think that the true significance of The Road Ahead can be obtained only by reading it in its entirety, and I respectfully suggest that the committee read it. It condemns practically all of the social legislation which has been passed by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, and opposes practically all of the present legislative program of President Truman. However, it does deal with specific legislation from time to time.

"For example, it deals with the war powers. On page 158 it states: 'We must curb the grasping hand of the Federal Government. We must restrain the grasping hand of the Executive. And our very first step must be to make a list of the emergency powers granted to the Executive for war purposes and then repeal every one of them.'

"It opposes compulsory national health insurance, the Brannan plan, Government credit regulation and direct Government lending, as exemplified by the Farm Credit Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agencies, home-loan banks, Federal savings and loan institutions, FHA, Public Housing Administration, and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The members of the committee were furnished with a memo on that book, and several others, when Mr. Rumely appeared.

"The CHAIRMAN. Is this your opinion, Mr. Counsel?

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Precisely.

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee——

"Mr. O'HARA. I don't think we are bound by that.

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee has been furnished with the notation.

"Mr. DOYLE. Counsel, will you fix the date of publication of The Road Ahead—what was the first date of publication?

"Mr. RUMELY. The Road Ahead was published in the spring of 1949 by Devin-Adair & Co., for the book trade.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. The date of publication?

"Mr. RUMELY. The date of publication was about June, as I recall.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. The date of distribution?

"Mr. RUMELY. We began to distribute in December 1949. Our first printing was 150,000 copies; our second printing, in December 1949, was 250,000 copies; our third printing, in February, 150,000; our fourth printing, in April 1950, was 200,000 copies; making a total of 750,000 copies.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. How many copies of Labor Monopolizes Freedom have you distributed?

"Mr. RUMELY. About 250,000.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. How many copies of Compulsory Medical Care?

"Mr. RUMELY. We have distributed about 130,000.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. When did you distribute them?

"Mr. RUMELY. In the last 4 or 5 months.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. After the Lobbying Act went into effect?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes; after the Lobby Act went into effect.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. That is so with Labor Monopolies or Freedom?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. How many copies do you plan to distribute?

"Mr. RUMELY. As many as we possibly can.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. How about the book, Why the Taft-Hartley Law?

"Mr. RUMELY. As soon as that is ready, we will print one hundred to one hundred and fifty thousand copies, and I will see what I can do to push it to large distribution.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You refuse to give us any information on those books?

"Mr. RUMELY. I refuse to give the names of the purchasers of quantities of that book, on the ground that you are invading the first article of the Constitution.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Even though you might be subject to citation for contempt on this particular point?

"Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may the record show that there is a quorum of the committee present at this time, and has been for the last hour?

"The CHAIRMAN. That has been established.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Has the Committee for Constitutional Government received any loans of over $500 in any one calendar quarter from any person since 1946?

"Mr. RUMELY. We reported the loans that we have received except—give me my statement of June 6. I made an exact statement of what we were doing. I said: 'I am going to produce the records on all contributions of $1,000 or more within the period designated. I am willing to produce the record of all loans within the period designated, except a few that related to the promotion of The Road Ahead and advertising Fighters for Freedom, which has nothing to do with lobbying. I am not going to produce the names of people who bought books, because, under the Bill of Rights, that is beyond the power of your committee to investigate.'

"Mr. FITZGERALD. And you take that position today?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. I might say that the total amount of loans and contributions that you did furnish to the committee aggregate a very small amount; in fact, I think it is about $25,000, in contrast to the very wide ramifications of conduct of your Committee for Constitutional Government, which, running as of the current quarter, will exceed $1,100,000 this year. I think that we have a right to know and have a right to seek that information.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You do distribute books to the school department in New York, to each teacher in New York City—copies of The Road Ahead?

"Mr. RUMELY. Not in New York City. We have, in some cities.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. What cities?

"Mr. RUMELY. In Houston. An attorney wrote in that he would get a few people to contribute money, enough to send The Road Ahead to every teacher in the town. We got an order for 3,000 copies. What we did was to send the Bill of Rights to about 200,000 schoolrooms, so that they could hang it up and have a ceremony, reading the Bill of Rights.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Had the American Medical Association ever sent the Committee for Constitutional Government more than $500, for books or other purposes?

"Mr. RUMELY. The American Medical Association never sent the Committee a penny. They want to spend their own money. Some State organizations have bought books.

"The CHAIRMAN. State medical societies or State medical groups?

"Mr. RUMELY. Some State organizations have bought books.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Where have they been located?

"Mr. RUMELY. I won't tell you. I am not giving the names of the people who bought books.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. That is one of the things you refuse to do?

"Mr. RUMELY. That is one of the things I refuse to do.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Are there more than 20 State medical associations that have sent the committee more than $500?

"Mr. RUMELY. No, no. There happen to be a few that have taken active leadership, and they bought, maybe, five or six.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Has the Physicians' Committee for the Extension of Medical Care ever sent you more than $500?

"Mr. RUMELY. Not a penny for The Road Ahead. We made a deal to acquire Compulsory Medical Care, which had been worked up before they disbanded. One of the great European economists was sent from country to country to study the effects of socialized medicine. He put it into manuscript form.

"The CHAIRMAN. How about the National Institute of Professional Service?

"Mr. RUMELY. That was organized by——

"The CHAIRMAN. They sent you a contribution of $20,000; is that right?

"Mr. RUMELY. We turned around and bought, for $18,000 of that, an edition of the book they had on hand, and spent $2,000 in sending those books out; so that it washed out, but left us with——

"The CHAIRMAN. The cost of distribution?

"Mr. RUMELY. Copyright use to publish the book further.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Has any person or group ever sent in more $500 at any one calendar quarter since January 1, 1947, for books, pamphlets, or for other purposes, other than the loans we have spoken of?

"Mr. RUMELY. Loans and contributions——

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Has any person——

"Mr. RUMELY. If you let me, I will give you an answer to that. Probably 15 percent of the total number of books that we have put out have been bought in quantities of 100 or more; 85 percent have been bought in quantities of from 1, 2, 5, 10, or 20. We desire the small purchasers, because it gives us a lot of enthusiastic workers who may buy more. Fifteen percent of the total volume has been purchased in larger quantities.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Those are the names that you do not wish to divulge?

"Mr. RUMELY. Those are the names that I decline to give you; I decline to give you any names of people who bought our books.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. I see.

"This is all at this time, Mr. Chairman.

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Doyle.

"Mr. DOYLE. I think, Mr. Chairman, as a member of this committee, that the material which our counsel has asked in the last few questions and which he asked for yesterday, and which information this witness has refused to give, repeatedly, is material which is pertinent, and, in accordance with the legal rights and responsibilities of this committee, and I believe that it is necessary to the proper function of this congressional committee, that this witness be required to answer these questions. I believe it is within the jurisdiction of Congress which assigned this responsibility to us, under House Resolution 298.

"I make this statement because I want the record to show that I believe this witness has refused contemptuously to answer questions that are pertinent and perfectly proper, perfectly legal, and which are material and which are in the best interests of the people of this country. I want the record to show that is my belief and my position.

"The CHAIRMAN. The witness refuses, of course.

"Mr. RUMELY. I certainly refuse to disclose those names—not contemptuously, but respectfully, because I feel it is my duty to uphold the fundamental principles of the Bill of Rights. I think that there is no power to require of a publisher the names of the people who buy his products, and that you are exceeding your right.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Because of the witness' refusal, I have no further material to offer at this time.

* * * * *

"Mr. DOYLE. I have been thinking about a matter that was raised—

"It is the contention of Mr. Rumely that he is in the publishing business rather than in lobbying business.

"The Committee for Constitutional Government is one of the heaviest spending lobbying groups on record. It has reported spending over $2,000,000 since the Lobbying Act went into effect, and yet has never revealed the identity of its big financial supporters.

"From time to time this organization has described itself as an ordinary commercial publisher. This lobbying organization differs from commercial publishers in many respects, some of which are:

"(1) A commercial publisher takes the normal risks of operating a private business—he does not beg the public for money to help him carry on.

"(2) A commercial publisher expects to pay income tax on his receipts—he does not seek tax exemption.

"(3) A commercial publisher is in business for profit; he is not primarily an advocate. He does not constantly grind out pamphlets, leaflets, books, etc., which present only one side of the subject.

"(4) A commercial publisher does not couple his publishing activities with incessant appeals to the citizenry to bring pressure to bear on Members of Congress in order to influence legislation.

"The commercial publishers of the United States are not governed by the Federal Lobbying Act in any way, and need not file reports under it. They are not attempting to influence legislation; they are attempting to make money. They should not be confused by attempts of out and out lobbying organizations to conceal their activities from Congress and the public.

"The Committee for Constitutional Government has also attempted to liken itself to educational institutions; but it ignores the following facts:

"1. An educational institution does not spend millions of dollars in pamphleteering campaigns designed to influence congressional action on legislation.

"2. An educational institution does not engage in a constant campaign for funds to carry on lobbying activities.

"3. An educational institution does not couple its activities with incessant appeals to the citizenry to bring pressure to bear on Members of Congress in order to influence legislation.

"4. An educational institution presents both sides of the question in an objective fashion for appraisal. It does not continually present only one viewpoint on each issue it considers.

"Considering all the aforementioned we can reach but one conclusion; Edward A. Rumely is not an educator. He is not a publisher. He is an ordinary, everyday run-of-the-mine lobbyist."

Thereafter on August 21, 1950, the chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities issued and caused to be served a subpena duces tecum on said Edward A. Rumely, directing him to be and appear before the said House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities on August 25, 1950, at 10 a. m., and to bring with him such records of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., as would disclose the identity of all persons from whom $500 or more had been received in a given period, whether under the name of "contributions" or "purchases" of books and pamphlets between the period from January 1, 1947, and August 1, 1950, and then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. The subpena duces tecum served upon the said Edward A. Rumely is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"To Wm. Earl Griffin:

"You are hereby commanded to summon Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y., to be and appear before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable FRANK BUCHANAN is chairman, and to bring with him the following documents in his custody (see Annex) relating to—

"(a) The organization and finances of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., and

"(b) The activities of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., its members, officers, directors, representatives, agents, and employees pertaining to legislation, in their chamber room 362, Old House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on Friday, August 25, 1950, at the hour of 10, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 21st day of August 1950.

"[SEAL] FRANK BUCHANAN, *Chairman.*

"Attest:

"RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk.*

"SUBPENA ANNEX—COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

"1. Such of the records of the committee as indicate:

"(a) The name and address of each person[2] from whom a total of $500 or more has been received by the committee during the period from January 1, 1947, to August 1, 1950, for any purpose.

"(b) as to each such person,[2] the amount, date and purpose of each payment which formed a part of the total of $500 or more, and all correspondence[3] relating to each such payment.

"2. Each monthly statement for each bank account maintained by the Committee at any time between January 1, 1947, and August 1, 1950, including but not limited to the following:

"a. at the National City Bank, East Midtown branch, accounts denominated Deposit Account "C"; Disbursing Account "C"; Deposit Account "I"; Disbursing Account "I"; General Fund Account "A."

"b. Accounts in Knoxville, Tenn.

"c. Accounts in Nashville, Tenn.

"d. Accounts in Memphis, Tenn.

"e. Accounts in Chattanooga, Tenn.

"3. Each check drawn on each such account referred to in paragraph 2 which has returned to the possession of the Committee.

"As to all documents called for in this subpena, carbon, photostat, or recordak copies should be produced in the event that original documents are not in the possession of the Committee."

The said subpena duces tecum was served on Edward A. Rumely by Earl Griffin, clerk for the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. The return of the service of the subpena endorsed thereon is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for_____

"before the Committee on the_____

"Served: This subpena, together with the annex affixed hereto, was served in hand by me on Edward A. Rumely, at the offices of the Committee for Constitutional Government, suite 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y., Tuesday, August 22, 1950, at 2:15 p. m.

"WM. EARL GRIFFIN,
"Clerk, House of Representatives."

Pursuant to the said subpena, Edward A. Rumely appeared before the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities on August 25, 1950, but failed and refused to produce certain records called for in the subpena duces tecum, and as a result of such refusal the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities was again deprived from receiving information concerning a matter committed to said committee. The record of the proceedings before the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities held on Friday, August 25, 1950, during which the said Edward A. Rumely refused to furnish certain material pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is set forth in part as follows:

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"SELECT COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING LOBBYING ACTIVITIES,
"Washington, D. C., Friday, August 25, 1950.

"The committee met pursuant to adjournment, at 10:05 a. m., in the caucus room, Old House Office Building, Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN (chairman), presiding.

"Present: Representatives BUCHANAN, LANHAM, ALBERT, DOYLE, BROWN, and O'HARA.

"Also present: Benedict F. FitzGerald, Jr., counsel to the committe.

"The CHAIRMAN. Will you take your seat, Mr. Rumely?

"The meeting will come to order, please. The House is scheduled to meet this morning at 11 a. m., and we would like to finish in time to attend the session.

* * * * *

"Now, the hearing was called for a specific purpose. This is not a hearing inquiring into lobbying techniques and methods such as we went into with the Committee for Constitutional Government before, or at their scheduled hearings back in June. It is a specific request for information from the witness.

"As we all know, Mr. Rumely refused on June 6, in answer to a subpena, to produce certain records of his organization dealing with receipts and contributions.

"When he was called later on June 27, 28, and 29, 1950, for the series of hearings into the Committee for Constitutional Government's lobbying activities and methods and operations, he again refused to provide information on the names of contributors and the amounts of their payments. Since then we have obtained from numerous sources information dealing with the payment of specific sums of money to the Committee for Constitutional Government, and I have given to Mr. Rumely the citations of some of these specific payments, so that he knows exactly the ones that we are most interested in today.

"We have asked him to bring in the information on these particular instances. It is regrettable to me that we have had to go to the lengths that were necessary in order to dig out essential facts about this lobbying organization.

"This investigation is not and never has been a snooping expedition, and it is regrettable to me when a committee of Congress is set aside in such manner that requests for information that it requires in order to make a comprehensive, intelligent, and objective investigation are refused so that we have had to resort in invoking our powers of subpena and getting the information where it could be found.

"I would like to have recorded here the fact that there is a quorum present consisting of myself, Mr. LANHAM, Mr. ALBERT, and Mr. DOYLE; Mr. BROWN and Mr. O'HARA are on their way over, and you will note as they enter the room, Mr. Stenographer, that a quorum is present at this time.

"Will you be sworn, Mr. Rumely?

"Will you solemnly swear by Almighty God that the statements you make before this committee shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

"Mr. RUMELY. I do.

"The CHAIRMAN. Counsel will proceed.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You appear this morning in response to a subpena served on you calling for your appearance here, is that not so?

"TESTIMONY OF EDWARD A. RUMELY (ACCOMPANIED BY NEIL BURKINSHAW, COUNSEL)—RESUMED

"Mr. RUMELY. I do.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to direct your attention to this exhibit that I hold in my hand which purports to be a carbon copy of a subpena issued by the chairman, FRANK BUCHANAN, on the 21st day of August 1950. Is that an accurate copy?

"Mr. RUMELY. That is the one that was served on me.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. And that requires your appearance here on Friday, August 25, 1950, at 10 o'clock. You are now before the committee mentioned in the subpena?

"Mr. RUMELY. I am.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Have you brought with you the documents that have been described in this subpena and annex affixed thereto?

"Mr. RUMELY. I have brought along information on all the 25 points about which Chairman BUCHANAN telephoned.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not ask you that question. I asked you if you had brought the material that is mentioned in this subpena. I am not mentioning any telephone call or anything else—this subpena and the annex affixed thereto, have you brought that material?

"Mr. RUMELY. As far as it was physically possible. But you asked for things that could not be produced in the course of months if we put six or eight people to work on it; so far as we physically could, I did, and I have got a statement outlining exactly the situation if you——

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Because of the limited time, I will go through these then, Mr. Rumely, and at this time I would like to offer the copy of the subpena in evidence, to make it part of the record.

"The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it will be included as a part of the record.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Have you brought each of the returned checks drawn on the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., Deposit Account 'C' maintained at the National City Bank, East Midtown Branch, New York, N. Y.?

"Mr. RUMELY. We put in four men to work on it, and it took 43½ hours.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Have you got it?

"Mr. RUMELY. For 1 month. I have got a statement here that will explain the situation, and that you ask an impossible thing.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. By 'returned check' I mean, Mr. Rumely, a check that was drawn on the account delivered to another person, and then returned to your bank and charged to your account after having been deposited by the payee or some endorser, you understand that?

"Mr. RUMELY. I have 1 month here, and you are asking for 37 months, and it took us 43½ hours and four people.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. And you only have 1 month here?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. But you have neglected to bring the rest?

"Mr. RUMELY. I have not neglected.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You have neglected to bring the other months?

"Mr. RUMELY. You ask an impossible thing.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. The answer is that you have not brought them because it is an impossibility.

"Mr. RUMELY. You ask an impossibility.

"The CHAIRMAN. Aren't these the same things we asked for at the previous hearing in June, Doctor?

"Mr. RUMELY. No; they are not the same things.

"The CHAIRMAN. In general, are they not the same? In general, are they not the same?

"Mr. RUMELY. No; these checks were never asked for before.

"The CHAIRMAN. Well, we asked for your complete financial record, which would include these checks, and you did not submit them to the committee at that time, June 27, 28, or 29, 1950?

"Mr. RUMELY. There was no indication that you wanted the canceled checks.

"The CHAIRMAN. You have a complete list of what we asked for?

"Mr. RUMELY. Yes.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Rumely, what records does the committee keep on contributions on any specific person? For example, supposing you wanted to find out for yourself how much Irénée du Pont had given your committee as donations and how much he had remitted to you for pamphlets or other literature to be

[2] The term "person" as here and hereinafter used throughout this subpena includes an individual, partnership, corporation, association, committee, and any other organization or group of persons.

[3] The term "correspondence" means letters, telegrams, memoranda, and transcripts or memoranda of telephone conversations.

distributed by you or to be sent by you to him for distribution? What records do you have that will show how much that one individual gave to your committee?

"Mr. RUMELY. We list every day on sheets about as big as a newspaper page the names and amounts and the purpose—the sheet has columns "Literature," "Books," "Contributions," or whatever there is there, and we list each day the name, the amount, and the purpose on that sheet, and we have about, in the period that you cover, we have between four or five thousand sheets with a hundred thousand entries.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. The subpena calls for the names and addresses of all persons sending $500 or more.

"Mr. RUMELY. If you will take my statement, you will get my answer.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You did not bring them all?

"Mr. RUMELY. It was an impossibility, just as you asked the bank to bring the copies of the checks, and the bank said it would take 10 men a year to do that. If you ask a thing that cannot be done in 4 months to be done in 2½ days you are asking the impossible.

"The CHAIRMAN. We might say, Mr. Rumely, that we sent one accountant up to the bank, and he did the job in 3 or 4 days, and worked about 4 hours a day.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, in your previous testimony you made mention of the following individuals who had made large payments to the Committee for Constitutional Government. You said J. Howard Pew, of Pennsylvania, had made some large payments. How much did he make, or how much did he——

"Mr. RUMELY. I don't recall that testimony.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You say or you said that a woman from Toledo gave you $2,000. Do you remember that in your previous testimony?

"Mr. RUMELY. For distribution of The Road Ahead.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Who was that woman?

"Mr. RUMELY. We are not giving you the names of the people who bought our books.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, you refuse to give that information?

"Mr. RUMELY. I refuse to give the names of people who bought our books. You are invading our constitutional right as publishers.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Even though you are registered as a lobbyist, and you realize——

"Mr. RUMELY. I am registered not for that activity, but because I send to Congress releases and other material, and as we have a publishing enterprise, two-thirds of our activities, or more, is the sale of books and literature, and we are not going to——

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You refuse, even in the light of the fact that we have subpenaed you here this morning, and we have a quorum present at the present time, and we might find you in contempt should you fail to comply with the questions that are proper and are pertinent to this occasion?

"Mr. RUMELY. They are not proper and pertinent; when a subordinate law of Congress conflicts with the organic law in the Constitution the subordinate law has to give way, and the organic law prevails, and you are trying to bust up the Bill of Rights and you are going to set the precedents of doing it.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, with respect to the names of the State medical associations which have purchased books from you, or furnished you with contributions, you refuse to give us that information also, is that right?

"Mr. RUMELY. We have not been furnished contributions; they have bought books, and——

"Mr. FITZGERALD. How many medical associations have bought books?

"Mr. RUMELY. Probably a dozen.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. What are the names of those?

"Mr. RUMELY. I will not give the names of purchasers of books, I have told you that repeatedly.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Rumely, I want to be perfectly fair with you, to give you this opportunity to answer these questions. Remember that this committee has contempt powers and they might be exercised should you fail.

"In view of that, would you change your mind and give us this information?

"Mr. RUMELY. I cannot where a constitutional question is involved. If we set the precedent of yielding against our conviction and against the advice of our lawyers that the first and fourth amendments cover our book operations, why then, we, instead of upholding constitutional government are setting a precedent to break it down, and we are not going to do it. It is a hot spot; I do not want to be in the spot.

"The CHAIRMAN. It is indicated to counsel that the answer of the witness is in negation of the question, and counsel will continue.

"Mr. RUMELY. I stated again——

"The CHAIRMAN. We do not need to go any further."

* * * * *

"AUGUST 25, 1950.

"MEMORANDUM

"To. Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN, chairman, House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities.

"From: Benedict F. FitzGerald, Jr., counsel, House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities.

"Subject: Committee for Constitutional Government, Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary.

"On August 21, 1950, a subpena duces tecum was issued by you, commanding Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., to appear before the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities on Friday, August 25, 1950, at 10 a. m.

"The said Edward A. Rumely appeared at the date and hour mentioned and remained until 11:10 a. m.

"During the period of his appearance the said Edward A. Rumely, failed to comply with the aforesaid subpena duces tecum in the following manner:

"1. He failed to produce original documents of any type whatsoever.

"2. He failed to produce either the originals or photostats of the records of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., as indicate:

"(a) The name and address of each person from whom a total of $500 or more has been received by the committee during the period from January 1, 1947, to August 1, 1950, for any purpose.

"(b) As to each such person, the amount, date, and purpose of each payment which formed a part of the total of $500 or more, and all correspondence relating to each such payment.

"3. The original or photostats of each 'returned' check drawn on each account maintained by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., during the period from January 1, 1947, to August 1, 1950, in the following banks:

"(a) National City Bank, East Midtown Branch, New York, N. Y., in the following accounts:

"(1) Disbursing Account C.

"(2) Disbursing Account I.

"(3) General Fund Account A.

"(b) Commercial National Bank, Knoxville, Tenn.

"(c) Commercial Union Bank, Nashville, Tenn.

"(d) Hamilton National Bank, Chattanooga, Tenn.

"(e) Ohio National Bank, Columbus, Ohio.

"BENEDICT F. FITZGERALD, Jr.,
"Counsel, House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities."

Because of the foregoing, the said Select Committee on Lobbying Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said Edward A. Rumely relative to the subject matter which under House Resolution No. 298 of the Eighty-first Congress the said Select Committee on Lobbying Activities was directed to investigate, and the refusal of Edward A. Rumely to furnish the information in response to the subpenas duces tecum hereinabove set forth, or in response to questions addressed to him under oath before a quorum of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities during Edward A. Rumely's voluntary appearances before said committee, deprived the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of necessary and pertinent testimony and information and places the said witness, Edward A. Rumely, in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

A copy of the resolution prepared for presentation in connection herewith is set forth in words and figures, as follows:

(Mr. BUCHANAN submitted the following resolution:)

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities as to the refusal of Edward A. Rumely to answer questions and produce documents before the said Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Edward A. Rumely may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. BUCHANAN (interrupting the reading of the report). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the report be dispensed with and that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 834) certifying the report of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities as to the refusal of Edward A. Rumely to answer questions and produce documents before the said committee, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities as to the refusal of Edward A. Rumely to answer questions and produce documents before the said Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Edward A. Rumely may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, of which I have the honor of being chairman, was directed to investigate "all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation."

At the time our investigation started, the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 had been in effect for a little over 3 years. We set about trying to find out how well this statute worked, whether it had any loopholes, ambiguities or other defects which would require corrective legislation. We found that the terms of the lobbying act were very broad. It is important to note at this point that the text of the statute nowhere includes the word "lobbying." It refers, instead, to groups or individuals who receive contributions, expend money, or engage themselves for any consideration for the purpose of influencing the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress, directly or indirectly. The words "contribution" and "legislation" are specifically defined in that statute, and give a very broad meaning.

So we started with a very broad field to cover. At the outset we made preliminary surveys of the financial reports which had been filed with the clerk of the House by organizations which were admittedly attempting to influence legislation. We found that the Committee for Constitutional Government had reported spending over $2,000,000 for lobbying and yet had never disclosed the name of one single contributor.

We investigated further into the subject and found that the committee had always refused to disclose the identity of its financial backers. In fact, it has gotten so that Rumely brags about not letting anyone know who his financial angels are. On of the recent releases of the Committee for Constitutional Government said of our investigation:

> Just as the Black-Minton committee of 1938 and the Anderson campaign expenditures committee of 1944 were frustrated in their demands for the names of our contributors, so now again the names will not be revealed.

Rumely is not the only one connected with the Committee for Constitutional Government who brags about refusing to tell Congress and the public the identity of their financial supporters. One of the exhibits introduced at our hearings is a letter from Sumner Gerard, treasurer of the Committee for Constitutional Government, to Henry Bass, of Enid, Okla. It speaks of the Committee for Constitutional Government and says:

> Unlike most of those groups that flourish for a while like the green bay tree and then fade out of sight, our committee has been functioning for over 10 years, and we have many scalps in our belt. Twice have we been before congressional investigating committees who sought to learn how we manage to survive. We even licked them there and refused to give them the names of our supporters.

So you see they are quite adept at this sort of covering up of identity of contributors.

Now we wanted full and complete information about all of the financial operations of the Committee for Constitutional Government for several reasons. We had noted that their lobbying reports announced that the organization received no contributions of more than $490. But the same reports carefully listed large sums of money which were alleged to have been received for the sale of books and pamphlets. The large sums of money were reported, but not the identity of the person from whom the money had come. The listing of the gross amounts of such receipts was accompanied by statements to the effect that such receipts could not possibly be considered as contributions under the Lobbying Act, but they reported them just the same, and that made us wonder. Was it possible that a means of evading the act had been devised? Could it be that this organization took in money in any amount, but applied the word "contribution" only if the sum of money were less than $500, and called the transaction a sale if the amount received was more than $500?

If so, our committee wanted to give serious thought to the question of amending the Lobbying Act to cover such a situation, if it were not already covered. Our study of this lobbying group has convinced me that our suspicions were true, and I also believe that this is an evasion of the act and is within the scope of the law as it now reads. I am, therefore, going to recommend to the Justice Department that they conduct an FBI investigation of the Committee for Constitutional Government with a view to prosecution for failure to comply with the Lobbying Act.

In addition to the subterfuge outlined above, I felt that the policy of the Committee for Constitutional Government of refusing to accept contributions of more than $490 unless earmarked for books, and so forth, might involve: First, dividing large contributions into installments of $490 or less, and causing the records of the Committee for Constitutional Government to reflect receipt of each installment on a different date, and/or causing the records of the Committee for Constitutional Government to give credit, for the several installments, to various relatives and associates of the actual contributor; or, second, causing the Committee for Constitutional Government's records as to contributions to reflect less than the total amount of contributions actually received, by labeling some part of such funds as payments made for printed matter.

In order to find out whether our suspicions about Rumely's organization were true or not, we subpenaed him to testify and produce financial records on June 6, 1950.

The subpena called for the name and address of each person who had given $1,000 or more to the Committee for Constitutional Government in a 3½-year period, plus the date, amount, and purpose of each payment which went to make up the $1,000 total. Now, since we were trying to get to the bottom of this phony sale dodge, we had to ask for such information in broad language, and not restrict ourselves to the word "contributions" because we knew Rumely would apply his own narrow interpretation to that word and come in and tell us the answer was "none." So we said in the subpena that the records produced should be for money received for any purpose, including, but not limited to:

(A) Receipts from the sale of books, pamphlets, and other literature.

(B) Contributions.

(C) Loans.

When Rumely appeared, I asked him (Rept., p. 7):

> And you are ready to produce these records before the committee, as stated in the subpena?

And he replied:

> I am going to produce a part of the records and withhold a part.

Later in the same day I asked him (Rept., p. 7):

> Did you bring with you the records of the Committee for Constitutional Government?

And he replied:

> I brought a portion of the records that we will supply the committee. There are certain areas that you ask information on, which I believe are outside of your power.

When I asked Rumely if he had brought the records of what he calls sales of books and other literature, he said:

> No; not receipts from the sale of books, or the identity of purchasers of books. I don't mind giving the total income, but not the identity of the purchasers of books and literature.

Then, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], wishing to establish that the records we were seeking did actually exist, asked:

> Do you have the records called for by the subpena in your custody and/or in your office?

And Rumely replied:

> Yes.

Then the following colloquy ensued between the gentleman from Georgia, Judge LANHAM, and Rumely:

> Mr. LANHAM. Do you refuse now to comply with the orders of the committee directing you to produce these books and records—do you have them with you?
>
> Mr. RUMELY. I have inforformation on the people who contributed—
>
> Mr. LANHAM. We didn't ask you for information. We asked you for books and records.
>
> Mr. RUMELY. We have transcripts.
>
> Mr. LANHAM. Do you have the books and records with you this morning in court—before the committee?
>
> Mr. RUMELY. I haven't them here. My auditor brought some.
>
> Mr. LANHAM. Do you have them here and are you ready to produce them for the committee?
>
> Mr. RUMELY. No; I do not have the books of account. We have the transcripts of them.
>
> Mr. LANHAM. I asked you whether you had the documents called for in the subpena, here before the committee this morning?
>
> Mr. RUMELY. I have a portion of the documents called for.
>
> Mr. LANHAM. You do not have all of the documents.
>
> Mr. RUMELY. I do not have all of the documents.

So, you see, he had not brought any records at all. He brought transcripts of the portions of the records which he thought were fit for us to see, but not the records themselves. This callous de-

fiance was aimed at preventing us from achieving our announced objective, which was to find out whether this book sale business was an open and honest operation or just a way of evading the Lobbying Act section which called for the names of contributors.

But Rumely insisted on refusing to produce the records which would show what we wanted. He said (Rept., p. 8):

I am willing to produce the records of all contributions of $1,000 or more within the period designated; I am willing to produce the records of all loans within the period designated; except a few that related to the promotion of The Road Ahead, and advertising Fighters for Freedom, which has nothing to do with lobbying. I am not going to produce the names of people who bought books because, under the Bill of Rights, that is beyond the power of your committee to investigate.

Of course, when he said he was willing to produce the names of contributors he meant the names of those who were contributors as he interpreted that word. He would not let the committee investigate and make its own finding on the facts.

The same goes for loans. He refused to produce the books of his organization showing loans, except those loans he wished us to have. He specifically refused, as I have just quoted, to give us information about loans for advertising Fighters for Freedom and promotion of The Road Ahead because he had decided they had nothing to do with lobbying. We wanted those records so we could decide that question. We did not want to leave it up to Mr. Rumely to decide, in view of his past history.

Also on this point, I asked Mr. Rumely (Rept., p. 9):

But you have not furnished the committee with the complete list of things that you were subpenaed to furnish?

And he replied:

I have not furnished the committee the list of buyers of our books and a few loans we made to publish the books.

Mr. Rumely very succinctly stated the reason for his refusal (Rept., p. 10):

You have no right to go against—go into the field in which public opinion is made; you are out of bounds.

On June 27, Rumely was once again before the committee, this time voluntarily and not in response to a subpena. Hundreds of documents were introduced into the record showing the lobbying activities of the Committee for Constitutional Government. Mr. Rumely, in one frank remark said (Rept., p. 11):

Our lobbying consists of going out with a viewpoint to the country, and informing people and letting the people talk to their Members of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The grass-roots approach?

Mr. RUMELY. It is helping people get the facts on which to do their thinking.

On the same day, Mr. LANHAM, referring to a letter from the files of Rumely's organization, said (Rept., p. 11):

That seems to indicate pretty well that they are engaged in lobbying.

And Mr. Rumely replied:

We don't deny that.

In an appearance before the committee on June 28, the following dialogue took place (Rept., p. 12):

Mr. FITZGERALD. I want to conclude with the letter from Mr. Rumely to Mr. Fletcher, of February 9, 1950, in which he discusses The Road Ahead, and he says that the industry of America has bought books, such as The Road Ahead, to saturate the community and make a long-time imprint on its thinking.

Mr. RUMELY. That is right. We are going to do that in Cleveland, Toledo, in Buffalo, in Rochester, in Niagara Falls, in Dallas, and we are going to do it in just as many cities as we can put a full-page ad into the paper—you must help stop socialism in America—and we will send, if we can get the money to do it, a book into every fifth home, a copy of The Road Ahead—into every fifth home.

I dined, the night I came here, with a good woman from Toledo; she gave $2,000——

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is her name, Mr. Rumely?

Mr. RUMELY. I am not going to give you her name.

Just last week, on Friday, August 25, Rumely appeared again before our committee in response to a subpena which called for such of the records of the Committee for Constitutional Government as show the name and address of each person from whom a total of $500 or more had been received in a 3½-year period, and the date, amount, and purpose of each payment which formed a part of the total of $500 or more. He was also subpenaed to produce monthly statements and cancelled checks from various bank accounts of the Committee for Constitutional Government.

At that time Mr. FitzGerald asked him several questions about the financial dealings of the Committee for Constitutional Government and the manner in which it deposited its receipts. The following colloquy is very illuminating—transcript, page 609:

Mr. FITZGERALD. When you deposit your money in your A, C, and I accounts you make no effort to differentiate between money received in amounts under $500, called contributions, and any amounts over $500 called receipts from the sale of books, do you?

Mr. RUMELY. We do not in that.

So you see it all goes into the same bank account. It is all money, and it is all used to finance the committee's avowed objective—the mass distribution of books and pamphlets giving one side of questions having legislative significance.

Then Mr. FitzGerald asked—transcript, page 610:

* * * what records does the committee keep on the contributions of any specific person? For example, supposing you wanted to find out for yourself how much Irénée du Pont had given your committee as donations and how much he had remitted to you for pamphlets or other literature to be distributed by you or to be sent by you to him for distribution? What records do you have that will show how much that one individual gave your committee?

Mr. RUMELY. We list every day on sheets about as big as a newspaper page the names and amounts and the purpose—the sheet has columns "Literature," "Books," "Contributions," or whatever there is there, and we list each day the name, the amount, and the purpose on that sheet, and we have about, in the period you cover, we have between four and five thousand sheets with a hundred thousand entries.

But Rumely did not produce these sheets, although he had taken the time to get an approximate count on them, and even the number of entries, which we had not asked for. But we had asked for the name and address of each person from whom a total of $500 or more had been received during a 3½-year period, and the date, amount, purpose, and all correspondence in connection with each such payment which formed a part of the total of $500 or more.

Those sheets would have given us a long start toward the answers to the questions in our mind, but Mr. Rumely refused and failed to produce them.

Another reason why we were interested in Mr. Rumely's alleged "book sales" is contained in a letter dated February 9, 1950, from Rumely to Mr. John Fletcher, Sr., Chattanooga, Tenn., which is one of our hearing exhibits. It reads in part as follows:

Here is a copy of a letter that Harvey C. Fruehauf is sending to 100,000 business leaders. Nothing that we have ever put out has brought such a response as is coming in to the book, The Road Ahead. We have 1,900,000 of these cards in circulation now and expect to add another 1,100,000 during the next 10 days. The book not only convinces, but arouses people to action. The industries that buy are requested to set aside one-third of their purchase for leadership distribution for homes in the community and to earmark two-thirds for their own employees. This plan will so saturate a community as to make a long-time imprint on its thinking. The sale of books provides funds to pay for the ads and the enlistment letters preceding it.

So now we have Mr. Rumely in letters admitting that he is attempting to saturate the thinking of the community, and also admitting that this book-sale business financed other activities of his organization. Yet this witness had the brazen effrontery to tell our committee that Congress had no right to even ask about their phony book-sale dodge.

On June 27, when Rumely appeared before our committee, he said:

We receive fifteen to twenty thousand contributions a year, and we get, on the average, over-all, $15 or $20 about what a union labor member pays. If we took the few names that give $500, it would look as if our committee had millionaire support * * *. You misrepresent the sources of support when you pick out a few rich men, able to give $500.

For all of his posturing as a man of the people, the fact remains that Mr. Rumely and his organization are living on the largess of those few rich men, able to give $500. An analysis of the bank deposits of the Committee for Constitutional Government and two allied groups, America's Future and the

Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation, give the true picture. I would like to introduce it into the RECORD at this time.

Group	Period	Total deposits	Amount of checks of $500 or more	Percentage of total deposits [1]	Number of checks of $500 or more	Average size of checks of $500 or more
America's Future	1947–50	$1,054,721.65	$560,883.49	53.1	423	$1,326
Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation, Inc.	1947–50	139,239.17	85,095.00	61.1	71	1,199
Committee for Constitutional Government (deposit account C)	1947–50	1,285,125.82	508,343.04	39.6	383	1,320
Total					877	

[1] High as these percentages are, they do not include multiple contributions of $490 by the same person or group. These are frequent because of Committee for Constitutional Government's professed unwillingness to accept larger general constributions in order to avoid disclosure under the Lobbying Act.

Mr. Rumely grossly misrepresented the truth when he insisted that large contributors were merely incidental to his operations. On the contrary, it is to these contributors that Mr. Rumely owes his present prosperity, particularly since he received a 4 percent commission on all Committee for Constitutional Government receipts.

The analysis shows that in a 3-year period more than 53 percent of the dollar value of all deposits of America's Future consisted of checks of $500 or over. The average size of the checks of $500 or more was $1,326. Over $560,000 in America's Future income came from checks of $500 or more.

In the 3-year period from 1947–50, more than 61 percent of the dollar value of all deposits of the Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation consisted of checks of $500 or more. The average size of the checks of $500 or over was $1,199. Over $85,000 of the foundation's income came from checks of $500 or more.

In the 3-year period from 1947 to 1950, more than 39 percent of the dollar value of deposits in one account of the Committee for Constitutional Government consisted of $500 or more. The average size of the checks of $500 or more was $1,320. Over $508,000 of the Committee for Constitutional Government's income came from checks of $500 or more.

Of course, the subpena we served related only to the Committee for Constitutional Government, and not for the other two groups, but the testimony shows clearly that they are subsidiary adjuncts of the Committee for Constitutional Government.

Late in May we sent a questionnaire letter to business corporations, farm and labor groups, asking about expenditures relating to attempts to influence legislation, directly or indirectly. The replies to this letter have been almost uniformly illuminating. They have given us a wealth of information about twentieth century lobbying.

Among other things, they show very clearly that the mass distribution of literature is being utilized by many business corporations and public utilities to influence the people on legislative issues. Millions of copies of books like The Road Ahead and similar books are being distributed to foremen and supervisory personnel, community leaders, the clergy, and other opinion-molding groups.

One corporation which responded to our questionnaire letter, the Eli Lilly Co., stated that they had contributed $25,000 to the Committee for Constitutional Government. This aroused our curiosity, since Rumely claimed he did not take contributions of over $500.

We wrote to the Eli Lilly Co. and asked them to send us the photostatic copy of the check and photostatic copies of all correspondence relating to their contribution of $25,000 to Rumely's organization. Their reply was frank, honest and very revealing.

The correspondence between the Eli Lilly Co. and the Committee for Constitutional Government started on January 10, 1950, when the Lilly Co. wrote to Rumely's organization:

This is to advise you that our budget committee has approved a contribution of $25,000 to the Committee for Constitutional Government for the calendar year 1950.

In approving this contribution, it was the consensus of opinion of our budget committee that we should like to have you use some of these funds in distributing books, pamphlets, Paul Revere messages, etc., to a mailing list which we will supply you with. Such a mailing list would include school teachers, members of the clergy, and other influential groups of our local community.

Sumner Gerard, treasurer of the Committee for Constitutional Government, replied on January 17, 1950:

Your letter of January 10 announcing a $25,000 purchase of our educational material was a source of great encouragement to Dr. King and myself.

Please note that Eli Lilly used the word "contribution" and merely asks that an unspecified portion of the contribution be applied to the distribution of Rumely's books and leaflets. The letter of acknowledgment from the Committee for Constitutional Government, however, nowhere mentions the word "contribution" but very carefully attempts to make the entire $25,000 contribution appear as a "purchase of * * * education material." This is exactly what we suspected had been going on.

At this point in the record I would like to introduce a letter of our committee to the Eli Lilly Co., together with their reply, which includes the text of the correspondence which Eli Lilly had with the Committee for Constitutional Government concerning their $25,000 contribution.

ELI LILLY & CO.,
Indianapolis 6, U. S. A., July 21, 1950.

Hon. FRANK BUCHANAN,
House Office Building,
House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BUCHANAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 13 which was not delivered to our offices until July 17.

In accordance with your request we are enclosing herewith photostatic copies of correspondence relating to our payment of $25,000 in 1950 to the Committee for Constitutional Government. A photostatic copy of the canceled check by which the payment was made is included with this material.

Very truly yours,
W. M. WHEELER, Jr.

JANUARY 10, 1950.

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT,
205 East Forty-second Street,
New York 17, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: This is to advise you that our budget committee has approved a contribution of $25,000 to the Committee for Constitutional Government for the calendar year 1950.

In approving this contribution, it was the consensus of opinion of our budget committee that we should like to have you use some of these funds in distributing books, pamphlets, Paul Revere messages, etc., to a mailing list which we will supply you with. Such a mailing list would include school teachers, members of the clergy, and other influential groups of our local community. Can you advise me as to how large a mailing list this contribution will supply with the educational material which your committee publishes?

It is also our opinion that perhaps distribution of every publication to these individuals might be so excessive as to do more harm than good. The tendency might arise for these people to throw everything that comes in the mail into the nearest waste basket. Therefore, would it be possible, in case we so desire, to supply you with a mailing list and to have you mail to them only those publications which we designate.

With all good wishes for a very successful year, I am

Sincerely yours.

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT,
January 17, 1950.

Mr. E. L. NOYES,
Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis 6, Ind.

MY DEAR MR. NOYES: Your letter of January 10 announcing a $25,000 purchase of our educational material was a source of great encouragement to Dr. King and myself. Because of Mr. Gannett's frequently expressed admiration and friendship for you, we sent him a copy of your letter. On Monday morning he telephoned from Miami Beach greatly pleased over this news.

Your substantial purchase so early in the year will enable us to lift our committee's activities to higher levels of effectiveness. We have found that money put to work in January multiplies itself several fold during the year by bringing in additional support. This purchase of material should be charged on your books as an outright purchase and not as a contribution.

The firm of Farabaugh, Pettengill, Chapleau & Roper have given us an opinion that such purchases of material to uphold our free-enterprise system are legitimate corporate expense, like other advertising, and the Treasury Department has accepted in hundreds of cases such expenditures as legitimate corporate purchases. When purchasing, it is necessary for the purchaser to do exactly what you suggest, namely, to designate the material purchased and the direction of its distribution.

We will service a list of 5,000 names at $4 per individual name 22 times between February and December 1950; or a list of 10,000 eleven times; or of 25,000 four times. In connection with this we will include the distribution of 5,000 copies of Norton's great book The Constitution of the United States: Its Sources and Its Application, and 3,000

copies of Pettengill's For Americans Only. We stand ready to cooperate with you in working out in detail, as may best suit your wishes, the servicing of such lists as you designate.

We suggest that you set aside $8 per name for the full Paul Revere messages service to 300 including all State legislators in Indiana (150), the balance of 150 to go to names that you particularly designate in your own organization or in the city of Indianapolis. We will include in this service a copy of the Norton book and a copy of Dr. King's The Keys to Prosperity which should have a special value to State legislators.

With $20,000 for the mailings, $2,400 for this Paul Revere service to 300 names, there would be left $2,600. We would suggest that you set aside this amount, at $1 per copy, for 2,600 copies of Compulsory Medical Care and the Welfare State, by Melchior Palyi. The report upon which this book is based was worked up at a substantial expenditure by the National Physicians Committee before it disbanded. We expect to have shortly 20,000 copies in book form, publication price $2. Our price to you will be $1 per copy.

The contents of the book are of such great importance that distribution to key leaders in national thinking and in positions of public influence should be made soon. If you agreed to allot $2,600 to this distribution we will bear distribution cost and send to all Members of Congress, all Governors, to selected editors, newspaper columnists, and radio commentators, and to 600 of the top level leaders in the medical profession, including all officers of State medical associations.

Any portion of this distribution where you desired it we would be glad to include your courtesy card as donor. Otherwise we shall distribute over the name of the committee itself. In the case of Palyi's book we shall seek some individual of public influence to write an accompanying letter calling attention to the book and its great importance. In the distribution to Congress we might have Congressman Smith himself—the head of a medical clinic and highly respected in both Houses of Congress—write the accompanying letter asking that every Member read the content. Please note copy of the telegram to members of the Rules Committee enclosed herewith.

Our trustees will meet on January 25 and it would be a matter of great encouragement if we could have this transaction closed by that date.

In the meantime, if you or any other member of your organization come to New York City, do give Dr. King and other members a chance to exchange thought with you.

Sincerely yours,

SUMNER GERARD, *Treasurer.*

JANUARY 24, 1950.

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT,
205 East Forty-second Street,
New York 17, N. Y.
(Attention: Mr. Sumner Gerard, Treasurer)

DEAR MR. GERARD: Thank you very much for your reply of January 17, which fully answered the questions which we raised. Therefore I am enclosing our check of $25,000 and with it goes our best wishes for success in the committee's efforts.

I am turning over your letter to Mr. J. F. Modrall of our industrial relations division, who is working very closely with the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce on the community part of our company's over-all program. You will undoubtedly hear from him at some future date concerning the mailing of your various publications.

Very truly yours,

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT,
February 20, 1950.

Mr. NIKOLAS L. NOYES,
Treasurer, Eli Lilly & Co.,
Indianapolis 6, Ind.

MY DEAR MR. NOYES: Attached hereto is your receipt for $25,000 for which a credit is being set up on our books against which you may draw for any literature we distribute.

We have available now in a preliminary fiber-bound edition Dr. Palyi's Compulsory Medicine and the Welfare State. We have entered the printing order and have in process a second printing of 100,000 copies with the Perma-board covers. The retail price is $2; bulk price $1.10. You may wish to draw against this book supply for distribution to lists in which you are interested, charging to the credit established.

We have just mailed the 310 top leaders of AMA the letter Dear Fellow-American, copy of which is enclosed.

Thanks again for your helpful cooperation in the purchase and distribution of the committee's educational literature.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD A. RUMELY,
Executive Secretary.

ELI LILLY & Co.
Office of E. L. Noyes, Assistant Treasurer,
Indianapolis 6, Ind.

Distribute the committee's literature. Government by citizens can work successfully only if citizens are informed, interested, willing to make effort and sacrifices. There must be leadership on national issues in every locality. We as voters must exercise our rights and fulfill our duties or democracy will fail. Make yourself a committee of one in your circles and community; send for any or all of the items of literature described on the back of this receipt; up to 10 free, postpaid, of any piece; for a larger supply you may wish to make some remittance to cover cost. Use this material to arouse and inform others. The committee's leadership will become increasingly effective is you and citizens everywhere respond and give support.

Help enlist others.

We are deeply grateful to you for your support of the committee and your help in the distribution of its educational literature.

Voluntary aid such as you have given makes it possible to intensify and broaden the scope of this nonpartisan educational effort.

---------- Tear here ----------

No. 81164

We hereby acknowledge receipt of $25,000.

Your remittance has been applied as directed for one or more of the following purposes:

------ A—General work of Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

------ B—For books, literature, or special purpose or fund, as directed by you.

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT, INC.,
205 East Forty-second Street,
New York 17, N. Y.

Per (signed) H. HIMSWORTH,
Auditor and Assistant Treasurer.

Date: January 26, 1950.

Ask for free literature listed below, sent anywhere, postage prepaid:

"I Am the Bill of Rights" folder. Up to 20 free; 150 for $1; $5 per thousand; postpaid anywhere.

"Bismarck's Golden Chain." Leaflet showing evils of compulsory health insurance. Up to 10 free. $1 for 300; $3 per 1,000; postpaid anywhere.

"Webster Leaflet. A More Glorious Edifice." Up to 20 free. $1 for 400; $2 per 1,000; postpaid anywhere.

"What American Democracy Means to Me." How much Americans gain from the Constitution and American way of life. Valuable for school children and adults. Up to 20 free. $1 for 200; $4 per 1,000; postpaid anywhere.

"The Church and Business—Friend or Foe." Up to 10 free. $1 for 150; $5 per 1,000; postpaid anywhere.

"Free Prices and Full Employment." A common-sense analysis showing why price controls check employment and prosperity. Up to 6 free. $1 for 60; $2 for 150; $8 per 1,000; postpaid anywhere.

"The Man on the Street." Holds America's fate in the hollow of his hand. Folder showing benefits of private enterprise and need for thrifty investors. Up to 6 free. $1 for 100; $2 for 225; $8 per 1,000; postpaid anywhere.

"The Only Path to Tomorrow," by Ayn Rand. Collectivist doctrine that supremacy of common good enslaves men. Only one source of progress: Individual man in independent action. Up to 5 free. 40 for $1; 100 for $2; 200 to 700 at $1.60 per 100; 1,000 for $15; postpaid anywhere.

"Why Democratic Socialism Breaks Down" (leaflet)—Politicians controlling jobs promise high wages and low prices, hence bankruptcy or inflation. Five copies free; 40 for $1; 100 for $2.50; 200 to 700, $2 per 100; 1,000 or more, 1½ cents each.

"Politicians Put This Burden on Your Back." Shows how each 100 families had to support two jobholders in 1930, three in 1940, and five today; also why bureaucratic horde fostering needless waste must be kicked off citizens' backs by taxpayers' rebellion. Up to 20 free. One dollar for 100; postpaid anywhere.

"Extracts From Hearings by House Committee on Labor and Education." Testimony by Dr. Willford I. King on harmful effects of labor monopolies. Shows why we should return to equality before the law to get maximum production and highest real wages—44 packages. One dollar for 10; 25 to 200, 8 cents each; larger quantities, 6 cents per name, if address is supplied on gummed labels; postpaid anywhere.

"What the Election Did Not Prove" (leaflet). Analysis showing how vital issues were not presented to the voters. Twenty copies free; 200 for $1; $4 per 1,000.

"What Is Ahead—Inflation or Deflation?" Proves last 2 years' price rise based on velocity, which may end with falling prices if confidence gives way to pessimism. Two copies free; 10 for $1; 25 to 700, 8 cents each; 1,000 or more, 6 cents each.

"Political (Socialized) Medicine". Shows how Washington politicians controlling health funds will undermine the medical and dental care that all citizens' families will receive. Six copies free; 25 for $1; 100 to 700, 3 cents each; 1,000 or more, 2½ cents each.

"Warning." Description of best book on "The Constitution of the United States; Its Sources and Its Application." Twenty copies free on request; postpaid anywhere.

"Suggestions for Changes in the Federal Tax Laws," by Robert B. Dresser (booklet). Sets forth nine steps that should be taken immediately, and the reason why. Immediate wide distribution important. Twenty-four-page booklet. Ask for three copies free; in bulk, 20 to 800, 5 cents per copy; 1,000 or more, 4 cents per copy; postpaid anywhere.

Continued on reverse side under Leaflets, Folders, Booklets.

(See other side.)

MAKE YOUR HELP MOST EFFECTIVE BY PURCHASING AND DISTRIBUTING THE COMMITTEE'S EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL AND SERVICES

Corporate or individual support can be effectively and usefully furnished by purchase of any or all of the items or services provided by the committee. Such purchases do not fall in the category of contributions

SERVICES

Paul Revere Messages—two or more a week mailed biweekly. Authoritative comments on

the vital issues confronting the United States. An informative service calculated to guide the thinking of readers in a constructive and persuasive fashion. Forceful and convincing writers with backgrounds on the subjects covered.

Single subscriptions, one year $10; two 1-year subscriptions $17; 3 to 24 subscriptions at $8 each; 25 to 80 at $7.50 each; 100 or more at $7 each. (Send lists of names with multiple subscriptions.)

King Economic Puzzles (10 separate bulletins). A course in fundamental economics discussing the all-important wage and profit structure. Done in plain English and attractively printed in brief form. Adapted for employee lists, for school and college work and desirable for teachers, members of the clergy, state and national legislators.

Mailed at stated intervals to lists furnished at $1 per name.

All committee releases—News bulletins, reports, special research data including reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, roster of Congress by States and Districts and selected Paul Revere Messages.

Serviced to lists furnished at $10 per name for 1 year.

Americanism series (six separate mailings). Comprising material that strengthens appreciation of our constitutional system and the American way of life; series featured by initial presentation of a book and Bill of Rights wall piece.

Serviced to lists furnished at $2 per name.

BOOKS

Book price schedule

Title	Single copy	3 copies for—	5 to 80 copies, per copy	100 to 700 copies, per copy	1,000 or more, per copy
1. Labor Monopolies or Freedom—John Scoville	$1.00	$2.00	$0.60	$0.55	$0.50
2. Constitution of the United States—Thomas J. Norton	.69	2.00	.63	.62	.60
3. For Americans Only—Samuel B. Pettengill	.60	1.38	.42	.40	.35
4. The Keys to Prosperity—Willford I. King:					
Fiber-bound	2.00	5.70	1.80	1.70	1.60
Cloth-bound	4.00	9.60			
5. Hunger and History—E. Parmelee Prentice	1.00	2.85	.90	.85	.80

1. Labor Monopolies or Freedom (Scoville), card-bound, pocket size, 168 pages. A sledgehammer attack at the fallacies underlying the evil of labor monopolies. Scoville makes his economics of freedom understandable to the simplest mind on the Bowery, or on Main Street.

2. The Constitution of the United States (Norton), card-bound, pocket size, 320 pages. Every home, office, school, and library should have this volume. A thoroughly accredited text and reference book about Our Constitution—the Civil Bible of America. (Available also in cloth-bound edition.)

3. For Americans Only (Pettengill), card-bound, 192 pages. A staggering revelation of what totalitarian planners have done to undermine constitutional liberties; for all who love this country and are willing to fight encroachments of national socialism, this book is indispensable.

4. The Keys to Prosperity (Willford I. King) Economic Principles for a Modern Society. As basic as Adam Smith's The Wealth of Nations. A must book. Distribute widely. (Available also in cloth-bound edition.)

5. Hunger and History (E. Parmelee Prentice), How Economic Freedom brought food abundance.

PARTIAL LIST OF EDUCATIONAL LEAFLETS, FOLDERS, BOOKLETS

FACTUAL DATA ON FEDERAL TAX ISSUE

Would You Like to Double Your Income? (leaflet)—30 for $1; 100 or more at 3 cents each.

On Income Taxation, as presented by Dr. Willford I. King to House Ways and Means Committee (leaflet)—5 cents each or 100 for $4.50.

Congress Can Provide Tax Relief (open letter by R. B. Dresser)—40 for $1; 90 for $2; 100 or more 2 cents each.

Postwar Federal Taxes, analyzing proposed constitutional amendment (leaflet)—100 for $2; 300 for $5; or $12 per 1,000.

Are Corporation Profits Too Large?—Exhaustive analysis shows for every $3 received by stockholders, Government takes $5 in taxes while $36 goes into wage-salary totals. Two copies free; 16 for $1; 100 to 600, 4 cents each; 1,000 or more, 3½ cents each.

Do You Want to Pay Higher Taxes? (leaflet)—Should go to millions. Fighters For Freedom (grass-roots F. F. F.) urges fighters for freedom forever to oppose politicians, regardless of party, squandering tax moneys to buy socialistic legislation the votes of minority groups. Five copies free; 40 for $1; 200 to 700, 2 cents each; 1,000 or more, 1½ cents each.

SPECIAL RELEASES ON LABOR ISSUE

Why Not Arbitrate (leaflet)—Shows why arbitration of wage rates by politically selected or influenced arbitrators will destroy stockholders' rights, and lead to fascism. Five copies free, 20 copies for $1. Larger quantities 4 cents per copy, postpaid anywhere.

Labor-Boss Candidates and You Make It. We Take It. (postcards), 50 for $1; 100 or more, 1½ cents each; $10 for 1,000.

The Housewife's Dilemma—No. 2 (leaflet)—25 copies for $1; 200 to 700 copies, 3 cents each; 1,000 or more copies, 2½ cents each.

Unions Defy Your Government (ad)—2 cents a copy, in bulk.

What Raises Wages? (leaflet)—60 for $1; 150 for $2; or $12 per 1,000.

Equality Before the Law (leaflet)—150 for $1; 1,000 for $6.

Labor's Bill of Rights Defined (folder)—200 for $1.

SPECIAL BULLETINS, MAIL TUCK-INS, FOLDERS

Statistical X-Ray Shows Up a Horseshoe—Proves that cost of living since 1939 has gone up less than weekly earnings and average real earnings of industrial workers. Three copies for 10 cents; 40 for $1; in bulk, $2 per 100.

Freedom Train and Where Karl Marx Went Wrong (leaflet)—Timely educational matter for youth and adults on the Constitution, and against communism. Three copies free; 20 for $1; 50 to 100, 4 cents each; 200 or more, 3 cents per copy, postpaid anywhere.

Workers Republic (folder)—125 for $1; 275 for $2; or $7 per 1,000.

Raising the Workingman's Scale of Living (8 pages)—10 for $1; 24 for $2; 100 to 800 at 7 cents each.

Capitalism the Creator (32 pages)—12 for $1; up to 100 at 7 cents each; over 100 at 6 cents.

The Man on the Street (folder)—100 for $1; 225 for $2; or $8 per 1,000.

Roster of Congress (leaflet)—100 for $1; $8 per 1,000.

The American Constitution and Its Significance (booklet)—in any quantity, 1 cent each.

(See other side.)

Eli Lilly & Co., Indianapolis, U. S. A. No. 822816. Pay to the order of Committee for Constitutional Government, $25,000. Chemical Bank & Trust Co., New York. Eli Lilly & Co.

Pay to the order of the National City Bank of New York, Sumner Gerard, Treasurer, Fighters For Freedom, Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc.

I am sure that files of the Committee for Constitutional Government contain hundreds of other letters just like this one which will indicate very clearly that the Committee for Constitutional Government takes money of any size but only applies the word "contribution" to remittances of $490 or less. As to those remittances which are more than $490 the Committee for Constitutional Government calls them "purchases of educational material."

Mr. Rumely's contemptuous refusal to produce these letters pursuant to the subpena of our committee has hindered us in our efforts to get the facts and consider the advisability or necessity for changes in the Federal Lobbying Act.

Further along in this letter Sumner Gerard suggests that $2,600 of the contribution be set aside for the distribution of copies of "Compulsory Medical Care and the Welfare State," a book by Melchoir Palyi. Gerard states:

The contents of the book are of such great importance that distribution to key leaders in national thinking and in positions of public influence should be made soon. If you agree to allot $2,600 to this distribution we will bear distribution cost and send to all Members of Congress, all governors, to selected editors, newspaper columnists, and radio commentators, and to 600 of the top level leaders in the medical profession, including all officers of State medical associations.

Any portion of this distribution where you desired it we would be glad to include your courtesy card as donor. Otherwise we shall distribute over the name of the committee itself. In the case of Palyi's book we shall seek some individual of public influence to write an accompanying letter calling attention to the book and its great importance. In the distribution to Congress we might have Congressman SMITH himself—the head of a medical clinic and highly respected in both Houses of Congress—write the accompanying letter asking that every Member read the content. Please note copy of the telegram to members of the rules committee enclosed herewith.

So you see the evidence is quite clear that the Committee for Constitutional Government is attempting to influence legislation directly and indirectly, through the distribution of these books. They attempt to influence legislation directly by sending copies of books and also telegrams, leaflets, and other printed material to Members of Congress, and they attempt to influence legislation indirectly by distributing the same material to thought leaders, newspaper editors, and so forth.

Our committee does not have and has never had the slightest desire to prevent or regulate this tremendous flow of books and pamphlets in any way regardless of the point of view presented. We feel that the Members of Congress and the general public are entitled to this information under the constitutional guaranties of freedom of speech and of the press. We also feel that such distribution can be a salutary influence on our

great democracy, provided that the Congress knows the identity of the financial backers of these mass efforts to influence legislation.

In recent days Mr. Rumely has been laying down a propaganda barrage aimed at muddling the issues. Free speech and free press are involved here, but not in the manner Mr. Rumely would have you believe. Our great free press is on the receiving end of millions of pieces of Rumely's pamphlets and releases on legislative issues. Rumely distributes these hoping to influence editorial opinion. The editors of the Nation's newspapers are entitled to know who pays for the distribution of these highly charged pamphlets.

The constitutional arguments advanced by Mr. Rumely are properly matters to be decided by the courts of our land.

Mr. Rumely's refusal to answer the committee's questions and produce the documents subpenaed constitutes a contempt of this great body, and it is my duty to recommend to you at this time that you so find.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. A moment ago the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania said that there would be some issue this afternoon on the question as to whether or not this organization should be registered as a lobby organization. I wish to remind him that his report contains the following question and answer on page 11 thereof:

> Mr. LANHAM. That seems to indicate pretty well that they are engaged in lobbying? (Indicating letter.)
>
> Mr. RUMELY. We do not deny that.

Is there any question but that this group should be registered as lobbyists?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is very clear, of course, that they are registered lobbyists, and in the reports filed in 1949 they were the second largest spender.

Mr. ROONEY. Since they are properly registered as lobbyists, is there not a provision in the Lobbying Act that they must account for contributions beyond a certain amount? And is not the Lilly Co. contribution over that amount?

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one additional minute.

The Corrupt Practices Act provides that all contributions of $100 or more shall be reported; in the Lobbying Act it is $500 or more, they must list their names.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachuetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We cited only the other day 56 persons for contempt, refusal to answer question before the Un-American Activities Committee. It so happened they were Communists or we felt they were Communists. But the reason they were cited was because of contempt of a committee. They refused to answer questions. They thought they were bigger than the House of Representatives and bigger than one of the committees of the House of Representatives. That is the issue involved here. They refused to answer. It is all repeated through this testimony, the refusal to produce records, the refusal to testify. The record is clear on the basic question.

In the case of the Communists it was refusal. If we refuse, with this record, to cite this man and the others for contempt, why, then, the message will go out to the country that only Communists are cited and others who have contempt for a committee where they have friends in the Congress of the United States need not fear being cited for contempt.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the membership will not be completely overwhelmed at this display of lawbooks. As I brought them down I recalled that on the occasion of the first speech I ever made here I got a little excited and I referred to the Speaker as "His Honor," not that our Speaker is without honor, but certainly it demonstrated that prior to my coming here I had had some little experience in the courtroom.

This is largely a legal matter. That is why I regret the statement just made by our distinguished majority leader from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. The observation that he made could not contribute anything to sanity of action or the exercise of fair judgment on the matter before us. It could only be calculated to try to divert attention from what is the real issue. I certain trust that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will not be so diverted.

The chairman has said there is no clear definition of "lobbying" and there is none. As a matter of fact, the statute is so indefinite that many, many people do not know when they are in compliance and when they are not. They do not know when to register and when not to register. That is why the work of the committee has been particularly onerous.

The majority leader referred to people with friends here. I say to him and to my colleagues, and I think my colleagues, on the committee will bear this out, I have worked and served on that committee without partisanship, without fear or favor, undertaking to let the chips fall where they may. I have some sincere convictions about this matter that is before us and I am going to express them. I am certainly not going to be drawn off the track by anything that is outside the issue, and I am sure you are not going to be.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] has made it quite apparent that the only information Dr. Rumely refused to give to the committee was naming the purchasers of his books in quantity. He was requested on 26 separate and distinct matters to appear before the committee. He responded completely on 25 of them. For some 2 weeks investigators of our committee, I think four in number, were in the offices of the Committee for Constitutional Government. They had access to all documents and records of the committee except that Dr. Rumely insisted that his rights under the first amendment to the Constitution guaranteeing the right of a free press, relieved him from the necessity of disclosing purchasers of his books and pamphlets.

It is true that Dr. Rumely registered under the Lobbying Act, and the committee has filed reports under the Lobbying Act. Parenthetically, that is not the situation in respect to the other two citations to be presented here today. But 6 years before the Lobbying Act ever was put on the books the Committee for Constitutional Government entered the publishing business and brought out books and pamphlets which it sold to the public, like any other publisher. Why, we had the former Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, of Americans for Democratic Action before our committee. I asked him whether there was any distinction in the freedom of the press between a newspaper and a book or a magazine. Good lawyer that he is, he said, "No; there is none." Of course there can be none. So, the publisher falls in that category.

Now, my friends of the House, one of these books about which information was refused was condensed in the Reader's Digest. I understand that over 3,000,000 reprints of that condensation were sold by the Digest to people in this country who then distributed them among their friends and others. I know some Members of the House who bought those reprints and mailed them out. Is there anything wrong in that? Are you going to cite the Reader's Digest for contempt if it refuses to disclose who bought its reprints?

Now, my friends, it comes down to the first amendment to the Constitution which guarantees the right of a free press. That right is inviolate. No government, no majority can override it; that is why it was written.

Now, there is precedent for my position. In the State of Louisiana is a case known as the Grosjean case. The State government undertook to levy a tax of 2 cents on every dollar of advertising received by newspapers of over 20,000 circulation a week. The 12 Louisiana newspapers challenged this as an invasion of the free press. Here is what the Supreme Court said in that case in volume 297 of the United States reports at page 244:

> The tax imposed is designated a "license tax for the privilege of engaging in such business"—that is to say, the business of selling, or making any charge for, advertising. As applied to appellees, it is a tax of 2 percent on the gross receipts derived from advertisements carried in their newspapers when, and only when, the newspapers of each enjoy a circulation of more than 20,000 copies per week. It thus operates as a restraint in a double sense. First, its effect is to curtail the amount of revenue realized from advertising, and, second, its direct tendency is to restrict circulation.

The Court went on in that decision to say:

> In the light of all that has now been said, it is evident that the restricted rules of the English law in respect of the freedom of the press in force when the Constitution was

adopted were never accepted by the American colonists, and that by the first amendment it was meant to preclude the National Government, and by the fourteenth amendment to preclude the States, from adopting any form of previous restraint upon printed publications, or their circulation, including that which had theretofore been effected by these two well-known and odious methods.

The Court said further, after reviewing another case:

The conclusion there stated is that the object of the constitutional provisions was to prevent previous restraints on publication; and the court was careful not to limit the protection of the right to any particular way of abridging it.

And then finally the Court said:

Judge Cooley has laid down the test to be applied: "The evils to be prevented were not the censorship of the press merely, but any action of the Government by means of which it might prevent such free and general discussion of public matters as seems absolutely essential to prepare the people for an intelligent exercise of their rights as citizens."

Further the Court said:

The predominant purpose of the grant of immunity here invoked was to preserve an untrammeled press as a vital source of information. The newspapers, magazines, and other journals of the country, it is safe to say, have shed and continue to shed, more light on the public and business affairs of the Nation than any other instrumentality of publicity; and since informed public opinion is the most potent of all restraints upon misgovernment, the suppression or abridgement of the publicity afforded by a free press cannot be regarded otherwise than with grave concern.

Now then, what is the situation here? Testimony before the committee that the publication disclosed that the Committee for Constitutional Government's sale of printed matter has already been hampered and impeded by the action that is here being taken. Here is an organization that admits it does certain things that come under the Lobbying Act and so reports; but apart from that it carries on a publishing business.

When this interrogation of Dr. Rumely was first made, a publisher in a far west State wrote me saying:

Look! I have published and sold wherever I could books that deal with general problems before the country. Am I to be called before a committee of Congress and required to divulge who the purchasers of my books and publications are? Why, that holds me up to obloquy, it could restrain my operation, abridge my right to publish these books and to sell them.

Who can deny the effect? Who can deny that will be the effect of requiring the publisher to come in and disclose his personal business affairs? Will you say in this legislative chamber that the publishers of the Washington Post or the Evening Star can be called before a committee of the Congress and be required to disclose who buys their papers, or who buys their advertising? Of course not. That would be a direct abridgement of the freedom of the press guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

Page 22 of the report indicates clearly that this is the issue. Mr. FitzGerald, our counsel, asked this question:

Mr. FITZGERALD. How many medical associations have bought books?

Mr. RUMELY. Probably a dozen.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What are the names of those?

Mr. RUMELY. I will not give the names of purchasers of books; I have told you that repeatedly.

That is the only issue.

Let it be said for Dr. Rumely further that he said:

I cannot where a constitutional question is involved. If we set the precedent of yielding against our conviction and against the advice of our lawyers that the first and fourth amendments cover our book operations, why then, we, instead of upholding constitutional government are setting a precedent to break it down, and we are not going to do it. It is a hot spot; I do not want to be in the spot.

I sympathize with him. I think the House of Representatives ought to take him off that spot, because he has not been in contempt of the Congress of the United States.

I want to pursue another point, wholly apart from questions involved in the first amendment of the Constitution. The courts have consistently held that the right of a congressional committee to require an individual citizen to testify on matters that can only be the subject of legislative function is the true function of the Congress of the United States. It is not proper nor constitutional nor legal for a committee of the Congress of the United States to inquire into any matter that does not come within that purview. The courts have held that time and again. They held it in the celebrated Kilborn case, and reaffirmed it in the case of McGrain against Dougherty which I want to read to you if I have the time.

The point I want to make is this: The citation sought here has nothing to do with the influencing of legislation in the ordinary ways of seeing Members of Congress or communicating with them. It has only to do with the formation of public opinion among the people of the country. I have struggled with this entire problem, and I do not believe the Congress of the United States, under the Constitution, can enact legislation to limit and abridge the rights of a citizen acting individually or collectively with others to speak his mind and his opinion to his neighbor or to write it down in a paper or magazine or a book and distribute it. I do not believe the Congress has that right. I do not believe we can limit and abridge the right of a citizen to do that as against the guaranty of free speech and press in the first amendment.

If I am correct in that, then any activity of a citizen or group of citizens which falls in that category cannot properly be a subject of interrogation by a congressional committee because it would not be in aid of any legislative process to which the Congress of the United States might resort. Does that make sense, or not? I think it does.

Let me read the summarization of the Kilborn case to show what I am getting at:

The question referred to in the Kilborn case was whether the House of Representatives had exceeded its power in directing one of its committees to make a particular investigation.

The decision was that it had. The principles announced and applied in the case are that neither House of Congress possesses a general power of making inquiry into the private affairs of citizens; that the power actually possessed is limited to inquiries relating to matters of which the particular House has jurisdiction.

Again, if this right can be asserted against the Committee for Constitutional Government and Dr. Rumely, it can be asserted against any publisher of any magazine or any newspaper or any book. They could be hailed before a committee of Congress and forced to disclose their own private affairs. I do not believe that the Members of the House are going to take that position.

I wish to refer to one more case: That of Hearst against Black, and it is a matter of some interest that the contempt then sought against Mr. Hearst was brought about by a Senate committee investigating lobbying under the terms of a resolution practically identical with the one under which we operate. That case came up for decision in the Circuit Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and the decision was written by Judge Groner. This is what he said:

And so we think the law is settled that if appellant were before the Senate committee as a witness and were questioned as to matters unrelated to the legislative business in hand, as this bill alleges is true of the messages in question, he would be entitled to refuse to answer.

You know there they issued a dragnet to call in all of the private telegrams that had been sent.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HALLECK. "And if for his supposed contumacy he were imprisoned, he could secure his release on habeas corpus."

To my mind, these decisions make it abundantly clear that the issue here is as I have pointed out. You have all received a telegram from the publisher of Editor and Publisher regarding this matter and its effect upon the freedom of the press.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I am sorry. I want to conclude.

The editorial was written and appeared in Editor and Publisher on June 10, the final paragraph of which is:

The current investigation of the House committee is an invasion of the guaranteed right of the American people to own, hire, and use a printing press without interference.

To my mind, that is an inalienable right—a right enabling the people of this country to continue to be the master of Government instead of Government becoming their master. It is the only way by which deeds and misdeeds of Government and agencies of Government may be controlled by the people.

I am making no idle argument. I never studied more carefully about anything in my life. I am presenting this as a matter of principle, and I trust my views meet with your approval.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] made one statement. That was that these people, the Committee for Constitutional Government and Mr. Rumely, are in the same class with newspapers and magazines. My answer to his contention is, that if we were trying to restrain Mr. Rumely or restrict Mr. Rumely, or if we were trying to hamper Mr. Rumely and the Committee for Constitutional Government in any way in the exercise of their right to publish whatever they please, his argument would be valid. But we have never sought to do that. The only thing we have asked of him is for the names of the persons who are contributing and making possible the publication of these books. That very thing is required of every newspaper and magazine in America and has been since 1912, and the courts have upheld it. The courts have said that that is legitimate and that it is for the best interests of this country of ours for the people to know who is backing, financially, every newspaper and every magazine in this country. That is all we ask. We ask that Mr. Rumely and every other lobbyist and every other publisher of information that is sent out to influence legislation shall disclose the backers, the financial angels of that organization. We have not sought in any way to restrain or restrict or to limit the freedom of the press. That claim is absolutely absurd.

I have been asked by the chairman to discuss the legal problems involved. Of course, I cannot do it in 5 minutes. I can only hit the high spots, but remember, in spite of everything that is said, that has been said, or that may be said on the other side, we have not attempted and we are not now attempting to restrict or restrain or in any way hamper either Mr. Rumely or the Committee for Constitutional Government. All we ask is a revelation of the financial backers of the organization, just as I say every newspaper in America and every magazine already has to do.

Oh, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] will say that it is to get the privilege of mailing under the second-class classification. Of course it is. That was the basis on which the Government could require the disclosure of the financial backers of every magazine and of every newspaper in America.

A careful analysis of Mr. Rumely's defense will show that it involves two separate and distinct legal propositions. His first contention is that the committee was out of bounds, as he phrased it, and had no authority to investigate the Committee for Constitutional Government and its allied organizations, because he claims they were not engaged in lobbying. This claim was made in spite of the fact that he himself registers as a lobbyist for the Committee for Constitutional Government.

The second contention is that the Committee on Lobbying Activities is in violation of his constitutional rights guaranteed under the first amendment to the Constitution and the fifth, when it seeks to make him produce a record of all persons contributing more than $500 to the Committee for Constitutional Government. He claims this is a violation of his constitutional rights because he says these contributions are not really contributions, but are for the purchase of books, pamphlets and other propaganda published and distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government.

Let us consider first the right of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities to investigate Mr. Rumely, and the Committee on Constitutional Government.

Congress has the power to obtain information at its hearings on a wide range concerning all matters having direct or indirect bearing on the subject. Congress has broad discretion in determining the subject matter of study and the scope and extent of the inquiry and can investigate if the subject under scrutiny has any possible materiality, no matter how remote, to some possible legislation. (*United States* v. *Bryan*, 72 F. Supp. 58, affirmed *Barsky* v. *United States*, 167 F. 2d 241, 83 App. D. C. 127, cert. denied, 344 U. S. 843, 68 S. Ct. 1511, 92 L. Ed. 1767, affirmed, *Morford* v. *United States*, 176 F. 2d 54.)

These books that Rumely has been publishing and sending out include a book entitled "The Taft-Hartley Law and Why it Should be Kept on the Statute Books." Does not that influence and refer to legislation that was pending in the Congress at that time? He has sent out literature that opposes rent control. Was not rent control legislation pending in the Congress at the time? This book, The Road Ahead, whatever else may be said about it, is certainly propaganda against all New Deal legislation of the past and what has been proposed since. Certainly directly, not indirectly, those publications directly refer to legislation that was pending in the Congress.

The authority for the statement I have just made is found in the case of *United States* v. *Bryan* (72 Fed. Sup., and others).

Obviously, from these decisions there is no merit to Mr. Rumely's contention that the committee was out of bounds and had no right to investigate the Committee for Constitutional Government and its satellite agencies, which he seeks to take with him behind an iron curtain of secrecy.

The pertinence and relevance of the financial data sought from the Committee for Constitutional Government may be seen by examining Senate Report 1400 on S. 2177, Seventy-ninth Congress, which became the Federal Lobbying Act. That report clearly indicates that the main object of the statute was to bring out into the open the financial sources of pressures on public issues:

> Full information regarding the * * * source of contributions * * * of organized groups would prove helpful to Congress in evaluating their representatives and weighing their worth. Publicity is a mild step forward in promoting the democratization of pressure groups.

Consider the instant factual situation in this light. A group which accepted contributions of any size up to the passage of the Lobbying Act suddenly refuses to accept any contributions of more than $490.

Mr. Rumely admitted that and admitted that he did it for the purpose of escaping the necessity of making public the names of contributors.

Those who wish to give more than that are informed that they may "purchase" unlimited amounts of pamphlets and booklets dealing with the legislative matters, which will be distributed by the committee as the purchaser directs. Is the Congress powerless to determine whether this situation is defeating the purpose for which the law is passed? Is the Congress powerless to find out the facts so that it may recommend means to strengthen the act, if necessary? Certainly the Congress has the power to find out the names and addresses of these persons.

In this connection I call attention to an excerpt from a radio address delivered by Samuel B. Pettengill on November 9, 1947, and introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by our able and distinguished colleague from Michigan, Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF, and I quote an excerpt from Mr. Pettengill's speech:

> I hold that Congress has as much right to have Communists labeled as it has to require food and drugs to be truly labeled, as it has to require the ownership of newspapers to be honestly declared.

Coming now to a discussion of the second proposition that is whether it is constitutional and lawful to require Mr. Rumely, the executive secretary for the Committee for Constitutional Government, to disclose contributions in excess of $500, whether by contributions or loans or, as he contends, for the purchase of books.

The obvious lack of merit in the Committee for Constitutional Government's basic contention is demonstrated by the cases holding that the first amendment does not immunize the press from governmental controls applicable to other types of business (*Oklahoma Press Publishing Co.* v. *Walling* (327 U. S. 186); *Associated Press* v. *Labor Board* (301 U. S. 103); *Associated Press* v. *United States* (326 U.S. 1)). The freedoms guaranteed by the first amendment are not absolute; they may be the subject of governmental inquiry or control in the interest of restraining abuses within the constitutional ambit of governmental activity (*American Communications Association, CIO*, v. *Douds* (339 U. S. 382); *United Public Workers* v. *Mitchell* (330 U. S. 75); *Kovacs* v. *Cooper* (336 U. S. 77)).

The power of Congress to investigate is certainly as broad as the power which it may validly confer upon an administrative official. In that field it has been held that the first amendment does not preclude a subpena by an administrative official requiring a newspaper to disclose the interstate distribution of its paper, dissemination of its news, or the source of its advertising receipts—Oklahoma Press Publishing Co. against Walling, supra.

In *Lewis Publishing Co.* v. *Morgan* (229 U. S. 288 (1913)) the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the requirements of section 2 of the Post Office Appropriation Act of August 24, 1912, amended by Thirty-ninth United States

Code Annotated, page 233. This section provides:

SEC. 2. * * * That it shall be the duty of the editor, publisher, business manager, or owner of every newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication to file with the Postmaster General * * * on blanks furnished by the Post Office Department, a sworn statement setting forth the names and post-office addresses of the editor and managing editor, publisher, business managers, and owners, and in addition, the stockholders, if the publication be owned by a corporation; and also the names of known bondholders, mortgagees, or other security holders; and also, in the case of daily newspapers, there shall be included in such statement the average of the number of copies of each issue of such publication sold or distributed to paid subscribers during the preceding six months: * * * *Provided further*, That it shall not be necessary to include in such statement the names of persons owning less than 1 percent of the total amount of stocks, bonds, mortgages, or other securities. A copy of such sworn statement, shall be published in the second issue of such newspaper, magazine, or other publication printed next after the filing of such statement. Any such publication shall be denied the privileges of the mail if it shall fail to comply with the provisions of this paragraph within 10 days after notice by registered letter of such failure.

The court held these requirements were not an unconstitutional abridgment of the freedom of the press protected by the first amendment or a denial of due process of law under the fifth amendment, or as a denial of the use of the mail, but only a requirement relating to second-class mail matter sanctioned by exclusion from the privileges of the mail in that regard.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today because I regard the issue raised in this proposed contempt citation to be so fundamental that I want to place my position and my views squarely in the RECORD. May I say, first, Mr. Speaker, that these citations are far different from those previously offered on the floor of the House. The other citations involved men and women whose loyalty to our Government was in issue. It involved the question of subversion. That is far different from the question which is raised today, where there is no loyalty involved, but a question of how far a committee of the House is privileged to go in prying into private affairs.

We are not dealing here with an ordinary matter. We are confronted with a question that is raised squarely on one of the cornerstones of American liberty—freedom of the press.

This is no mere issue of lobbying. This is no mere question of a man named Rumely, Smith, or Jones. This is no mere question of the merits or demerits of an organization that calls itself the Committee for Constitutional Government. All of these questions are transcended by the fundamental issue.

To state this in the simplest terms possible, here is what confronts this House—

It is the fundamental question of whether the American people under the guarantee provided by the first amendment to the Constitution have the right, without fear of governmental inquiry, to purchase whatever products of a free press they please, so long as that product is not of an indecent, salacious, or subversive nature.

If the Members of this House will reason with me I think that we can reach the inevitable answers to this question by very simple and fundamental logic.

First, we must consider the nature of the special committee which is requesting this House to vote a contempt citation—the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. This committee was specifically directed by this House under a resolution passed in the first session of this Congress "to conduct a study and investigation of (1) all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation, and (2) all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation." That was its authority and its only authority.

Second, we must consider the position taken by certain members of this select committee and certain members of its staff. That position is: That an organization represented by Dr. Edward A. Rumely, and known as the Committee for Constitutional Government is in contempt because that organization, through its representative, refused to respond to a subpena calling for the names of all purchasers of its many published books, tracts, and pamphlets.

Third, the committee does not allege that these books, tracts, and pamphlets were indecent, salacious, or subversive, in fact, it concedes—if I have read the hearings properly—that these publications were of a general nature involving the state of the Union and, in one instance, involving a law which is on the statute books, namely, the Taft-Hartley Act.

Fourth, we should consider that the organization, through its representative Dr. Rumely, responded to 24 of the 25 demands by the select committee for the records of this organization, but refused to respond to the twenty-fifth demand on the ground that making available a list of the purchasers of its publications violated the Bill of Rights, specifically the first amendment to the Constitution, regarding freedom of the press.

Now, it is pertinent to our deliberations to determine the nature of the books, tracts, and pamphlets published by this organization. Here are some of the titles according to the Select Committee's transcript:

The Constitution of the United States, by Thomas James Norton.

Jefferson, the Forgotten Man.

Challenge to Freedom, by Henry M. Wriston, the esteemed president of Brown University.

For Americans Only, by Samuel B. Pettengill, an honored and respected former Democratic member of this House.

Smoke Screen, by William G. Ross.

Hunger and History, by E. Parmalee Prentice.

The Keys to Prosperity, by Dr. Willford I. King.

Needed Now.

Capacity for Leadership, the Courage to Lead, with a prologue by the Rev. Norman Vincent Peale, a prominent New York minister of national reputation.

Revolution, by Robert Hunter.

The Road Ahead, by John T. Flynn.

I am familiar with some of these books and by no stretch of the imagination could a thinking man declare them—and I now quote from the House resolution which set up this committee—"intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation."

They are dissertations on American political life, the American system of government, and the philosophies alien to that system of government which is of course the subject of thousands upon thousands of books, tracts, pamphlets, and other printed matter published in the United States every year.

Now, it has been argued by certain members that the organization in question was financed to a considerable extent by the sale of these books, and it has been intimated that frequent purchasers of the books bought not one copy but many copies. Therefore, these members appear to reason that there was something insidious in such action although the sworn testimony of the witness, Dr. Rumely, was that his organization sold the overwhelming portions of its publications in small quantities as 1, 2, 3, 5, or 10 books at a time.

Be that as it may, when did it come within the scope of the lobbying laws of this country for a determination to be made that a purchaser of a book or books must undergo public identification by an investigating committee of Congress, particularly when such publications were in the realm of general discussion of public affairs?

It so happens that I know a Member of this House who last year during the holiday season bought and distributed to a number of his friends copies of a book discussing general political trends in this country. It is to be presumed that the publisher of this book sold many copies in addition to those purchased by this Member because the book was on the best-seller lists. It also happens that this publishing firm deals largely in books of a political and economic nature. By the logic of the members of the select committee who are pressing this House to vote a contempt citation today, this publishing house also could be subjected to the same ordeal if it stood on its rights under the Bill of Rights and refused to disclose the name of the purchasers of this particular book, including the Member of this House who made his purchase in quantity.

Now, let us see how far afield reasoning—and I use the word advisedly—can be carried down the road in this attempt to cause the House to participate in a miscarriage of justice which could undermine one of the basic freedoms of America. I want to read to you an exchange of questions and answers by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], who is a member of the select committee, and Dr. Rumely, the witness:

Mr. LANHAM. You distributed it because you wanted to discourage that sort of leg-

islation, and a doctor, if he were to distribute it would be getting it from you for that purpose, would he not?

Dr. RUMELY. We distributed it because we wanted to preserve private industry. I do it with enthusiasm because I worked as a medical interne under the Bismarck system and I know how disrupting that kind of medicine can be.

Mr. LANHAM. I agree with you on socialized medicine. I am not in favor of it. But the point is, if you distribute this book, and if the doctors buy it and distribute it, they are engaged in lobbying in an attempt to influence legislation.

Now, let us consider that proposition for a moment. The book in question is entitled "Compulsory Medical Care" and according to Doctor Rumely is a study by a European economist of compulsory medical care in every country. Dr. Rumely testified: "There is not one word about socialized medicine in this country—it is a study of what happened in Europe."

Now let us weigh the implications of these facts for a moment.

First, there are several bills introduced in both Houses of the present Congress involving medical care of varying sorts, including one sponsored by the administration. All of the authors, including the administration, claim the bills in no way embrace compulsory medical care or socialized medicine. Yet, we have a finding here by a distinguished member of the select committee that should any doctor buy a copy of the book in question and give it to somebody else, the doctor would then be engaged in lobbying against legislation that is pending.

Dr. Rumely testifies that there is not a word in the book involving this country in our legislation before this Congress. I have not read this book but let us assume that is so. Are we to conclude under the findings of our distinguished colleague that the mythical doctor would be guilty of lobbying because some day in the future—how many years from now apparently would make no difference—somebody might introduce a bill which could be properly characterized as providing for compulsory medical care?

I urge the House to consider carefully the twilight zone it will be in, the dark corners of suppression that it will be walking in, if we today vote a contempt citation on the basis of such specious premises.

Now let us return to the question of financing of the activities of the Committee for Constitutional Government for one moment. I am not a member of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, but I have read the transcript, and Dr. Rumely testified that he had provided the committee with a list of all contributors who made contributions to his organization of $1,000 or more. That does not sound like concealment of proper information to me.

I must confess I am mystified by the proceedings that have been brought before this House. These are times like the world has not seen for centuries—perilous times, dangerous times. Nearly one-half the world is hidden behind the iron curtain of totalitarianism. In that half of the world, people smuggle forbidden books and newspapers to one another, handling them like gold nuggets in their search and hunger for information that in the other half of the world is as free as the air we breath.

Perhaps you or I have purchased publications sold by Dr. Rumely and the Committee for Constitutional Government. I say—so what? I also purchase the Saturday Evening Post, I also purchase Collier's National Weekly, I also purchase other magazines and other publications of a similar nature, any one of which devotes up to 50 percent of its space to discussing public issues directly affecting congressional legislation. Are the publishers of these magazines to be subjected to similar treatment? Should they refuse to make public a list of their subscribers? Is contempt citation to be brought before this House against them?

I cannot believe for one moment that my colleagues in this House can join in this adventure into the shadowland of thought control and thought suppression. With the sun already setting on liberty in half the globe, the least we can do here today is to make certain that it does not cross the horizon of the other half.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to make the statement that I have given the better portion of my life to the service of my country and in the endeavor to protect the rights of the citizens in the enjoyment of the freedoms guaranteed to them. Mr. Speaker, this effort to cite these people for contempt is as phony as is the alleged renunciation of communism by Lee Pressman made recently before one of the committees of this House. I have protested and I now protest to the further use of an arm of this Congress as an instrument with which to inflict vengeance upon those who have spoken up for their country. If there is anything bad in the publication of the Rumely organization such fact has not been disclosed. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have not the time or the opportunity to pull aside the veil and reveal what is behind this whole movement. I have seen like committees operate heretofore, all under the inspiration of those leftist influences which we are now combating even in war. I observed that this committee, when it came into existence, became the object of the attention of those same influences with the result that a staff of pinkos was put together to labor for the committee, and when this fact became known the committee had to let go the counsel that they had engaged. I witnessed the examination of the people out of which this citation arose and I want to testify that the people in question were not given decent consideration by the committee. The counsel that the committee later had to dismiss sat beside the chairman and prompted him in the conduct of the investigation.

This citation is an outrage, Mr. Speaker, and ought to be repudiated.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

In conclusion, we must never forget that this is more than a contempt citation. It is a precedent—a precedent by this House—which will be set if we vote this action. I am convinced it is a dangerous precedent which this House—one of the few great parliamentary bodies left in the world—can ill afford to establish. There is far more at stake here than the prestige of this great body. We must face the fact that not the honor of the House or one of its committees is at stake but that one of our great basic freedoms—freedom of press—is in jeopardy if we take this action. Let the Members ponder this well, and I am certain that no one can find it in his heart or mind to vote the contempt citation sought here today.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have an idea that when I made the observation that Rumely had pretty powerful friends in this House, that I must have hit the right spot, because of the present two leaders of the Republican Party coming down here on a technical question and defending this man who, on two previous occasons, has been cited for contempt before congressional committees for refusal to answer questions, and on each occasion advanced the same argument that there was a constitutional question involved. As a matter of fact, the Communists that we cited only the other day claimed that there was a constitutional question involved.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman has made a charge against me, and I think I have a right to reply.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman can reply in his own time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no time. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was the gentleman talking individually or as leader?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I was talking as an individual.

Mr. McCORMACK. All right, I will withdraw the "leader" then.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to tell the gentleman that I never knew Mr. Rumely or anything about him until this matter was brought up. My position is prompted entirely because I believe this is a question of the preservation of freedom of the press.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I say is, the evidence shows he has powerful friends in this House, and all I can say is that as to anybody with powerful friends in this House, if this contempt proceeding is voted down, it will mean an open invitation to defy any committee of the Congress of the United States, and the unfortunate who has no friends will take his own chances.

My friend from Georgia, whom nobody has stronger affection for than I, said it was an outrage. Outrage where? Who is Mr. Rumely? Is he an innocent individual? Yes, Mr. Rumely was convicted for receiving money from the Imperial German Government in 1915 to buy a newspaper in the city of New York

for propaganda purposes to help the German Government out in World War I.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; to my publisher friend of several papers, do you approve of that as owner of a newspaper?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Do you approve of that as owner of a newspaper? Is that freedom of the press?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman knows enough I think to tell the House that while this man was convicted he was later exonerated and pardoned.

Mr. McCORMACK. He was not exonerated. A pardon is a different proposition.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Why do you not give the facts?

Mr. McCORMACK. Rumely was convicted by a jury. I have the floor and the gentleman from Ohio is not clever enough to take me off the floor. Rumely was convicted by a jury, and the circuit court sustained it. The Circuit Court of Appeals sustained the conviction, which grew out of the willful failure to report to the Alien Property Custodian under the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act an indebtedness which this Rumely had contracted—with whom? With my friend from Ohio, Mr. BROWN? No. But with whom? The Imperial German Government. In other words, he was a spy in America for the German Government during World War I. That is whom we are dealing with. That is the man who repeatedly said, "I refuse—I defy you." And in his testimony he challenged the committee to cite him in order to go to court to thrash this out. Yet, we find here powerful men on a technical question undertaking to defend a spy in World War I, and a man who is nothing but a Fascist, who is an opponent of American institutions and American Government on the right just as much and just as strongly as the Communists are on the left.

The basic question here is whether or not we shall insist upon the dignity of the House being respected. He refused to answer proper questions. The Communists refused to answer proper questions. That is why we cited them for contempt of Congress. They were Communists. That was the color. That was the emotional influence. But I voted because they refused to answer questions which I felt were proper and within the purview of the Committee on Un-American Activities. The other two were cited for the same reason, refusal to answer questions—not whether they are of the right or of the left or of anything else. They refused to answer questions. The issue involved here is the same as in the case of the United Shoe Machinery, and other big interests many years ago, when they bought up newspapers. They bought up a Boston paper. There was a Senate investigation then of big interests buying up newspapers for propaganda purposes in America. That investigation was held to be proper and the questions were within the purview and jurisdiction of the Senate committee in its investigation.

The members of the committee asked proper questions. This man refused to answer. The question before the House is whether or not we are to maintain our own dignity by citing this man and the other two men. The issue is refusal to answer. The evidence is plentiful. The House must do its duty as it sees it, but if you do not vote to cite for contempt, you are doing an injustice in the case of those who have been cited heretofore.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I hope, in the years I have served in the House of Representatives, if I have accomplished anything it is to have earned the reputation for being frank and outspoken, and perhaps even blunt at times.

I have been surprised, grieved, and amazed to find my good friend JOHN McCORMACK resorting to the statements he used on the floor which are exactly in line with the smear tactics which have been used so constantly, if you please, by certain members of the Committee on Lobbying Activities, so often that some of us who serve on the committee, and Members of Congress who came and listened in to the hearings, have had to publicly protest against such methods.

Let us look at the facts for a moment. The majority leader makes statements about this man Rumely being convicted as a German agent. Let us see what the facts are. The facts are Rumely was convicted under the Trading With the Enemy Act. But it was not long after he was convicted in World War I, as a result of borrowing money from an American citizen to buy a New York newspaper, that it developed evidence which would have cleared him had been suppressed by the Government. Eleven of the twelve members of the jury, when they found out the purport of the evidence which had been suppressed, signed a petition to the Attorney General of the United States—a man named Harlan F. Stone—who, after carefully studying and reviewing the case, requested the then President of the United States, another New England man, Calvin Coolidge, to pardon Rumely.

He was not only given full pardon, and restored completely to citizenship, but he was publicly exonerated, and the apology of the Attorney General went to him. Now, why use such smearing tactics here on the floor of the House?

Let us go a little further. They talk about this man Rumely having been cited twice for contempt. One attempt was made to cite him for contempt in the Senate, but the Senate refused to do so, because he had stood on constitutional grounds. The Anderson committee, back in 1944, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] has said, did cite Mr. Rumely for contempt. I happen to have been a member of the Anderson committee and voted for that contempt citation. I was sorry afterwards that I did. Why? Because when the case came into court the Federal judge threw it out on its ears, and said that the Anderson committee did not have any right to ask Rumely those questions under the Constitution.

Then they drag in the fact that newspapers, have to give certain information in connection with ownership of the paper, to get second-class-mail privileges. But that does not bar such newspapers from printing anything that they please. The law only requires one thing, and that the newspaper give its ownership.

Let me tell you something. This committee of ours—or rather certain members of it—tried to make the publishers of newspapers tell why they wrote editorials, or who wrote them. They even criticized certain farm papers and about everything else they found to disagree with their philosophy of Government. So every newspaper in the United States is watching this particular case or action.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Who was the publisher of the farm paper?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The Lumbermen's Digest. Of course, you know. All you have to do is to look at the record. All you have to do is to read the committee hearings. You will quickly find why this citation is here. This citation for contempt against this Dr. Rumely and the Constitutional Committee is here for one reason and one reason only—because a man named John T. Flynn happened to have the courage to write a book against state socialism, The Road Ahead. Certain people have been trying to find out, if they can, who bought those books. Well, I bought some of them myself and distributed them to a few of my friends because I believed every honest-to-God American ought to read about the danger which confronts this country. Then, of course, one of the members of the committee—just read the committee hearings, if you please—had the effrontery to argue in the committee that because this Constitutional Committee had published a book by a great French economist on the history of state medicine in Europe, which did not even mention socialized medicine in the United States or the possibility that it might come here, that any doctor who might buy that book and permit any person to read it, was a lobbyist, and if he did not register as a lobbyist he should be punished under the law and sent to prison. Just how ridiculous can we get?

Look at the record and read the hearings, if you please, and you will find that 90 percent of the time of the committee was spent on getting after people who dare to stand up against state socialism. There are no citations for contempt here for the Dewey Anderson group on the other side of the street, and which did not even file a report under the Lobby Act.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, which he directed to me, I directed a letter to the Pacific Coast Lumber Digest asking how many companies had requested copies or reprints of an editorial which had appeared in their newspaper and which was being circulated wholesale in Missouri, far from the Pacific coast. We did not question the editorial

in any way, but merely asked about its distribution. Incidentally, they never answered our inquiry. That is the matter he refers to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank our loyal, hard-working staff for the fine job it has done for the committee and to take issue with those who have criticized it. I think all Members on both sides of the committee will agree with me when I say they have done an excellent job.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I must regretfully say to you that the record is filled with times that the gentleman from Ohio has protested against the type of question asked.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. It is true that the gentleman has objected to many of the questions that counsel has asked, and so have I, but that has nothing to do with their sincerity or with the job they have done for this committee.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], able orator and debater that he is, has made a very excellent argument, but he has only brought us up to the edge of this issue. The Oklahoma Publishing Co. case is the latest Supreme Court case on this subject. It is more recent and more in point than any of the cases which the gentleman from Indiana has cited. The Oklahoma Publishing Co. case involved the power of the administrator of the wage-hour division of the Labor Department to subpena from a newspaper the sources of its advertising income.

The Supreme Court held that this was not in violation of the first amendment or of the right to freedom of press. It is no more a violation of the first amendment to the Constitution than is the requirement of the Registration of Lobbying Act that a lobbyist shall report to the Congress the sources of his income, a violation of the right of petition.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired, all time has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 183, nays 175, answered "present" 1, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

YEAS—183

Addonizio
Albert
Aspinall
Bailey
Baring
Barrett, Pa.
Bates, Ky.
Battle
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Biemiller
Blatnik
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buchanan
Buckley, Ill.
Burke
Burleson
Burnside
Byrne, N. Y.
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carroll
Cavalcante
Chelf
Chesney
Christopher
Chudoff
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
Cooper
Crosser
Davenport
Davies, N. Y.
Deane
Delaney
Denton
Dollinger
Donohue
Douglas
Doyle
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle, Calif.
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Frazier
Fugate
Fulton
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gary
Gordon
Gorski
Granahan
Granger
Grant
Green
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Havenner
Hays, Ark.
Hays, Ohio
Hedrick
Heffernan
Heller
Hobbs
Howell
Huber
Hull
Irving
Jackson, Wash.
Jacobs
Javits
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N. C.
Karst
Karsten
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Kennedy
Keogh
King
Kirwan
Kruse
Lane
Lanham
Lind
Linehan
Lyle
Lynch
McCarthy
McCormack
McGrath
McGuire
McKinnon
McSweeney
Mack, Ill.
Madden
Magee
Mahon
Mansfield
Marsalis
Marshall
Miles
Mills
Mitchell
Monroney
Morris
Moulder
Multer
Murdock
Murphy
Noland
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Neill
O'Sullivan
O'Toole
Patman
Patten
Perkins
Peterson
Philbin
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Rains
Ramsay
Redden
Rhodes
Ribicoff
Richards
Rodino
Rooney
Sasscer
Secrest
Shelley
Sims
Spence
Steed
Stigler
Sullivan
Sutton
Tauriello
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Trimble
Underwood
Vinson
Wagner
Walsh
Walter
Welch
White, Calif.
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Okla.
Wood
Woodhouse
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—175

Abbitt
Abernethy
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen, H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Arends
Auchincloss
Bates, Mass.
Beall
Bennett, Mich.
Bishop
Boggs, Del.
Bolton, Md.
Bolton, Ohio
Boykin
Bramblett
Brehm
Brooks
Brown, Ohio
Burdick
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Chatham
Chiperfield
Clevenger
Cole, Kans.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Corbett
Cotton
Coudert
Cox
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
D'Ewart
Dolliver
Dondero
Doughton
Ellsworth
Elston
Fallon
Fellows
Fenton
Fisher
Ford
Gamble
Gathings
Gavin
Gilmer
Golden
Goodwin
Gossett
Graham
Gross
Guill
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Hall, Leonard W.
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hare
Harvey
Herlong
Herter
Heselton
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holmes
Hope
Horan
Jackson, Calif.
James
Jenison
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kean
Kearns
Keating
Kerr
Kilburn
Kilday
Kunkel
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lichtenwalter
Lodge
Lovre
Lucas
McConnell
McDonough
McGregor
Mack, Wash.
Marcantonio
Martin, Mass.
Merrow
Meyer
Michener
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Morton
Murray, Tenn.
Nelson
Nicholson
Norrell
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Hara, Minn.
Passman
Patterson
Phillips, Calif.
Pickett
Potter
Poulson
Rankin
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Rich
Riehlman
Robeson
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Sadlak
Sanborn
Saylor
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Scudder
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Stanley
Stefan
Stockman
Taber
Tackett
Talle
Taylor
Teague
Tollefson
Towe
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Weichel
Wheeler
Whitten
Whittington
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Woodruff

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Case, N. J.

NOT VOTING—71

Angell
Barden
Barrett, Wyo.
Blackney
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Case, S. Dak.
Celler
Crook
Dawson
DeGraffenried
Dingell
Durham
Eaton
Engel, Mich.
Gillette
Gore
Gregory
Hall, Edwin Arthur
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Johnson
Judd
Kearney
Keefe
Klein
Larcade
Latham
McCulloch
McMillan, S. C.
McMillen, Ill.
Macy
Martin, Iowa
Mason
Miller, Calif.
Morgan
Morrison
Murray, Wis.
Nixon
Norblad
Norton
O'Konski
Pace
Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Pfeiffer, William L.
Phillips, Tenn.
Plumley
Powell
Quinn
Regan
Rivers
Roosevelt
Sabath
Sadowski
St. George
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Sheppard
Sikes
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Ohio
Staggers
Van Zandt
Werdel
Whitaker
White, Idaho
Wier
Williams
Withrow
Yates

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Gillette against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.

Mr. Crook for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Latham against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. McMillen of Illinois against.

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Martin of Iowa against.

Mr. deGraffenried for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Case of New Jersey for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Sadowski for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Werdel against.

Mr. Buckley of New York for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Nixon.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Angell.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Wier with Mr. Withrow.

Mr. Quinn with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Smith of Kansas.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Powell with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Regan with Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.

Mr. Smathers with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.

Mr. BATTLE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. If present, he would have voted "nay." I would have voted "yea." I therefore answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance on behalf of the United States of a memorial plaque to the memory of Stephen Collins Foster, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7302. An act to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8028. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the remaining Government lots in the town site of St. Marks, Fla.

CITATION OF WILLIAM L. PATTERSON FOR CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report (No. 3025) from the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT CITING WILLIAM L. PATTERSON

The Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, created by the House of Representatives under House Resolution 298 of the Eighty-first Congress, was authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of "(1) all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation; and (2) all activities of the agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation."

The Civil Rights Congress, an unincorporated association, with offices at 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y., registered and filed reports under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act during the years 1946, 1947, and 1948.

Since 1946 the Civil Rights Congress has advocated or opposed many national legislative proposals and has succeeded in establishing chapters in many of the larger cities.

William L. Patterson is the national executive secretary.

The chairman of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities issued and caused to be served a subpena duces tecum on said William L. Patterson, directing him to be and appear before the said Select Committee on Lobbying Activities on August 3, 1950, at 10 a. m.

The subpena called for the production of documents relating to (a) the organization and finance of the Civil Rights Congress, and (b) the activities of the Civil Rights Congress, its members, officers, directors, representatives, agents, and employees pertaining to legislation.

The said William L. Patterson, pursuant to said subpena and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said committee but failed and refused to answer certain questions and failed and refused to produce certain records called for in the subpena duces tecum and as a result of such failure and refusal, the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities was deprived from receiving information concerning a matter committed to said committee. The record of the proceedings before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities held on Thursday, August 3, 1950, during which the said William L. Patterson refused to furnish certain material pertinent to subject under inquiry, is set forth in part as follows:

"CIVIL RIGHTS CONGRESS (H. RES. 298)

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE
ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES,
"Washington, D. C.,
Thursday, August 3, 1950.

"The select committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:45 a. m., in the caucus room, Old House Office Building, Hon. Frank Buchanan (chairman) presiding.

"Present: Representatives BUCHANAN (chairman), LANHAM, ALBERT, DOYLE, HALLECK, and BROWN of Ohio.

"Also present: Benedict F. FitzGerald, Jr., committee counsel.

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

"The House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities has this morning the Civil Rights Congress and their executive secretary, Mr. William L. Patterson.

"Will you be sworn, Mr. Patterson?

"Do you solemnly swear that the statements you make before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God, until the last great day?

"Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, counsel.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Please state your name and address.

"Mr. DOYLE. Will the record show it is a quarter of 11 and we convene at 10 o'clock.

"The CHAIRMAN. Note that in the record.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Also that there is a quorum present.

"Please state your full name and address, Mr. Patterson.

"TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM L. PATTERSON, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, CIVIL RIGHTS CONGRESS

"Mr. PATTERSON. Before doing that, I would like to apologize to the committee for being late. I took a plane, 6:53 Eastern, that was due to arrive here at 8:46, and it arrived here at a quarter after 10, so that the lateness is not a matter of discourtesy at all to the committee.

"My name is William L. Patterson.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. And your address?

"Mr. PATTERSON. My address is 409 Edgecomb Avenue, New York City.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. What is your official connection with the Civil Rights Congress?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I am the national executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. And is that an incorporated organization?

"Mr. PATTERSON. It is not an incorporated organization.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Has it filed a business certificate?

"Mr. PATTERSON. It filed a certificate of doing business; yes.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it an unincorporated association?

"Mr. PATTERSON. It is an unincorporated association.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. And where are its offices located?

"Mr. PATTERSON. The offices are located at 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City.

"Mr. HALLECK. Although your organization has taken a definite position in respect to many matters that have been pending before the Congress are we to understand from what you say that you have not done anything to implement those positions that you have taken?

"Mr. PATTERSON. Yes; in certain instances we have, but the Lobbying Act——

"Mr. HALLECK. Well, as a matter of fact I know of my own observations, I think, that your organization has been very vocal and active in connection with the matter of legislation pending in the Congress.

"Mr. LANHAM. Have they not had hordes of people coming down here?

"Mr. HALLECK. Oh, yes. Is it not true, Mr. Patterson——

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Mass trips?

"Mr. HALLECK. That you and your organization and members of your organization have in an organized manner visited and talked to the Congressmen and Senators in respect to legislation?

"Mr. PATTERSON. Correct.

"Mr. HALLECK. And have you not done that with the purpose of trying to influence either the enactment or the defeat of legislation?

"Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

"Mr. HALLECK. And those activities have been directed at either bringing about the passage of legislation or the defeat of legislation, is that not true?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I would say that was true.

* * * * *

"The CHAIRMAN. We have asked you to turn over certain records to the committee, is that not a fact, Mr. Patterson?

"Mr. PATTERSON. That is a fact.

"The CHAIRMAN. Have you turned them over to the committee?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I have not. I have brought some of the material here.

"The CHAIRMAN. Will you turn that material over to the committee?

"Mr. PATTERSON. If you mean will I turn over all of the material asked for in the 32 demands that have been propounded here, the answer is, 'I will not.'

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Patterson, are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I refuse to answer that question. It is in violation of my constitutional rights."

* * * * *

Thereafter, on August 3, 1950, the chairman of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities issued and caused to be served a second subpena duces tecum on said William L. Patterson, directing him to be and appear before the said Select Committee on Lobbying Activities on August 4, 1950, at 10 a. m. and to bring with him the same documents identified in the first subpena.

The subpena duces tecum served upon William L. Patterson is set forth in words and figures below:

The said subpena duces tecum was served on William L. Patterson by Benedict F. FitzGerald, counsel for the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. The return of the service of the subpena, endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"TO BENEDICT F. FITZGERALD, Jr.:

"You are hereby commanded to summon William L. Patterson, executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., to be and appear before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable FRANK BUCHANAN is chairman, and to bring with him the following documents in his custody: (See attachment) relating to (a) the organization and finances of the Civil Rights Congress, and (b) the activities of the Civil Rights Congress, its members,

officers, directors, representatives, agents, and employees pertaining to legislation, in their chamber, room 362, Old House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on Friday, August 4, 1950, at the hour of 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 3d day of August 1950.

"FRANK BUCHANAN, *Chairman.*

"Attest:

"RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk.*"

"Subpena for----------

"Before the Committee on the----------

"Served the undersigned Benedict F. FitzGerald, made service upon William L. Patterson, by serving a copy of this subpena, together with an attachment, to the said William L. Patterson, on August 3, 1950, at 11:15 a. m., in room 362, House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

"BENEDICT F. FITZGERALD, Jr.

"WM. EARL GRIFFIN, *Clerk.*

"*Attachment*

"1. Articles of incorporation and certificate of incorporation of the Civil Rights Congress, hereinafter referred to as the CRC; or other charters, articles, or certificates of association if unincorporated, or certificates to do business, etc.; and all amendments to any such documents.

"2. Such records as show the name, address, and title of each of the officers and directors of the CRC for each year from January 1, 1947, to date.

"3. All minutes and records of proceedings, including all motions made and resolutions offered, and the action taken thereon, at all meetings of (A) the board of directors, (B) the members, (C) the executive committee, (D) any other committee of the CRC from January 1, 1947, to date, relating in any way to—

"(a) Any legislation[1] proposed or pending in the Congress of the United States;

"(b) Attempts or plans to influence such legislation, either directly or indirectly;

"(c) Studies made of proposed or pending legislation."

"4. Each annual report of the CRC from January 1, 1947, to date, or a copy thereof where the original is not available, together with a copy of all reports made by any officer, agent, representative, committee, or department of the CRC, from January 1, 1947, to date, relating in any way to the matters set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 3 above.

"5. Each publication, circular, letter, memorandum, pamphlet, bulletin, etc., or copies thereof where the originals are not available, issued by the CRC or any committee or department thereof, from January 1, 1947, to date, relating in any way to the matters set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 3 above.

"6. All correspondence[2] between the CRC, or any of its officers, representatives, agents, or employees and members of the CRC, their officers, representatives, agents, or employees from January 1, 1947, to date, relating in any way to the matters set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 3 above.

"7. All interoffice correspondence between any two or more officers, representatives, agents, or employees of the CRC from January 1, 1947, to date, relating in any way to the matters set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 3 above.

"8. All correspondence between the CRC, or any of its officers, representatives, agents, or employees, and any other person[3] from January 1, 1947, to date, relating in any way to the matters set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 3 above.

"9. All correspondence between members of the CRC, their officers, representatives, agents, or employees, and any other persons, from January 1, 1947, to date, relating in any way to the matters set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 3 above.

"10. All correspondence between any regional, State, or local units or affiliates of the CRC, or officers, representatives, agents, or employees of such units or affiliates and any other persons, from January 1, 1947, to date relating in any way to the matters set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 3 above.

"11. All correspondence between the CRC, or any of its officers, representatives, agents, or employees, and Members of the Congress of the United States or their employees from January 1, 1947, to date, relating in any way to the matters set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 3 above.

"12. All press release, articles, or other informational material or copies thereof where the originals are not available, prepared by the CRC or any of its officers, representatives, agents, or employess, for submission to any newspaper, magazine, periodical, radio or television station or network, radio or television writer, announcer or commentator, from January 1, 1947, to date, relating to the matters set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 3 above.

"13. All statements, or copies thereof where the originals are not available, from January 1, 1947, to date, prepared by any officer, representative, agent, or employee of the CRC for submission to any committee of the Congress of the United States by any person.

"14. Such records as show the name of each officer, representative, agent, or employee of the CRC who has assisted in the preparation of each such statement.

"15. Such records as show the name and affiliation of each person submitting each such statement, to a committee of the Congress of the United States.

"16. Such records as show the date each such statement was submitted, together with the name of the committee to which the statement was submitted.

"17. Such records as show the title and bill number of all bills, resolutions, and other legislative proposals prepared in whole or in part by any officer, representative, agent, or employee of the CRC or prepared by any other person at the behest of the CRC, or whose preparation was arranged by the CRC, from January 1, 1947, to date, together with such records as show the disposition of each such bill, resolution, or other legislative proposal.

"18. Such records as show the name of each officer, representative, agent, or employee of the CRC, who has assisted in the preparation of each such bill, resolution, or other legislative proposal.

"19. All correspondence relating in any way to each such bill, resolution, or other legislative proposal.

"20. Books of account, audits, canceled checks, deposit slips, receipts, and other supporting documents which show the receipts and expenditures of the CRC from January 1, 1947, to date.

"21. Such of the records of the CRC which indicate the name and address of each person from whom a total of $500 or more has been received in the 43-month period from January 1, 1947, to date, for any purpose, including but not limited to, receipts in the following categories:

"(a) Money received from the sale of books, pamphlets, and other literature.

"(b) Contributions.

"22. Such of the records of the CRC which indicate, as to each such person referred to in paragraph 21, the amount, date, and purpose of each payment which formed a part of the total of $500 or more.

"23. Such of the records of the CRC which show all receipts and expenditures of the CRC in relation to the borrowing, lending, or renting of mailing lists to or by the CRC.

"24. Such of the records of the CRC which show the number of mailing lists of the CRC, the identity of each type of mailing list, and the number of names on each type of mailing list.

"25. All correspondence which relates to the lending or renting of mailing lists by the CRC to other persons.

"26. All correspondence relating to mailing lists borrowed or rented by the CRC from other persons.

"27. Such records of the CRC as indicate receipts and expenditures in relation to the distribution of any material under the frank of any Member of the Congress of the United States, and all correspondence relating in any way to any such distribution.

"28. Such records, from January 1, 1947, to date, which show the name of each officer or employee of the CRC receiving a salary in excess of $5,000 per annum.

"29. All contracts, memoranda of agreements, and other records showing or defining the duties and terms of employment of each such officer and employee.

"30. Books of account, canceled checks, and vouchers showing for the period from January 1, 1947, to date, all receipts of and expenditures by Milton Kaufman, Joseph Cadden, Thomas G. Buchanan, Jr., Len Goldsmith, William L. Patterson, George Marshall, Miranda Smith, and Charles A. Doyle, relating to their activities on behalf of the CRC.

"31. Such of the records of the CRC which indicate the names and addresses of all banks, trust companies, or other financial institutions with which the CRC or Milton Kaufman, Joseph Cadden, Thomas G. Buchanan, Jr., Len Goldsmith, William L. Patterson, George Marshall, Miranda Smith, and Charles A. Doyle have accounts, or through which the CRC or Milton Kaufman, Joseph Cadden, Thomas G. Buchanan, Jr., Len Goldsmith, William L. Patterson, George Marshall, Miranda Smith, and Charles A. Doyle transact financial business together with a description of the nature of the accounts maintained and the dates during which the accounts were maintained, from January 1, 1947, to date.

"32. All correspondence, all records of receipts and disbursements of money (including but not limited to canceled checks, receipts, and deposit slips), and all other records of the CRC relating to each convention, rally, protest meeting, assembly, "march on Washington," group train or bus trip or caravan to Washington, or legislative conference relating in any way to the matters set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 3 above, which was sponsored by or held at the behest of the

[1] The term "legislation" as here and hereinafter used throughout this subpena means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House.

[2] The term "correspondence" as here and hereinafter used throughout this subpena means letters, telegrams, memoranda, pamphlets, bulletins, circulars, and other printed or duplicated matter, and transcripts or memoranda of telephone conversations; and the term includes copies of such documents where original documents are not available.

[3] The term "person" as here and hereinafter used throughout this subpena includes an individual, partnership, committee, association, corporation, and any other organization or group of persons.

CRC or in which the CRC participated in any manner."

Pursuant to said subpena, William L. Patterson appeared before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities on August 4, 1950, but failed and refused to produce certain records called for in the subpena duces tecum, and as a result of such refusal the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities was again deprived from receiving information concerning a matter committed to said committee. The record of the proceedings before the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities held on Friday, August 4, 1950, during which the said William L. Patterson refused to furnish certain material pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is set forth in part as follows:

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE
ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES,
"Washington, D. C.,
"Friday, August 4, 1950.

"The select committee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:02 a. m., in the caucus room, Old House Office Building, Hon. HENDERSON LANHAM presiding.

"Present: Representatives LANHAM (presiding), ALBERT, and DOYLE.

"Also present: Benedict F. FitzGerald, Jr., committee counsel. William L. Patterson, national executive secretary, Civil Rights Congress.

"Mr. LANHAM. Because the House meets at 10 this morning and a quorum call has already been requested and is in progress, the meeting will be adjourned until 11 this morning when we will be back.

"(Whereupon, the committee recessed at 10:03 a. m., and reconvened at 11:12 a. m.)

"(Present: Representatives LANHAM (presiding), ALBERT, DOYLE, and O'HARA of Minnesota).

"Mr. LANHAM. The committee will come to order.

"Mr. Clerk, do you know where the witness is?

"Mr. GRIFFIN. I will try to locate him, sir. I haven't been able to as yet.

"Mr. LANHAM. See if the officers can locate him and ask him to come in. We will wait a few minutes, otherwise we will ask the clerk to draw a citation for contempt.

"Let it be noted that a quorum is present at 11:15. Those present are DOYLE, ALBERT, LANHAM, and O'HARA of Minnesota.

"(Recess: 11:15–11:25 a. m.)

"Mr. LANHAM. The committee will be in order.

"TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM L. PATTERSON, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, CIVIL RIGHTS CONGRESS—RESUMED

"Mr. LANHAM. Did the witness misunderstand the time of the hearing?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I find myself in the unfortunate position of having to make another apology. I saw the chairman of the committee, and I was watching from the gallery of the House, and not understanding procedure I thought the chairman absent, why——

"Mr. LANHAM. Well, the chairman is a member of the committee that is guiding the bill through the House that they have been discussing and that accounts for his absence.

"Mr. PATTERSON. I regret my absence.

"Mr. LANHAM. Would the witness proceed?

"Mr. Counsel, do you have any questions?

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

"Mr. Chairman, at this time I think we want to introduce into evidence the subpena——

"Mr. LANHAM. Let me swear the witness first, please.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

"Mr. LANHAM. Hold up your right hand.

"Do you solemnly swear that the evidence you shall give the committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I do.

"Mr. LANHAM. Mr. FitzGerald.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Yesterday when we adjourned we were discussing the subpena that had been served upon the witness, Mr. Chairman, and today I want to introduce into evidence a copy of a subpena duces tecum dated August 3, 1950, which was served yesterday, commanding William L. Patterson, executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., to appear before this committee today and instructing him to bring with him documents mentioned in the attachment accompanying that supena. Thirty-two provisions are contained in that attachment.

"I would like to make that a part of the record.

"Mr. LANHAM. Without objection it will be admitted."

(The subpena and attachment referred to has been set forth above.)

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. For the record, Mr. Chairman, the subpena that I have introduced is a new subpena which was served yesterday, and from my study of it it is perfectly in order.

"Mr. LANHAM. Was it served upon the witness as the representative of the Civil Rights Congress?

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Precisely. It was served by me in the company of Earl Griffin, clerk of our committee and the return made on the reverse side thereof so designates.

"Mr. LANHAM. All right, proceed.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, Mr. Patterson, I direct your attention to this subpena which has just been introduced into evidence, and I want you to examine it and tell me whether or not that is an exact copy of the one that you have in your hand.

"Mr. PATTERSON. I find it to be so. I find it to be so. I am satisfied that it is so, rather; I haven't examined it.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You are now before the committee, the House Lobbying Committee, which is mentioned in that subpena?

"Mr. PATTERSON. That is my understanding.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. And I direct your attention to the attachment of the subpena now. I just mentioned that there are 32 provisions in that attachment.

* * * * *

"Mr. LANHAM. Will you state which you will not supply and which you will?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I will not supply any account, any list, of those who have given material support to the organization.

"Mr. DOYLE. May I ask a question, please?

"When you got this subpena, did you look to see what material you had in the files that was referred to in the subpena?

"Mr. PATTERSON. To a certain degree, yes.

"Mr. DOYLE. To how far a degree?

"Mr. PATTERSON. To a very large degree.

"Mr. DOYLE. Did you bring it with you?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I did not.

"Mr. DOYLE. Why didn't you?

"Mr. PATTERSON. Because I didn't regard this organization as a lobbying organization.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Now paragraph 20 in the attachment to the subpena mentions all the "books of account, audits, canceled checks, deposit slips, receipts, and other supporting documents which show the receipts and expenditures of the Civil Rights Congress from January 1, 1947, to date."

"What about those items? Have you brought them with you this morning?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I have not brought it this morning. I will not bring it any morning. You have subpenaed that from the bank with which I deal, and insofar as you have in your possession those bank accounts, so far as I am concerned, you will be limited to that. And I say that for this reason——

"Mr. LANHAM. Never mind your reason. Go ahead with something else.

"Mr. PATTERSON. Just a moment. I am not refusing questions categorically——

"Mr. LANHAM. You have refused to do it. We have not time to listen to a long tirade.

"Mr. PATTERSON. I am not trying to introduce any tirades here.

"Mr. LANHAM. Please answer the question and confine yourself to the direct answer to the question.

* * * * *

"Mr. PATTERSON. Such as is kept there, pursuant to the law we have, I have—may I phrase it this way: If there is such material and I do not regard it as having anything to do with lobbying, I will take that question to the Supreme Court before I will furnish it to this committee. I want that clearly understood. I am not going to be a party to the terrorization of anybody.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Passing on to item 21, which also deals with financial records, do you have that in front of you? Do you propose to furnish the committee with that material?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I do not.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. With regard to item 22, do you propose to furnish the material with that—financial material is also included in 22?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I think that should be read, 21 and 22, so that my position is set forth clearly.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. All right, you may read it.

"Mr. PATTERSON. It says in 21: 'Such of the records of the CRC which indicate the name and address of each person from whom a total of $500 or more has been received in the 43-month period from January 1, 1947, to date, for any purpose, including, but not limited to, receipts in the following categories:

"'(a) Money received from the sale of books, pamphlets, and other literature;

"'(b) Contributions.'

"Now, I would say this: With relation to any moneys received from the sale of books, pamphlets, or other literature, I would not at all be adverse if I have such records to furnishing them to this committee.

"With reference to (b), the question of contributions, I shall not furnish this committee with such.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. All right. Passing on to 22, you may read that.

"Mr. PATTERSON (reading): 'Such of the records of the CRC which indicate, as to each such person referred to in paragraph 21, the amount, date, and purpose of each payment which formed a part of the total of $500 or more.'

"With relation to (a) of 22, I am not adverse to what records I have, to furnishing them. With relation to (b) of 22, I would give you the same answer.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. That is, you will not?

"Mr. PATTERSON. And for the same reason, which I want specified here clearly.

"Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I think that should be plain which way he means it—whether he will or will not furnish it. I do not understand, Mr. Patterson, myself that you would not furnish it.

"Mr. PATTERSON. I would not furnish these amounts.

"Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. With reference to (b) of 21?

"Mr. PATTERSON. With reference to (b), that is, contributions.

"Mr. ALBERT. For contributions under 22?

"Mr. PATTERSON. That is what I said.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Item No. 24, which is the next one, deals with what Mr. DOYLE has just described—mailing lists. [Reading:] 'Such of the records of the Civil Rights Congress

which show the number of mailing lists of the Civil Rights Congress, the identity of each type of mailing list, and the number of names on each type of mailing list.'

"Do you propose to furnish the committee with that material?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I propose to furnish no committee with the identity of individuals who can be pursued by virtue of the fact that our organization has been declared to be subversive, which it is not.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Passing on to No. 25——

"Mr. LANHAM. Being declared by whom? The Attorney General?

"Mr. PATTERSON. That is right.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Passing on to No. 30, will you read that, please?

"Mr. PATTERSON (reading): 'Books of account, canceled checks, and vouchers showing, for the period from January 1, 1947, to date, all receipts of and expenditures by Milton Kaufman, Joseph Cadden, Thomas G. Buchanan, Jr., Len Goldsmith, William L. Patterson, George Marshall, Miranda Smith, and Charles A. Doyle, relating to their activities on behalf of the CRC.'

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Do you propose to furnish that material to this committee?

"Mr. PATTERSON. There wouldn't be any in existence save that which comes within compliance with the law, which might be for 2 years.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. Do you propose to furnish the material that is in existence as you have just mentioned?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I do not.

"Mr. LANHAM. You refuse to furnish it?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I refuse.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. And would you identify the contributors to organization in the last year?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I might answer that question if someone asked me did so-and-so contribute. But as far as having in my memory a list of the contributors, I haven't it.

"Mr. FITZGERALD. You mean you can't list one contributor to your organization during the last year?

"Mr. LANHAM. Well, you have a list in your office, I take it?

"Mr. PATTERSON. I think that comes within the purview of the question that I said I have no intention of answering.

"Mr. LANHAM. If you refuse to answer, just tell us.

"Mr. PATTERSON. I don't say I refuse to answer here. I say as far as my memory is concerned, I say. I refuse to answer as far as furnishing a list is concerned. As far as my memory is concerned, I have no recollection.

* * * * *

"Mr. FITZGERALD. In view of the witness' refusal, Mr. Chairman, to give us evidence as to his contributors, I respectfully suggest that we adjourn at this time. I am unable to continue without that information, and I think that the witness is in contempt of this committee for refusing to answer that question and certain others, and I respectfully suggest that you adjourn because of that.

"In closing I want to point out that in the history of this committee we have only had two other individuals who have taken a similar position. I refer to Edward A. Rumely, executive secretary of the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., and Mr. Joseph Kamp, executive vice chairman of the Constitutional Education League. Both seem to share the identical philosophy of this individual insofar as refusing to give their lists of contributions. Apparently, the activities of these three organizations are in accord with a desire to go underground. I hesitate to recommend that you give further time to such individuals, particularly in view of the pressing war and economic problems which now confront you, and no doubt are calling you on the floor of Congress at this very moment.

"Mr. LANHAM. The committee will stand adjourned.

"(Whereupon, at 12:40 p. m., the select committee adjourned.)"

Because of the foregoing the said Select Committee on Lobbying Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said William L. Patterson relative to the subject matter which under House Resolution 298 of the Eighty-first Congress the said Select Committee on Lobbying Activities was directed to investigate and the refusal of William L. Patterson to furnish the information in response to the subpena duces tecum hereinabove set forth, or in response to questions addressed to him under oath before a quorum of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities during William L. Patterson's voluntary appearances before said Committee on Lobbying Activities deprived the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of necessary and pertinent information and places said witness William L. Patterson in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. BUCHANAN (interrupting the reading of the report). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the report be dispensed with.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe that the record of the hearing in this case is very, very important, and that the membership should give it some attention. I am therefore constrained to object. The purpose is not to be dilatory I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I want the Members to hear what is in the report.

The Clerk continued reading the report.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 835).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities as to the refusal of William L. Patterson to answer questions and produce documents before the said Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said William L. Patterson may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE ARE ENTITLED TO A PRESUMPTION OF REGULARITY AND THEIR REPORTS OF FAIRNESS AND JUSTIFICATION

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, instead of going into a discussion of ideologies as far as my presentation of this proposed citation is concerned, I think I will just stick to the printed record and let that record speak for itself, with this observation, however, I could not help but note that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], in the very first six words he spoke, said: "This thing is largely a legal matter." So I am glad the House voted the last citation, because if the gentleman from Indiana is correct, and I believe he is, I hope it will get to the United States Supreme Court as soon as possible in order that this question of the jurisdiction of a committee of the House of Representatives in such matters as are in controversy in the case of this citation asked for against Mr. Rumely can be fairly determined by the highest court in the land.

I have the duty of presenting the proposed citation directed against William L. Patterson, the head of the Civil Rights Congress. The record will show that the Lobbying Committee agreed to take a sample out of the many we studied of the right and the left, in common parlance. We could not possibly take time for more. The extreme right was the Committee for Constitutional Government, the director of which, Dr. Rumely, we just cited; the extreme left for the purpose of taking the sampling as to methods used to lobby and other matters within the jurisdiction and purview of House Resolution 298 and not because we thought they were any worse than anyone else, but because we thought their lobbying activities were typical of the methods and means used by those on the right or on the left, whichever the case may be. That is why we are asking you to cite Mr. Patterson in this case. It is regrettable time to debate is so short.

Because I realize that many Members of this House have not recently read House Resolution 298, passed by this House August 12, 1949, I present its text to you, to wit:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a Select Committee on Lobbying Activities to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of (1) all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation; and (2) all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

And, because, by the nature of the questions asked me within the last 2 or 3

hours by Members of this busy House as to the text of the applicable sections and portions of the Regulation of Lobbying Act, being title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which became Public Law 601, passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, of which I was a Member, I wish to say that section 304 and section 305, subdivision (a) (1), provides:

RECEIPTS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 304. Every individual who receives a contribution of $500 or more for any of the purposes hereinafter designated shall within 5 days after receipt thereof rendered to the person or organization for which such contribution was received a detailed account thereof, including the name and address of the person making such contribution and the date on which received.

STATEMENTS TO BE FILED WITH CLERK OF HOUSE

SEC. 305. (a) Every person receiving any contributions or expending any money for the purposes designated in subparagraph (a) or (b) of section 307 shall file with the Clerk between the first and tenth day of each calendar quarter, a statement containing complete as of the day next preceding the date of filing—

(1) the name and address of each person who has made a contribution of $500 or more not mentioned in the preceding report; except that the first report filed pursuant to this title shall contain the name and address of each person who has made any contribution of $500 or more to such person since the effective date of this title;

Section 307 provides:

PERSONS TO WHOM APPLICABLE

SEC. 307. The provisions of this title shall apply to any person (except a political committee as defined in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and duly organized State or local committees of a political party), who by himself, or through any agent or employee or other persons in any manner whatsoever, directly or indirectly, solicits, collects, or receives money or any other thing of value to be used principally to aid, or the principal purpose of which person is to aid, in the accomplishment of any of the following purposes:

(a) The passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

(b) To influence, directly or indirectly, the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States.

And section 308 provides:

REGISTRATION WITH SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND CLERK OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 308. (a) Any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States shall, before doing anything in furtherance of such object, register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and shall give to those officers in writing and under oath, his name and business address, the name and business address of the person by whom he is employed, and in whose interest he appears or works, the duration of such employment, how much he is paid and is to receive, by whom he is paid or is to be paid, how much he is to be paid for expenses, and what expenses are to be included. Each such person so registering shall, between the first and tenth day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk and Secretary a detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter in carrying on his work; to whom paid; for what purposes; and the names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials, and the proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any person who merely appears before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support or opposition to legislation; nor to any public official acting in his official capacity; nor in the case of any newspaper or other regularly published periodical (including any individual who owns, publishes, or is employed by any such newspaper or periodical) which in the ordinary course of business publishes news items, editorials, or other comments, or paid advertisements, which directly or indirectly urge the passage or defeat of legislation, if such newspaper, periodical, or individual, engages in no further or other activities in connection with the passage or defeat of such legislation, other than to appear before a committee of the Congress of the United States in support of or in opposition to such legislation.

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Therefore, my colleagues, you will observe the pertinency and materiality of the questions which were asked Dr. Rumely and which he refused to answer. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the representatives of the American people know the source from which the money is had and received by which the legislation which Members of Congress are asked to enact or do enact is influenced, directly or indirectly. This is not a question of freedom of the press, with all due respect to my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], both of whom are able newspaper owners and editors. I declare that their appraisement of the freedom of the press being the issue is most unreasonable, unfounded and not according to the facts and issues in any of these three citations.

And as long as my distinguished committee colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] stated that "it was largely a legal question," why not let the Supreme Court of the United States decide the constitutional rights of these parties concerned—where there is controversy over that question?

But, may I make it crystal clear that I would not knowingly vote for any bill or any citation or legislation in any form which I believed curbed the legal freedom of the press. But our high courts have held that this freedom is not absolute.

There are a few legal decisions which I wish to call to your attention at this point in my extemporaneous discussion. They are as follows:

The freedoms guaranteed by the first amendment are not absolute; they may be the subject of governmental inquiry or control in the interest of restraining abuses within the constitutional ambit of governmental activity. (*American Communications Assn., CIO* v. *Douds*, 339 U. S. 382; *United Public Workers* v. *Mitchell*, 330 U. S. 75; *Kovacs* v. *Cooper*, 336 U. S. 77.)

It is pertinent for a committee to inquire as to the finances of an organization which indulges in activities which may be the subject of legislation. (*Marshall* v. *U. S.*, 176 F. 2d 473; appeal pending; *Kamp* v. *U. S.*, 176 F. 2d 618, cert. den. May 1950.)

Many years ago the Supreme Court indicated that Congress had broad powers of investigation. In *ICC* v. *Goodrich Transit Co.*, 1912, 224 U. S. 194, that Court held that "* * * requiring * * * information concerning a business is not regulation of that business * * *" and refused to confine investigation to activities which might be regulated.

The power of Congress to investigate is certainly as broad as the power which it may validly confer upon an administrative official. In that field it has been held that the first amendment does not preclude a subpena by an administrative official requiring a newspaper to disclose the interstate distribution of its paper, dissemination of its news, or the source of its advertising receipts. (*Oklahoma Press Publishing Co.* v. *Walling*, 327 U. S. 186.)

The obvious lack of merit in the Committee for Constitutional Government's basic contention is demonstrated by the cases holding that the first amendment does not immunize the press from governmental controls applicable to other types of business. (*Oklahoma Press Publishing Co.* v. *Walling*, 327 U. S. 186; *Associated Press* v. *Labor Board*, 301 U. S. 103; *Associated Press* v. *United States*, 326 U. S. 1.)

And, now, back to this Patterson citation.

I now call your attention to the Patterson report and I ask you to observe it carefully. I am reading from pages 2 and 3 thereof:

Mr. HALLECK. Although your organization has taken a definite position in respect to many matters that have been pending before the Congress. Are we to understand from what you say that you have not done anything to implement those positions that you have taken?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes; in certain instances we have, but the Lobbying Act——

Mr. HALLECK. Well, as a matter of fact I know of my own observations, I think, that your organization has been very vocal and active in connection with the matter of legislation pending in the Congress.

Mr. LANHAM. Have they not had hordes of people coming down here?

Mr. HALLECK. Oh, yes. Is it not true, Mr. Patterson——

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mass trips?

Mr. HALLECK. That you and your organization and members of your organization have in an organized manner visited and talked to the Congressmen and Senators in respect to legislation?

Mr. PATTERSON. Correct.

Mr. HALLECK. And have you not done that with the purpose of trying to influence either the enactment or the defeat of legislation?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. And those activities have been directed at either bringing about the passage of legislation or the defeat of legislation, is that not true?

Mr. PATTERSON. I would say that was true.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. We have asked you to turn over certain records to the committee, is that not a fact, Mr. Patterson?

Mr. PATTERSON. That is a fact.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you turned them over to the committee?

Mr. PATTERSON. I have not. I have brought some of the material here.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you turn that material over to the committee?

Mr. PATTERSON. If you mean will I turn over all of the material asked for in the 32 demands that have been propounded here, the answer is, "I will not."

Mr. Speaker, I read from page 5, article 12:

12. All press releases, articles, or other informational material or copies thereof where the originals are not available, prepared by the CRC or any of its officers, representatives, agents, or employees, for submission to any newspaper, magazine, periodical, radio or television station or network, radio or television writer, announcer or commentator, from January 1, 1947, to date, relating to the matters set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) of paragraph 3 above.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to state to the House that some 32 items are listed here, that we demanded an inspection of and presentation of under subpena duces tecum. None of this information was produced for the record. We believed and still believe that his refusal to produce those records and that information to the lawful uses and purposes of your committee under House Resolution 298, deprived the committee of material and necessary information, records, and data needed to efficiently and adequately make our study, our survey, our report, and any recommendation we might consider making to Congress.

I think the record of the committee hearing in this Patterson matter speaks very clearly and loudly that Mr. Patterson, in his own language, stated time and time again that he would not produce the names of the contributors, and he would not produce these records which we asked for and which we were entitled to have him produce.

I hope the Members of the House will not vote for or against this citation on the ground that this man we are asking you to cite happens to come from the extreme left. Do you get my point? I am asking the Members not to vote for or against this citation on the basis that this man happens to represent the extreme left in our judgment. Mr. Rumely, in my opinion, represented the extreme right. It seems to me that we ought to deal with this question on the basis of what the record speaks. You and I must not be prejudiced against this American citizen in this citation matter merely because we know him to be what is termed on the extreme left. That is not the issue in this case. Political ideologies are not the test as to whether or not this citation should issue. I am sure you will agree with me that the record speaks very loudly and clearly this gentleman should be cited on the basis of the record for contempt of a committee of the Congress.

I cannot refrain from making this observation of my own position on the committee that I have been privileged to serve. I have enjoyed my service. I have enjoyed the work of the committee; I have enjoyed the work of the distinguished Members on the Republican side as well as those on the Democratic side. I wish to say to the Members of the House that I am satisfied, by and large, we have not been trying to catch anybody; we have not been trying to persecute anybody; we have not been trying to trap someone for the purpose of citing them to the district attorney of the United States. I wish to say that I believe the record of these hearings by the committee will show it is a fact this committee work has been objective as contrasted to being essentially partisan or petty or with small, puny motive. As to the remarks made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] graciously yielded to him, I wish to say that I have not known of any devious or any secret power and control of the committee or any member of the committee, and I hope that the gentleman's remarks will not be appraised by any Member of this House as inferentially even suggesting that any Member of this House on this lobbying committee has been the subject of some unseen or secret power. I believe fundamentally the House of Representatives should as far as possible uphold the arm of every committee which is legally constituted by the Congress itself. The well-established presumption in law is that the function of committees of Congress is legal, that they take legal steps; that they do not violate the law. So I am glad to see the House of Representatives sustain its own committee. We should give our own committees the benefit of the doubt, if any doubt exists.

Our highest courts have declared that a presumption of regularity and jurisdiction exists in favor of a congressional committee in the performance of its congressional investigations. And, may I say to you gentlemen on the Republican side of this House and any others who may be inclined to vote against this citation, why not take the word and appraisement of your own distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] as basically correct, to-wit: that this question is largely a legal question. Vote the citation if there is any doubt in your mind. Give the committee the benefit of your doubt. Send it to the United States Supreme Court and let us find out whether or not questions such as your committee asked and whether or not questions such as Dr. Rumley refused to answer and whether or not the facts the majority of your committee believes it is entitled to receive is, in fact, a violation of the freedom of the press or the violation of any other inherent right to any American. If it is, I certainly do not know it. I do not believe it is.

The voting of this citation does not send Dr. Rumely to prison. It presents a case for him to defend as well as a case for the Attorney General of the United States to prosecute under due process of law in the courts. Dr. Rumely will get full and adequate opportunity to present his defense, and he should have it.

No doubt some of the vast amounts of money received by the Committee for Constitutional Government would be allocated to see to it that he was very adequately defended. As a matter of fact, he always had with him at the committee hearings one of the most able and best-known attorneys on the eastern seaboard, a man trained by able service with the United States Government as well as in a large private practice. So Dr. Rumely was well-advised legally, and he followed his lawyer's advice.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has referred to the report and has read to the membership certain questions and answers, some of which were put by me. Do I understand it is the gentleman's contention from those questions and and answers that the answers do definitely disclose that Mr. Patterson and his organization, not being registered under the Lobbying Act, have from time to time directly intervened with Members of Congress for and against pending legislation?

Mr. DOYLE. I will say to the gentleman I think there is no question about it. The record clearly shows, that, based on our own printed hearings which are in the possession of every Member of the House this afternoon, that this gentleman and his organization were engaged in lobbying. And I believe the record clearly speaks because Dr. Rumely frankly admitted in the hearings that the committee was engaged in lobbying your own House committee, appointed under House Resolution 293, was entitled to ask and was entitled to know the source of all moneys coming to Dr. Rumely's committee for the purpose of lobbying, either directly or indirectly—that is the clear text of the act passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does not the record show they did register?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes, but the record shows he refused to comply with a legal supena duces tecum.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is another question.

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

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

Mr. KEATING. In order to get the issue perfectly clear here, the gentleman was reading on page 3 regarding this subpena and the witness' answer that he refused to turn over all of the material in the 32 demands. Then the gentleman ceased reading, as I remember, and I wondered whether a part of the charge here is his refusal to answer questions about membership in the Communist Party.

Mr. DOYLE. I deliberately avoided reading that question. I felt the question of whether or not this man was a Communist or whether or not he denied or admitted it was not pertinent to this citation. I felt that was a matter of ideology and it should not be emphasized in this House in order to prejudice any Member to vote for citing Patterson. The printed record should stand on its own feet as to the issuance of this citation. We are not citing this man on the ground of whether or not he is a Communist. I wish to say this, we did not vote for or against Mr. Rumely because he was a Fascist either.

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

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. That certainly is a question within the province of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and I doubt whether our committee would have jurisdiction over that question.

Mr. DOYLE. I deliberately avoided it for the reasons stated.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. That is exactly what I wanted to indicate. It seems to indicate that that was a question which perhaps would not be within the purview of the Committee on Lobbying. Do I understand that the contempt which your committee charges has to do with his refusal to turn over some of these papers called for in the 32 demands?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct; that is what the printed record clearly shows.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, we have had a most unusual situation here today. At least one part of this House has temporarily reformed; one part of this House got Constitution conscious today. I submit that my vote has been a most consistent vote on the question of these citations upon which the House has just voted. I always believed that the first amendment to the Constitution was applicable to 150,000,000 Americans and that it was applicable to all of them, irrespective of their color, race, or political beliefs. Part of this House has decided today to apply it to Mr. Rumely, I think only because of his political beliefs being of the extreme right, or of a reactionary character. I have no respect for Mr. Rumely; I have no respect for his views. I deem him to be a domestic Fascist, but he is one of the 150,000,000 Americans, and the first amendment applies to him just as much as it applies to anybody else. For this reason, and no other, I voted against citing him for contempt. I think the day is not far off when Members of this House are going to rue the fact that the Constitution is being disregarded daily in this House and that the Bill of Rights is being destroyed daily in this House. We are repeating the Fascist story of Italy and the Nazi story of Germany.

Now I want to address myself to this particular citation, because this citation is most unusual and stands by itself from all of the other citations that have come before this House. We just had a confession from the last speaker, the gentleman from California, speaking for the committee. He said, "You see, we took in the right" and they had two citations, at least, thought they were going to vote and finally did vote two citations against individuals who were supposed to represent the right. So, they had to balance this matter; they could not come before this House with two citations, both against the extreme right, so they had to balance it, they had to have a victim from the so-called left, and they picked on William Patterson of the Civil Rights Congress.

Now, William Patterson has been a courageous fighter for his people and the rights of his people for years. He is a Negro. The Civil Rights Congress has been listed by the Attorney General, because it happens to be one of those organizations militantly fighting for civil rights, and one which has exposed the hypocrisy of this Democratic administration on civil rights. The action of the Attorney General was sheer political vengeance. Despite this persecution, the Civil Rights Congress has been doing tremendous work. Yes, it was the Civil Rights Congress that only recently went down to Mississippi and saved Wm. McGee from the electric chair. McGee, a Negro, is the victim of a vicious frame-up. This gives you an idea of the kind of activity in which Patterson and his organization are engaged. This activity is the kind of lobbying this committee chose to investigate.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. I wish to say to the gentleman that this committee was not thinking in terms of individuals. We selected these three as representing typical lobbying organizations.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes, but the gentleman confessed that they had two citations of the right, so he said, "We had to have a sample of them among the left" and the Negro Patterson was the sample. In other words, they had to have a victim from the left in order to make a pretense at impartiality, irrespective of whether or not the Civil Rights Congress was a legitimate subject of this investigation or even remotely came within the purview of the investigation.

The kind of work the Civil Rights Congress does is not what Congress intended by lobbying in its resolution establishing this committee. It has been constantly, in every State of this Union, fighting for the civil rights of the Negro people and it has been defending Negroes who have been deprived of their rights in the various courts and by officials in the various States of this country. So, Mr. Patterson received a subpena to come in here. A victim from the left had to be produced. Here was the victim and he was a Negro. This record is very, very illuminating as to how this Negro was treated before this House committee, and I think it is about time we examine this record and hang our heads in shame. I call your attention to the report containing excerpts of the hearings.

Read the following on page 3.

The chairman asked Mr. Patterson:

> Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

The last speaker, the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Oklahoma all admit now that this question did not come within the purview of this committee. Then why did you ask the question? Why did you ask the question if it did not come within the purview of these investigations? Why did you ask it? The answer is obvious. The Negro victim from the left had to be smeared and this was the beginning of the smearing of that victim. Mr. Patterson was late. He was in the gallery according to the testimony. He noticed the chairman of the committee on the floor of the House, and he figured because the chairman of the committee was on the floor of the House there would be no committee meeting without the chairman. He did not know anything about the appointment of an acting chairman. What happened? When Mr. Patterson did not get there on time that afternoon, when he was a few minutes late, Mr. LANHAM, acting chairman of the committee, said, "See if the officers can locate him and ask him to come in. We will wait a few minutes. Otherwise, we will ask the clerk to draw a citation for contempt." I wonder if officers would have been sent after a white witness.

Do you get the anxiety here? They wanted to get this victim. It had to be a victim from the left. So they sent out the officers for him. He appeared by himself. The point is, he appeared immediately. He was there. Then let me show you what short shrift they gave this man when he tried to explain his position. He was asked questions about documents and records and the record shows here that many of these documents had been obtained by subpena duces tecum served on the bank in which the organization keeps its funds. The only thing that Mr. Patterson refused to give was his list of contributors, and you gentlemen who voted "no" on the Rumely citation had better bear in mind that there is no distinction between these two cases, because the Civil Rights organization is also publishing pamphlets and selling pamphlets on the issue of civil rights and on the various cases which it has been handling. So that there is no difference between this case and the Rumely case. Of course, I know a lot of people are going to split hairs and are going to make up a lot of arguments to try to show a difference. However, any such difference will be synthetic and fake. But there is no difference and anybody with common sense and honesty will not challenge this statement. Let me get back again to show you how they treated this Negro victim from the left. Mr. Patterson said:

> And I say that for this reason——
>
> Mr. LANHAM. Never mind your reason, go ahead with something else.

This is a Negro before this committee. Short shrift with him. This is the kind of treatment he received while he was being questioned. Mind you, this man is not a lobbyist. He is a defender of his people. What has he engaged in? He has asked the Members of the Congress to vote for the civil rights bills that have come before the Congress. What has he done? He has sent letters. Yes, there have been delegations coming down here, public, open, mass delegations of hundreds of people coming down here to ask the Members of Congress to

live up to the pledges on civil rights which they made at the time they sought to be elected. He was not a lobbyist for special privilege. He was not a lobbyist for the real estate crowd. He was not a lobbyist for the loan to Franco. He was not a lobbyist for the special privileges—special privileges that go up and down these Halls of Congress, infesting the Halls of Congress like cockroaches, and doing so with immunity despite this committee. He has been petitioning the Congress of the United States. What kind of deal did he get from this committee? He was twice called a liar by the acting chairman. He finally wound up before that committee by having his race insulted, and by having 15,000,000 Negro people villified when he was called "a black * * *" epithet by the acting chairman. That happened before that committee. That happened to this witness, yes this Negro victim from the alleged left. I say that somebody is in contempt. Mr. Speaker, somebody is in contempt, but it is not Mr. Patterson. I tell you we in the House, all of us are in contempt when we permit that kind of language and that kind of insult to be hurled at 15,000,000 Americans and we do nothing about it.

Oh, sure. Let somebody now get up here and try to wash it off by hollering about "atheistic Russia," or communism, or set up the red bogey. But I tell you what we are facing here is a challenge, a challenge to fairness and justice and decency. The challenge is, shall we by voting for this citation, by voting to send this Negro victim to jail, put our stamp of approval on the use of the language in Congress to which this Negro was subjected before this committee. You want the Negro victim from the left. I cannot stop you from taking him. You have him; but you know deep down in your hearts that you are not doing what is just. Crucify Patterson. Crucify him the way you villified his people, the 15,000,000 members of his race before your committee. Go ahead and crucify him. That is within your power, but you are not only violating the Constitution, you are undermining the faith of Americans in the justice and integrity of this Congress.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, the only Member who is going to say anything about atheistic communism in this debate is the gentleman from New York, because it does not have anything to do with the issue we are discussing here.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. And I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from New York, even though I disagree with him.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I know the gentleman from Oklahoma does not need the gentleman from Mississippi to prompt him. The gentleman from Oklahoma has plenty of ability to take care of himself any time of the day without the help of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ALBERT. I always welcome the help of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not mean to interrupt. I was just asking for information.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's question answers itself.

This is not a question involving the communism of William Patterson. The only question here is whether a committee of Congress asking for information, which it is entitled to have, has the power to require a witness to furnish such information and to cite for contempt such witness when he contemptuously and flagrantly refuses to give it. This witness not only admitted that he and large numbers of people representing his organization had been to Washington lobbying Congressmen on several different occasions, but that the organization at one time had reported under the Registration of Lobbying Act, an act which requires reports of receipts and expenditures. We asked him for the information that he already should have filed with the Clerk of the House when he reported under the Lobbying Act, and he refused to give it: First, because he said he did not know whethe- his was a lobbying organization; and, second, because he thought it might incriminate somebody else.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. This party you are talking about is supposed to represent the Civil Rights Congress. That is a Communist-front organization?

Mr. ALBERT. The Attorney General has so held, I think.

Mr. RANKIN. Have you ever heard any individual who investigated it who did not hold it was a Communist-front organization?

Mr. ALBERT. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. RANKIN. I was a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and I have been in close contact with the FBI. I have never found any informed person who denied that this outfit was a Communist front.

Mr. ALBERT. Even so, I would like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that whether William Patterson is a Communist or not is not the issue here. He was clearly and flagrantly in contempt of the committee.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. TOWE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this defendant, so-called, had clearly violated the law, the statute?

Mr. ALBERT. In my judgment, he has.

Mr. TOWE. I understood you previously to say that. I wondered why he has not been prosecuted under the law, rather than brought here under this contempt citation. Can the gentleman give me some information about that?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, there are several thousand files on record with the Clerk of the House, and it is hardly to be expected that the proper administrative agency would have every possible violation of the act called to its attention.

Mr. TOWE. Could not your committee bring it to the attention of the proper governmental agency?

Mr. ALBERT. Well, we are bringing one phase of it to the attention of the proper governmental agency now.

Mr. TOWE. I understand that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I might say the Civil Rights Congress has filed under the Lobbying Act, and their representatives in Washington have filed.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. But that does not answer the charge that it is a Communist-front organization, lined up with other Communists who are dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That was not any of our concern. It was strictly on the basis of the Lobbying Registration Act that we made these queries.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that whenever any outfit dedicates itself to the destruction of this Government, then it is the duty of every congressional committee when its representatives appear before it, to make a thorough investigation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I think the issue is clear.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and also the remarks that I made during consideration of the previous resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALBERT. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Were the records which the witness refused to turn over to the gentleman's committee solely those relating to contributions to the Civil Rights Congress, or were there other records?

Mr. ALBERT. We called for the same records here that we called for in the Rumely case. These included not only contributions but also receipts from the sale of books. He did not give us any of this information.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The real pinpoint of this thing, of course, is that he admitted that he had been lobbying, that groups had been sent here to pressure Congress but that he had never filed.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is not true; he did file.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman wants to be correct about that, though it is immaterial to the pending matter whether he did or not, I should say that the organization did report up to the time that Patterson took it over, after that, as I remember it, it ceased reporting.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think that basically, however, on the question of refusal, as far as refusal to comply with the subpena duces tecum is concerned, there is no difference between the Rumely case and this case. He was asked for contributors; he refused to name the contributors, and that is all that is involved here. That is what was involved in the Rumely case.

Mr. ALBERT. I may say to the gentleman that if there was a difference it was only a difference of degree and not of kind.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. A very slight degree.

Mr. ALBERT. Rumely did furnish the committee part of the information which it requested.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Rumely did furnish a complete list of contributors as such.

Mr. ALBERT. That is my understanding.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. His defense on the other names which he refused to disclose was that they were purchasers of books.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Basically the proposition is the same.

Mr. ALBERT. Basically it is the same.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. There is this difference between the Committee for Constitutional Government and the Civil Rights Congress: The former was for constitutional government; and this outfit, this Civil Rights Congress, this Communist outfit, is for the overthrow of Government.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The only difference is that this outfit is for FEPC, and the gentleman from Mississippi is against it and he thinks FEPC is Moscow-borne. Is not that right?

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, it is.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say with respect to bank records of the Civil Rights Congress that there were a total number of check items all over $500 that were not reported in August 1950, mind you, of $29,775; 1949, of $36,601; in 1946 of $156,568; and in 1947, $80,990; a total of $303,935.40.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the evidence in these two cases, as I did to the evidence in the Un-American Activities Committee's pilot case we heard the other day. I am unable to see a particle of difference in any of them. There is a basic question involved. That is the question of law and order; it is the question of whether or not we will have respect or contempt for constituted authority. It does not matter to me one bit whether the man who refused to answer questions before a constituted committee of this Congress was a Fascist, a Communist, a Democrat, or a Republican, or whether his face was white, or black, or yellow.

On the question of this particular defendant's being a Negro, I believe that I have always been a friend of the Negro. But my Negro constituents also believe in law and order and obedience to the law regardless of color. I could not help but think this morning of my many law-abiding Negro constituents. Attention was called to a vile crime that was committed by a Negro over in Virginia; a case in which Justice Burton had taken some action; I could not help but think of a case that occurred a few years ago—in my district where a Negro had committed the vile crime of rape. The fact that it was a Negro was pretty well publicized. And there was great praise for two detectives who solved the case and brought him to justice. Their skill and devotion to duty was described and praised. But the significant fact that was omitted was that these two detectives themselves were Negroes. There were two good citizens and one bad one. All three were born with black skin. Only one had a black soul, but the other two, as do most of all races, possessed white souls. So to me it makes no difference; it is a question of law and order. The white man and the black man are both subject to the law and must be judged in the same balance of justice.

The question was asked me recently by a mother whose 18-year-old son is sleeping on Iwo Jima: "Why did he have to die?"

It is because there are those in the world who do not believe in submitting themselves to law and order. They seek freedom for themselves and shackles for fellow creatures. License for themselves, slavery for the other fellow. There will be evidence of that here in the House today when we compare the vote that we just took on Mr. Rumely with the vote that was taken on those gentlemen the other day and on this case. There has been distinctions drawn here as to whether the man was right or whether he was left. What difference it makes under the American system of government I have yet been unable to understand. Both are amenable to the law. Neither can be a law unto themselves. Neither can have a special law. All men must be measured by the same yardstick.

Let us take up some of the technical arguments that were offered a moment ago against the Rumely citation. They are just as applicable in this case as they were in the Rumely case. Both involved contributors. Mr. Rumely refused and Mr. Patterson refused to name their contributors. Why? They say because that money was used for printing, or received for the sale of printed matter, hence to inquire of the sources would infringe upon freedom of the press. Just exactly the same attitude as the fellow who says he can be a Communist behind the cloak of secrecy.

Let us take an illustration. The name of an old and famous pharmaceutical house, the Eli Lilly & Co., which happens to be in my own congressional district, was brought into the discussion this afternoon. It was stated they had made certain contributions to the Committee for Constitutional Government.

Well, they made contributions to my Republican opponent in 1948, and I made fun of it. I said, "I don't care how much money you spend." And I did not. The Lilly's contributed to my opponent in 1948, and I expect them to do the same this year. Yet Mr. Eli Lilly has communicated with me on legislation and matters of service a Congressman owes a constituent. And I have responded and measured his suggestions with the same yardstick I measure the proposal of any other man. And regardless of how vigorously he opposed me I would always do the same. To me that is America; it is her tradition. That is why I voted against the establishment of the lobbying committee. We are supposed to be men. We should be able to resist pressure. They can all come and see me; I will listen to both sides, then try to make a proper decision. I do not care how much money they spend; I do not care how much money they convert into print. Ninety percent of the press was against Mr. Truman, and he was elected anyway. In my district 99.99 percent of the press opposed my election. But the people elected me. Most of the opposition press treated me fairly in news coverage. Thus I was able to get my message to the people. And then I went to the radio. The people have a better capacity to understand and discern than we ofttimes believe.

The sooner we learn that the people are smart enough to see through a lot of propaganda, the better off we are going to be. Most of these violently partisan speeches are wasted. They only gratify those who are violent partisans, a small percent of our countrymen. The broad hard core of American people are sound, clear thinkers. So I for one did not favor the establishment of the committee and voted against it. But the fact remains the committee was established; it is a legal committee, and I do not care whether they are tomcats or alley cats when they are brought before the committee. They are supposed to answer these questions. I know of and will always defend the right to speak and print every viewpoint. But I know of no vested right to remain anonymous in the exercise of that right. In my State we must name the sponsors of every political slate. No one has been hurt thereby.

Now let us examine these arguments; that because these contributions, or receipts were spent for or bought printed matter.

Suppose some one gave me a thousand dollars for my campaign expenses. Suppose I used that money to print political literature. The Corrupt Practices Act says I must list my contributors. But I refuse to. I say this money was given to me for printing—and printing is free to proceed without interference. This is press work—in that field I enjoy freedom of the press—hence this money is anointed with the special license and freedom of dark dank secrecy.

Why, the judge would throw the book at me.

Now these folks, Rumely and Patterson, both print political literature. I get it by the bushel. Read a lot of it, too. But if I cannot separate the grain from the chaff I have no business here.

Yet this committee was established. Its existence is of the fiber, the warp and woof of the lawful authority of this Congress; and this Congress is of the American people. Law and order demands submission to lawful authority—and no man is too big and no man is too small—in the single sovereign scales of the law. All men must be weighed alike.

That is why it will be interesting to note how many of us will vote—whether we will weight these two men in the same scales.

Because I believe in constituted authority—in upholding it even though I might disagree, I am voting for these citations as I did the fifty-odd citations recently presented by the Un-American Activities Committee.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" had it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] 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 239, nays 106, not voting 85, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

YEAS—239

Abbitt	Burleson	Dollinger
Abernethy	Burnside	Dolliver
Addonizio	Burton	Donohue
Albert	Byrne, N. Y.	Doughton
Allen, La.	Camp	Douglas
Andresen,	Canfield	Doyle
August H.	Cannon	Eberharter
Andrews	Carlyle	Elliott
Aspinall	Carnahan	Engle, Calif.
Auchincloss	Carroll	Evins
Bailey	Case, N. J.	Fallon
Baring	Cavalcante	Feighan
Barrett, Pa.	Chatham	Fernandez
Battle	Chelf	Fisher
Beckworth	Chesney	Flood
Bennett, Fla.	Christopher	Fogarty
Bennett, Mich.	Chudoff	Forand
Bentsen	Clemente	Ford
Biemiller	Clevenger	Frazier
Bishop	Cole, Kans.	Fugate
Blatnik	Combs	Fulton
Boggs, La.	Cooley	Furcolo
Boiling	Cooper	Garmatz
Bolton, Md.	Crosser	Gary
Bonner	Curtis	Gathings
Bosone	Davenport	Gordon
Boykin	Davies, N. Y.	Gorski
Brooks	Davis, Ga.	Granahan
Brown, Ga.	Davis, Tenn.	Granger
Brown, Ohio	Deane	Grant
Bryson	DeGraffenried	Green
Buchanan	Delaney	Halleck
Buckley, Ill.	Denton	Harden
Burke	D'Ewart	Hardy
Harris	McKinnon	Richards
Harrison	McSweeney	Robeson
Hart	Mack, Ill.	Rodino
Havenner	Mack, Wash.	Rogers, Fla.
Hays, Ark.	Madden	Rooney
Hays, Ohio	Magee	Sadlak
Hedrick	Mahon	Sasscer
Heffernan	Mansfield	Secrest
Heller	Marsalis	Shelley
Herlong	Marshall	Sims
Hobbs	Miles	Smith, Va.
Hoffman, Ill.	Mills	Spence
Howell	Mitchell	Stanley
Huber	Monroney	Steed
Hull	Morris	Stigler
Irving	Moulder	Stockman
Jackson, Wash.	Multer	Sullivan
Jacobs	Murdock	Sutton
Javits	Murphy	Tackett
Jenison	Murray, Tenn.	Tauriello
Jennings	Noland	Taylor
Jones, Ala.	Norrell	Teague
Jones, Mo.	O'Brien, Ill.	Thomas
Jones, N. C.	O'Hara, Ill.	Thompson
Karst	O'Hara, Minn.	Thornberry
Karsten	O'Neill	Trimble
Kee	O'Sullivan	Underwood
Kelley, Pa.	O'Toole	Van Zandt
Kelly, N. Y.	Passman	Wagner
Kennedy	Patman	Walsh
Keogh	Patten	Walter
Kerr	Perkins	Welch
Kilday	Peterson	Wheeler
King	Philbin	White, Calif.
Kirwan	Pickett	White, Idaho
Kruse	Poage	Whittington
Lane	Polk	Wickersham
Lanham	Preston	Willis
Lind	Price	Wilson, Ind.
Linehan	Priest	Wilson, Okla.
Lyle	Rabaut	Wilson, Tex.
Lynch	Rains	Winstead
McCarthy	Rankin	Wood
McCormack	Redden	Woodhouse
McGrath	Rhodes	Young
McGuire	Ribicoff	Zablocki

NAYS—106

Allen, Calif.	Hand	Morton
Andersen,	Harvey	Nelson
H. Carl	Herter	Nicholson
Anderson, Calif.	Heselton	Patterson
Arends	Hill	Phillips, Calif.
Bates, Mass.	Hinshaw	Potter
Beall	Hoeven	Reed, Ill.
Boggs, Del.	Holmes	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton, Ohio	Hope	Rees
Bramblett	Horan	Rich
Brehm	Jackson, Calif.	Riehlman
Burdick	James	Rogers, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenkins	Sanborn
Chiperfield	Jensen	Saylor
Cole, N. Y.	Jonas	Scott, Hardie
Corbett	Judd	Scrivner
Cotton	Kean	Scudder
Crawford	Kearns	Shafer
Cunningham	Keating	Short
Davis, Wis.	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Dondero	Kunkel	Simpson, Pa.
Ellsworth	LeCompte	Smith, Wis.
Elston	LeFevre	Stefan
Fenton	Lichtenwalter	Taber
Gamble	Lodge	Talle
Gavin	Lovre	Tollefson
Golden	Lucas	Towe
Goodwin	McConnell	Velde
Graham	McDonough	Vorys
Gross	McGregor	Vursell
Guill	Marcantonio	Wadsworth
Gwinn	Martin, Mass.	Weichel
Hagen	Merrow	Widnall
Hale	Meyer	Wigglesworth
Hall,	Michener	Wolcott
Leonard W.	Miller, Md.	Wolverton

NOT VOTING—85

Allen, Ill.	Durham	Klein
Angell	Eaton	Larcade
Barden	Engel, Mich.	Latham
Barrett, Wyo.	Fellows	McCulloch
Bates, Ky.	Gillette	McMillan, S. C.
Blackney	Gilmer	McMillen, Ill.
Breen	Gore	Macy
Buckley, N. Y.	Gossett	Martin, Iowa
Bulwinkle	Gregory	Mason
Case, S. Dak.	Hall,	Miller, Calif.
Celler	Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.
Colmer	Hare	Morgan
Coudert	Hébert	Morrison
Cox	Hoffman, Mich.	Murray, Wis.
Crook	Holifield	Nixon
Dague	Johnson	Norblad
Dawson	Kearney	Norton
Dingell	Keefe	O'Brien, Mich.
O'Konski	Regan	Smith, Ohio
Pace	Rivers	Staggers
Pfeifer,	Roosevelt	Vinson
Joseph L.	Sabath	Werdel
Pfeiffer,	Sadowski	Whitaker
William L.	St. George	Whitten
Phillips, Tenn.	Scott,	Wier
Plumley	Hugh D., Jr.	Williams
Poulson	Sheppard	Withrow
Powell	Sikes	Woodruff
Quinn	Smathers	Yates
Ramsay	Smith, Kans.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Nixon.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Crook with Mr. Angell.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Breen with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Gilmer with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Smathers with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. BREHM, Mr. GOODWIN, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. JUDD, Mr. MERROW, and Mr. HOLMES changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DAVENPORT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the contempt citation just passed.

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

There was no objection.

RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROOKS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8594) to provide for the acquisition, construction, expansion, rehabilitation, conversion, and joint utilization of facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, legislation to strengthen the defenses of this country and to build all parts of our

Military Establishment has had my consistent support.

It was particularly difficult for me to accept the fact that I missed by less than 10 minutes the vote on H. R. 9554 to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories because weather conditions held up the plane on which I was returning to Washington.

Had I been on the floor I would have voted for the bill. I am delighted indeed that the measure passed so overwhelmingly.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain speeches which he has heretofore made on the floor of the House.)

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSES ALL PROGRESSIVE LEGISLATION—NEW RIVAL FOR NAM

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, as the final session of the Eighty-first Congress draws to a close, I want to call to the attention of the Members of this House the singular record of the American Medical Association on the health and social legislation which has come before this Congress.

It is a record untainted by a positive act or a progressive idea, a 99 and 44/100 percent pure record of negation, of opposition and obstruction on every legislative measure proposed to advance the Nation's health, safety, and security.

Lest the hierarchic officialdom of the AMA mistake these words for praise—and such is their lexicon that they might—I say this in bitter criticism of the AMA, its leaders, its ideas, and its methods.

If the record made by the AMA's representatives on matters before this Congress stood alone, there would be reason to regard these political medicine men with suspicion and distrust. When that record is added to the steadfastly reactionary attitudes and actions of the AMA over the last 25 years, it is ample evidence that the AMA now stands with the NAM and the most reactionary forces in American life—not on matters affecting medicine and health alone, but on the whole social-political front.

Let us take apart the record of this new monolith on the political scene. Item by item it is a demonstration that a private organization with a dog-in-the-manger philosophy has taken to itself the privileges and powers of semipublic and public institutions, has indeed, partially succeeded in persuading the public that the public should have no voice in matters concerning its own health and general welfare.

The record of the AMA in the Eighty-first Congress is a sort of proof perfect that the organization is not fitted for its present high trust and responsibilities. That is not to say that individual doctors are not competent to perform their medical tasks, it is rather to point out that their political leaders are a unique combination of selfishness, obtuseness, and a kind of paranoid malice.

But back to the AMA's legislative record in the Eighty-first Congress. I recite the record from personal knowledge of the opinions expressed, the pressures exerted, and the finagling used to paralyze the legislative machinery whenever the great public-health needs of this Nation came up for consideration.

BLOCKED AID TO MEDICAL SCHOOLS

I make no attempt to list the AMA's acts of violence against public-health legislation in order of importance, but I will place its filibustering against Federal aid to medical education at the top of the list. I have not hesitated to tell you of the importance of this legislation in the past and I will not hesitate now or in the future.

The AMA is the only group in the United States today which opposes emergency federal aid to our schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing and public health. The AMA's own members who really know the situation intimately—including the deans of these schools—oppose the AMA's official stand vehemently, pointing out that the very future of the finest medical schools in this country is at stake; that without Federal aid they must consistently fall short of the standards of quantity and quality of personnel demanded by a Nation whose requirements grow annually. These critics-from-within do not even have to recite the medical needs of the potential civil disasters of a future war to prove their point. The facts of the past and the present speak eloquently enough. As previously documented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 13 most of the deans of the medical colleges, the nursing and dental associations, the public health administrators and almost everybody else in the country not tied to the AMA by the bands of medical bondage recognize the shortages of trained medical personnel of all kinds. And now that this country is engaged in the Korean conflict, the Armed Forces have become acutely aware of the situation.

President Truman, Secretary of Defense Johnson, and VA Administrator Carl Gray, have all urged immediate approval of this legislation as vital to national health and security. The Senate was so impressed with the needs of the finest medical schools in the nation—which reported a net deficit of more than $10,000,000 last year—that it passed a Federal-aid bill unanimously. Yet in the past year we have made no progress in providing the aid which is needed so desperately—simply because the AMA is not interested in getting enough doctors to go around.

BLOCKED BILL IN COMMITTEE

It has filibustered this legislation endlessly. When one of its criticisms is accepted and a compromise introduced into the legislation, the AMA comes up with a new objection. When the new objection is compromised—seemingly satisfactorily—a third objection is raised. Apparently the only kind of medical aid bill the AMA would approve is a measure which would place unlimited public funds in the hands of the AMA itself to dispense as it sees fit after paying its lobbying and propaganda expenses to the distinguished crew of wreckers and hucksters who made it all possible.

Afraid of a decision in an open House vote on this legislation, the AMA has three times blocked the bill in committee by a single vote—and with the feeblest of excuses.

Here, for instance, is part of the most recent public statement on this legislation by an AMA official. In a letter from Dr. Frank Wilson, one of the AMA's official Washington representatives—lobbyists to those of us who understand that sort of thing—to every member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, it was declared that the Korean conflict had no bearing on the aid to medical education legislation because the bill would not produce any more doctors for a minimum of 6 to 8 years. Besides showing a sublime disregard for all other kinds of medical training such as nursing and dentistry, the letter reveals a willful begging of the question. Aid to medical education means better education in a matter of a year. And, even if it did not, are we to refuse to meet the quantity situation 6 or 8 years hence? Unless we start now it will never be met.

KOREAN CONFLICT MAKES NEED GREATER

The present significance of the Korean conflict would seem to be that we are involved in a long and costly struggle which may reach its peak at any time during the next 10 to 15 years. Korea is a warning and a portent. To say that it is meaningless in terms of our shoring up our national health defenses, that it has no bearing on the numbers and quality of our medical personnel, is to deny the wisdom of preparedness of any kind. I hardly think we could have had a more explicit warning of the dangers of our current shortages of doctors and others with medical training than the need to pass a medical draft in order to get enough doctors for the limited demands of the Korean conflict.

That is not nearly enough on the subject, but it is all I can take time for today. The RECORDS for this session are filled with the need for action. I discussed the problem at some length on July 13 and ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks at that time at this point in the RECORD.

MEDICAL COLLEGES, OTHER INSTITUTIONS TRAINING HEALTH PERSONNEL IN SERIOUS FINANCIAL STRAITS—PASSAGE OF H. R. 8886 OF VITAL IMPORTANCE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Eighty-first Congress is nearing the end of its existence. We are rapidly approaching that time when this Congress will no longer be able to correct its own errors of commission or make amends for its errors of omission.

The wisdom or folly of what we have done and what we have left undone will be matters for decision by the electorate in November. In many cases there is time enough to wait for that judgment—and to be guided by it in the next Congress. In some matters, however, the delay of months, even 6 or 7, may be more than we can afford. In such matters our failures may be written large

and indelibly on the record before the Eighty-second Congress ever convenes.

That is why I speak today. A bill vital to the welfare of this Nation, the health of our Armed Forces and our civilian population alike, is in danger of being left in the debris of the unfinished business of this Congress. H. R. 8886, the Emergency Health Training Act, better known as aid to medical education, is a measure which should be passed now, not 6 or 12 or 18 months from now. And all the stalling, twisting, turning, conniving tactics of the American Medical Association cannot conceal the stark need for this legislation.

The word "emergency" has seldom meant more than it does in the official title of H. R. 8886. This Nation is now involved in an enormously difficult and costly police action in Korea. The evolution of this conflict into a full-fledged modern war is a distinct possibility, a possibility not entirely within the power of this country to control. Even if we should escape a major holocaust, no one believes that the Communist's adventure in Korea will be their last.

Yet, at this moment as at every recent critical moment in our history, we do not have enough doctors or dentists or nurses or public-health personnel to meet peacetime requirements, much less the demands of our mobilizing Armed Forces and civilian defense. And we have not taken a single step to end the critical shortage of every kind of trained health personnel.

As a matter of honest and disturbing fact, our national resources for training health personnel are rapidly deteriorating instead of improving. Financial difficulties are forcing our professional health-training schools, particularly our medical schools, to curtail their programs drastically. Both the quality and quantity of training are being slashed. Fewer individuals are receiving training in some schools and the training is falling short of minimum standards in others. Some of our medical schools—and by no means the weakest in an academic sense—are near to closing because of their desperate financial state.

This situation is intolerable in a Nation that may soon need more doctors, nurses, and other trained health personnel than it ever dreamed were necessary before World War II. And even if it were not for the possible demands of war, we would need these people to take advantage of the expanding opportunities for better health in a peaceful world.

The Eighty-first Congress must reverse this trend to neglect and potential disaster by immediate action on Federal aid to medical education. We must, by our action, recognize that you cannot train doctors and their assistants overnight, that we are already far too late in getting a program under way, that our inaction in years and months past has created our present health-personnel shortage, and that inaction now will create shortages for the next crisis.

The minute we moved into Korea—and I believe there is near unanimous support in this House for that move—the Armed Forces started to look for doctors, dentists, and nurses. If the experience of World War II is repeated, and it is certain to be because of present shortages, the Armed Forces will never find as many as they need. And the ones they do find and take will be those whose services are fully needed by civilians.

It is proper that the needs of our Armed Forces come first. It is hardly proper for congressional inaction to permit this choice of life and health for one group as against sickness and occasional death for another group when there should be no real need to make the choice. We have it within our power to make adequate care available for all.

For those who may hesitate to believe that our present situation is really so bleak—and I know there are doubters among the Members of this House—I will cite a large number of chapters and verses at a later point in this speech. Most of them will come directly from the best authorities on health education in the Nation—the deans of the Nation's leading medical and dental schools, public and private alike, and the heads of associations of nurses and public-health personnel. It is also worth noting that the American Dental Association is on record for the bill.

Right now, however, I want to discuss the general situation of the bill to aid medical education with particular reference to its only vocal opposition—the American Medical Association.

H. R. 886 is still in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, scheduled for further consideration August 8, if this House and its committees are still in a position to consider any legislation at that time. This despite the fact that corresponding legislation passed the Senate last September and shortly thereafter went to the Rules Committee of this House with the blessing of the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Who and what are responsible for this sudden reversal in the legislative process? Who is responsible for this inexcusable delay in meeting a vital national need this late in the grim struggle of the free world against the forces of communism? Why do I stand here in July of 1950 and plead for action on a measure which most of us well know should have been law months ago?

The answer is always the same—the American Medical Association.

Until recently I though I had grown calloused to the AMA's dog-in-the-manger selfishness in its efforts to defeat almost every progressive public health measure offered in this Congress. I thought I had grown used to the double talking, double dealing methods of the AMA and its huckster representatives in their defense of a status quo riddled with inadequacies. I thought I had learned to brace myself against the overwhelming weight of the AMA hierarchy's $3,000,000 advertising and political slush fund.

Well, I was wrong. When the AMA maneuvered to kill by indirection this literally life-and-death legislation, I lost my calluses. I want the Members of this House to know the whole story of this measure and the AMA's opposition. Perhaps it will furnish an insight into the operations of this organization which some of you have not always displayed in the recent past.

I do not mean to say this is the only story of AMA duplicity and reaction in the face of the health needs of the people of this country. Many others come immediately to mind. There is the slander campaign against national-health insurance which calls it socialized medicine despite the fact that the AMA well knows it is not socialized medicine at all. Part of this campaign is the attempt to use the completely discredited alleged quotation from Lenin that "socialized medicine is the keystone of the arch of the Socialist state." The AMA has been called upon to either document or stop using that quotation many, many times. Its officials have admitted that the quotation cannot be documented. Experts at both the Library of Congress and the University of Chicago have declared there is no such statement in the known works of Lenin. Yet the quotation continues to be used in published material, in public speeches, and in political assaults. The use of such falsehoods is typical of the AMA approach to issues of public health, and they can no longer be defended on the lame grounds of ignorance of the truth. They are willful perversions of the truth.

Then there is the attempt to discredit the Federal Security Agency and its Administrator with completely unfounded and disproved charges that they wish to dictate to American medicine. There is the constant pounding at the slogan, "Keep politics out of this picture," while the AMA tops the Nation's lobbyists in expenditures and publicly prepares a political blast in the Nation's newspapers for next October, while its incoming president, Dr. Elmer Henderson, delivers a violent political tirade against the Fair Deal at the annual AMA convention in San Francisco.

He attacked our Government as "sick with intellectual dishonesty, moral laxity, and with reckless excesses," and charged the administration with a campaign to gain control over all fields of human endeavor to make this a Socialist state. Dr. Henderson ignored his responsible position as head of an organization which says it wants nothing to do with politics to engage in political mud slinging and use of misrepresentations and distortions.

There are many other items. There is the AMA's cooperation in spreading the hate-mongering nonsense of John T. Flynn's book, The Road Ahead, across the country in hundreds of thousands of volumes—volumes which the conservative New York Times has very properly labeled "pernicious flummery."

There is the back-scenes battle against school health measures. There is the long history on voluntary medical insurance plans related in the Harpers magazine article, The Dogged Retreat of the Doctors. There is indeed an overwhelming mass of evidence to show that the hierarchic officialdom of the AMA is one of the most reactionary forces in American life today. But I think the story of the bill to bring Federal aid to the medical education is the most devastating illustration of all of the AMA's complete disregard for the national interest when it conflicts with the narrow, selfish interest of the AMA.

The history of the legislation to provide Federal aid to the Nation's medical schools is the story of conflict between two forces. On one side is the desperate need of the medical schools and the health requirements to the Nation, on the other side is the American Medical Association.

In 1946, immediately after the war, it was generally agreed that this country must proceed to make up its deficiencies in medical personnel, to get sorely needed doctors, dentists, nurses, and trained public health technicians into rural and other shortage areas, to make available enough health personnel to put into practice all that we have learned about how to keep people healthy and well. It was recognized that the only way to do this would be to step up the numbers of individuals receiving training and to improve the quality of that training.

Even the American Medical Association permitted official spokesmen to discuss the need. Dr. Herman Weiskotten, dean of the Syracuse University College of Medicine and a member of the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the AMA, declared that approximately half of our medical schools were operating on budgets far below the essential basic minimum required for the conduct of a satisfactory educational program. And in February 1947 he added, and I quote:

"The American people should realize that the first and most important step in improving the health and the medical care of our people is the more adequate support of more than half of the medical schools of this country."

In October 1947 Dr. Anderson, secretary of the same council, told of a study made by the AMA, of which he said, and again I quote:

"We are prepared to contend that the maximum deficit that could possibly be forecast for 1960 does not exceed 15,000 physicians."

Only 15,000. When you consider that the average physician's patient list runs between 500 and 1,000, you get some idea of what number of people would get inadequate care with such a shortage. It could not conceivably run below seven and a half million. And this in peacetime. Yet there you have the statement of a responsible AMA official

predicting a doctor shortage—and even more astounding, not worrying about it.

Well, the AMA, for all its later denials and present insistence that the Federal Government do nothing to help medical schools, recognized at that time that some help must come if the schools were not to collapse. So in February 1948 its board of trustees decided that it would seek voluntary assistance in order to avoid bringing the Federal Government into the matter. A commendable idea, but it just did not work.

The 1948 report of the Council on Medical Education of the AMA said medical schools required an addtiional $15,000,000 in support for operations and some $197,000,000 for construction of needed facilities, and commented:

"The question that remains is whether the public will provide this support voluntarily or whether it will have to be provided by direct Federal subsidy."

That, indeed, was the question. The trouble was the answer. In July 1948, a meeting authorized by the board of trustees was held in New York City. Representatives of universities, business, industry, banking, educational foundation, and private philanthropic organizations discussed a national campaign for raising about $15,000,000 a year to support medical education. A lot of hopes were raised by that meeting, but as of this date, 2 years later, no money.

So we have arrived finally at the set of circumstances which led to introduction of the aid to medical education legislation.

Something had to be done—and still does, for that matter. It could not be done privately or through State governments. Only the Federal Government was in a position to act. Did the AMA admit this? Not the AMA. The report of its council on medical education and hospitals on October 30, 1948, as much as declared that if the problem could not be solved the AMA's way, there was no problem. The report was naturally a bit confused, but I will quote it anyway to give you the full flavor:

"These studies have led to the conclusion that there is no need for any great increase in the number of medical graduates and the gradual expansion of facilities for medical education that is taking place will adequately meet the Nation's needs. The council will continue to give close attention to this problem."

Where did that word "problem" come from again? Was there or was not there one? There was one.

Dr. Weiskotten pops up with this admission in a statement in February 1949, in which he points out:

"Paradoxic as it may appear in the face of the present plight of the existing medical schools, there is developing a demand that these schools greatly increase the sizes of their student bodies and that new schools be established."

At this juncture it became clear that only Federal aid could help with this problem, a very real one growing more acute with every evasion and statement of the AMA. So bills were introduced in both the Senate and the House. At the end of the open Senate hearings a group of the most distinguished experts in every sector of the professional health training field, including important AMA representation, agreed on a set of 13 general principles among which were statements that the schools were in a financial emergency, that there are recognized shortages of manpower in the health professions, and that existing private sources of income are not able to meet the needs for either operation or construction. They supported Federal aid and even agreed that scholarships as well as operation and construction grants would be helpful in equalizing and expanding educational opportunities for qualified individuals.

This group also set up a series of guides to the Senate committee for the writing of the bill. The bill conformed to those guides as closely as possible and was passed as S. 1453 in September 1949. Before passage, at an August meeting in Washington, Dr. George F. Lull, of the AMA, told reporters the organization favored aid to medical education.

After Senate passage, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee took up H. R. 5940, the House companion bill which I sponsored. The committee unanimously approved the bill and sent it to the Rules Committee for a rule. The rule was refused not because of opposition, but because of the press of time just before the close of the first session of this Congress. During this entire process the AMA was almost quiet. Only a few words broke the welcome silence and they were far from ominous. In a report to the AMA House of Delegates in November, the AMA's Council of Medical Education declared, and I quote:

"While the council is not entirely satisfied with the bill, it does incorporate several modifications suggested by the council's representatives and it is a distinct improvement over any other bill for Federal aid to education that has been introduced."

The honeymoon, however, was soon over. In a supplementary report of the board of trustees in December 1949 there was the following statement:

"Since S. 1453 has now passed the Senate and since it appears doubtful that further changes will be made by the House in the companion bill, H. R. 5940, the board of trustees feels it must oppose this bill."

There was no explanation of what happened between November and December.

And so it has gone ever since. Attempts have been made to satisfy the AMA objections which were made after this December declaration. H. R. 8886, a considerably changed version of H. R. 5940, which goes at least half way in compromising both major and minor issues, has been the result. And still the AMA opposition is adamant. There is neither rhyme nor reason in their opposition, but nothing apparently will change it. The Federal Government is involved and while the Federal Government safely makes all other sorts of laws for the United States, the AMA is not going to have it even take note of the health needs of the Nation's citizens.

Despite the AMA's exasperating attitude, despite this long "compromise and then oppose the compromise" period extending way into June, we have done everything possible to write a bill which would get at least the tacit approval of the AMA. We might as well have saved our energy. No matter what was said or done, the AMA stalled and temporized. Typical was a proposal that we wait until still another survey, the survey on medical education of the AMA, be completed.

I asked a participant in the survey, Dr. Joseph C. Hinsey, dean of the Cornell University Medical School and chairman of the executive council of the Association of American Medical Schools, if this request was valid. I will not read his whole reply, but let me give you one paragraph:

"I strongly recommend that you do not hold up action on H. R. 5940 (now H. R. 8886). The final report of the survey committee will be available for the use of the National Council on Education for Health Professions (a group set up by the proposed legislation) before it submits its recommendation on January 1, 1953."

I repeat 1953. Well might Hinsey add later, as he does—

"There seems no reason to wait."

There is only one conclusion. The AMA does not want the Federal Government to help the Nation's medical schools, no matter how desperate their plight. And since there is no other aid forthcoming, it looks very much as if the AMA did not want medical schools and other professional health-training schools helped at all.

As a matter of fact, many of the schools and professions affected are beginning to realize this sad truth and break with the reactionaries of the AMA. This Congress would do well to follow their example.

Earlier I promised to cite chapter and verse on the entire health training situation in this country. We must all know something of the general picture. Time printed a piece discussing the plight of the medical schools recently. The Philadelphia Inquirer carried an editorial the other day which told of the closing of private rooms and wards in voluntary hospitals in New York because of the shortage of nurses. Other newspapers have noted both nursing and public health personnel shortages. The New York Times carried a long, analytic article in one of its Sunday magazine sections asking for urgent action on Federal aid to dental and medical schools.

But to get down to the chapter and verse let us turn to the statements of the best qualified experts in America, the men who run the professional health training schools of all kinds. I am going to read just a few excerpts on the floor, but I ask that the entire communications be made part of the RECORD.

I have already read some of Dr. Hinsey's remarks as head of the organization to which almost all of the medical school deans in the country belong, but I want to quote from another letter written January 12, 1950, in which he discusses this need the AMA denies. First making clear that the AMA acted on aid to medical education without consulting the Association of American Medical Colleges, he goes on to tell the schools' sentiments in the matter. Here I begin to quote:

"Our committee on financial aid to medical education decided unanimously that we should poll the individual medical colleges by telegrams in order to fairly determine our over-all position.

"This committee on financial aid to medical education is made up of Dean Arthur C. Bachmeyer, of the University of Chicago; Dean George P. Berry, of Harvard University; Dean Walter A. Bloedorn, of George Washington University; Vice President Ward Darley, of the University of Colorado; and Dean Joseph C. Hinsey, of Cornell University, chairman. After its study and work with this legislation, this committee is unanimous in its support of H. R. 5940. The poll of the membership, with definite returns in from 63 schools, shows 47 favorable to the legislation in H. R. 5940 and 16 opposed. Of the 26 State-owned schools, 14 favored and 12 opposed. Two municipally owned institutions were favorable. Of the 35 private institutions, 31 were favorable and 4 were opposed. Even if the 15 schools not reporting were to be opposed—and I have reason to believe strongly that this would not be the case—there would still be a strong majority in favor of the legislation."

Other letters I have from individual deans support Dean Hinsey. The AMA did not consult them, they point out, and they, after all, are the ones who know the facts of the situation.

Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, dean and vice president in charge of medical affairs at Columbia University, writes:

"May we express the earnest hope that your committee will give favorable consideration. * * * This is a matter of great urgency."

Dr. R. S. Cunningham, dean of the Albany Medical College at Union University, writes:

"Only if our income is substantially increased can we maintain the high level of medical education from which the public benefits so greatly. In view of these facts, I hope that you will exert your full influence to secure passage of the bill."

Dr. W. E. Brown, dean at the University of Vermont, adds:

"I hope we can count on you to help medical education in Vermont and throughout the United States by supporting H. R. 5940 or its substitute House bill for aid to medical education. * * * Most American medical schools, and this includes the University of Vermont College of Medicine, must radically curtail educational programs unless substantial financial support is forthcoming within the next 2 months."

That letter, gentlemen, was dated May 12.

It is the same with the University of Buffalo, Marquette University, Creighton University, Meharry Medical College, the University of Virginia, Loyola University, and dozens of others.

The Association of Urban Universities wired this in October of 1949:

"The Association of Urban Universities, whose membership are carrying a large percentage of the burden of medical, dental, and nursing education, voices its approval of the emergency health training bill."

And now that we have begun to hear of the other schools beside the medical schools, let me read you a part of a letter from the deans of all the schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health in Massachusetts. The dentistry, nursing, public health, and other training included in this bill is just as important as the training of doctors. This is what the deans of these varied schools at Harvard, Tufts, and Boston University wrote:

"We are convinced that the present desperate plight of our professional schools not only in Massachusetts but throughout the United States, has already interfered with the quality of professional education and is preventing the development of adequate medical and health personnel for the country.

"We make this statement in full awareness of the position recently taken by the American Medical Association. We vigorously oppose that position. The American Medical Association in adopting its position was in no way authorized to speak for the professional schools of Massachusetts.

"Early passage of H. R. 5940 will enable the professional schools of the United States to start immediately on an expanded, more effective total program of training. We do not believe that this urgent need can be met without such a program."

Then there are the letters from the administrators of huge universities like Chicago and Illinois.

Chancelor Robert Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, also chairman of the committee on Federal aid to medical schools of the American Association of Universities, wired:

"President Conant's recent statement on the precarious financial condition of Harvard medical and public health schools is applicable in my opinion, to every school in the country training personnel for the professions concerned with health. * * * Without operating funds schools will be unable to maintain current enrollments—already dangerously low—and improve present standards of instruction * * * I therefore urge prompt passage of H. R. 5940."

Dr. A. C. Ivy, vice president in charge of the College of the Health Professions at the University of Illinois—including medicine, dentistry, nursing, and pharmacy—expresses similar sentiments with this interesting statement thrown in for good measure:

"Everyone knows that more physicians, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, and public health officers are needed in our State and county. In some places this is true to such an extent that the principle of free enterprise and free choice of a physician is not operative."

That, as the AMA has been telling us all along, is intolerable.

There is much more of the same and I include it all in the RECORD, an editorial from the University of Southern California Medical Bulletin, the statement of need from the joint congressional Committee on the Economic Report which saw many low-income families without proper medical care because of health personnel shortages and the Hoover Commission's task force recommendations.

There is the recent speech by Father Michael I. English, regent of the Loyola University of Medicine in Chicago in which he criticized the AMA for deciding against Government aid to medical schools without consulting medical leaders, calling the organization more than conservative. Among the endorsements of Federal aid to medical education which I am attaching to this record is one from Father English in which he not only endorses the bill despite AMA opposition, but indicates that at least one AMA sponsored amendment would hurt rather than help the bill.

It all adds up and it all adds up to this. H. R. 8886, the latest version of the Emergency Health Training Act, is of vital importance to build our national health defenses for both peace and war. Our health-training schools cannot do the job without Federal aid. The only opponent of Federal aid is the AMA, as the AMA has so often been the only opponent of bills designed to improve the health of the American people.

We must pass H. R. 8886 over the objections of a blindly selfish AMA officialdom which either stupidly or wilfully is interfering with the welfare of our Armed Forces and our civilian population. We must either pass H. R. 8886 or relinquish to the AMA our right to promote the general welfare through health legislation. *

As Brig. Gen. James S. Simmons, dean of the Harvard School of Public Health, told the same AMA convention at which Dr. Henderson's disgraceful mangling of the truth took place 2 weeks ago, "all problems of health assume a dominant role" in the present uncertain international situation.

We must, among other things, be prepared to meet the entirely new threat of unannounced atomic war and biologic warfare. What we need most, and again the words are those of General Simmons, is to "shore up our national health defenses."

H. R. 8886 is the first step in that most urgent task. It cannot wait for another Congress.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES, OFFICE OF CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL,
New York, N. Y., January 12, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Fifth District of Wisconsin,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: As president of the Association of American Medical Colleges and chairman of its committee on financial aid to medical education, I am writing you regarding H. R. 5940 which your subcommittee has studied and passed. Our association is the one qualified to speak for the medical schools of the United States and to present their needs. We wish to state our position as accurately as we have been able to determine it. Our association is made up of the staffs of our member colleges, representing the ones approved for membership in the United States and affiliate members in Canada and the Philippine Islands. Here we speak for the 78 approved schools in the United States of which 72 are 4-year schools and 6 are 2-year schools. Of these 41 are privately endowed, 34 are State-owned (including 3 schools now in the process of becoming State-owned), and 3 municipally owned.

Because of the variety of our schools with problems peculiar to each, our Association of American Medical Colleges has refrained, up to this time, from taking one stand on the legislation in H. R. 5940 and its companion bill S. 1453. We have encouraged each medical college to communicate with the legislators from their respective districts. Thus the problem inherent in and the criticisms directed at it could be worked out in a democratic manner. We appreciate your sponsorship of this bill and your interest in the problems with which it deals. We are grateful for the fact that our representatives were given the opportunity to appear before you and your colleagues of your committee and to participate in the bipartisan conferences preceding the final writing of the legislation. It was recognized that H. R. 5940 contained imperfections but at the same time, it would go a long way to helping solve the financial problems plaguing some of our institutions in meeting what they deem their obligations in the various health sciences.

The action by the board of trustees, the house of delegates, and the council on medical education and hospitals of the American Medical Association opposing H. R. 5940 after it had passed your committee, and the companion bill S. 1453 after it had passed the Senate, was taken independently of our Association of American Medical Colleges and without a poll of our membership. Our committee on financial aid to medical education decided unanimously that we should poll the individual medical colleges by telegrams in order to fairly determine our overall position.

This committee on financial aid to medical education is made up of Dean Arthur C. Bachmeyer, of the University of Chicago; Dean George P. Berry, of Harvard University; Dean Walter A. Bloedorn, of George Washington University; Vice President Ward Darley, of the University of Colorado; and Dean Joseph C. Hinsey, of Cornell University, chairman. After its study and work with this legislation this committee is unanimous in its support of H. R. 5940. The poll of the membership, with definite returns in from 63 schools, shows 47 favorable to the legislation in H. R. 5940 and 16 opposed. Of the 26 State-owned schools, 14 favored and 12 opposed. Two municipally owned institutions were favorable. Of the 35 private institutions, 31 were favorable, and 4 were opposed. Even if the 15 schools not reporting were to be opposed, and I have reason to believe strongly that this would not be the case, there would still be a strong majority in favor of the legislation.

A number of suggestions were offered to make for improvements in the bill. Two schools strongly urged scholarship aid for needy medical students. Some 14 schools favoring H. R. 5940 expressed hope that the safeguards in section 2, Senate bill 246 (Educational Finance Act of 1949) might be substituted for section 352 of H. R. 5940. However, it is our firm conviction that a strong majority of our medical colleges believe that the general provisions of H. R. 5940 are essential for the maintenance of their programs.

Our committee is prepared to come for discussions or hearings of this bill. We hope that this letter will help clarify the positions of the medical schools. We are aware that this legislation is of vital importance to nursing, dentistry, and to schools of public health, and that the positions of some of these have been made known to you. Likewise, you have heard from our medical colleges, some of whom favor the legislation, while others vigorously oppose it. There is nothing in this legislation that would make any institution participate in its benefits against its better judgment.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH C. HINSEY,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Aid to Medical Education.

HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL,
OFFICE OF THE DEAN,
Boston, Mass., January 5, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: We, the undersigned deans of the professional schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health in the State of Massachusetts, individually and jointly, urge your strong support of H. R. 5940, the bill proposing an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the medical and health fields. We hope that you will work for early priority for this bill in the Rules Committee and will vote for its passage when it comes on the floor of the House.

We are convinced that the present desperate financial plight of our professional schools, not only in Massachusetts, but throughout the United States, has already interfered with the quality of professional education and is preventing the development of adequate medical and health personnel for the country.

We make this statement in full awareness of the position recently adopted by the American Medical Association. We vigorously oppose that position. The American Medical Association in adopting its position was in no way authorized to speak for the professional schools of Massachusetts.

Early passage of H. R. 5940 will enable the professional schools of the United States to start immediately on an expanded, more effective total program of training. We do not believe that this urgent need can be met without such assistance.

Very truly yours,

DWIGHT O'HARA, M. D.,
Dean, Tufts College Medical School.

JAMES M. FAULKNER, M. D.,
Dean, Boston University School of Medicine.

JAMES M. DUNNING, D. D. S.,
Dean, Harvard School of Dental Medicine.

C. D. MARSHALL-DAY, D. M. D.,
Dean, Tufts College Dental School.

GEORGE PACKER BERRY, M. D.,
Dean, Harvard Medical School.

JAMES S. SIMMONS, M. D.,
Dean, Harvard School of Public Health.

JANUARY 23, 1950.

Re H. R. 5940; grants-in-aid for education in the health professions.

I am writing you in my capacity as vice president of the University of Illinois in charge of the colleges of the health professions (medicine, dentistry, nursing, and pharmacy) because one important point for the people of the State of Illinois has not been introduced into the discussions of H. R. 5940.

And, since you represent the people of the State of Illinois on the House committee considering this bill, I feel it to be my duty to call the point to your attention.

This is the point:

I. THERE IS A SHORTAGE OF HEALTH PERSONNEL IN OUR COUNTRY

1. Everyone knows that more physicians, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, and public health officers are needed in our State (rural areas) and county. In some places this is true to such an extent that the principle of free enterprise and free choice of a physician is not operative.

II. THE COST OF TRAINING HEALTH PERSONNEL IS VERY HIGH AND MORE PERSONNEL CANNOT BE PRODUCED BECAUSE OF LACK OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES AND OPERATING FUNDS—THE DEFICITS ARE NOW ALMOST INTOLERABLE

2. It is a matter of common knowledge that the cost of medical education in the health professions is very high. This is because much learning and considerable experience must be imparted and acquired in view of the great medical advances, before the student can be released to practice.

3. The majority of medical and dental schools and schools of public health operate on a large annual deficit. This draws money from other areas of university education. And, many university presidents, if they could morally do so, would like to drop their colleges in the health professions because these colleges are such a financial drain and handicap on the other educational functions of a university.

III. LARGE URBAN AREAS MUST PRODUCE THE HEALTH PERSONNEL FOR OUR COUNTRY

4. For obvious reasons, medical, dental, and nursing education is most economically and best given in urban areas where there is a concentration of charity or semicharity patients.

5. For this reason it is necessary to have several medical schools and dental schools, etc., in Chicago.

IV. CHICAGO PROVIDES EDUCATION FOR 20 PERCENT OF THE PHYSICIANS WHO PRACTICE IN OUR COUNTRY AND FEDERAL MEDICAL SERVICES

6. Chicago provides some or all of the undergraduate or postgraduate education of 20 percent of the physicians who now are in private practice or practice in Federal governmental medical services.

V. THE COST OF THIS HEALTH EDUCATION PROVIDED IN CHICAGO IS BORNE ALMOST ENTIRELY BY STATE TAXES AND BY ILLINOIS CITIZENS WHO ARE BENEFACTORS OF THE PRIVATELY ENDOWED SCHOOLS

7. Since there is practically no money for the support of these schools in Chicago which train personnel in the health professions not only to take care of the citizens of Illinois but also the citizens of other States in and out of the Federal medical services, the taxpayers of Illinois and the citizens of Illinois, who make gifts to the schools in Chicago, pay more than their share for the training of health personnel.

VI. FROM AN EQUITABLE AND ECONOMIC VIEWPOINT, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD DEFRAY APPROXIMATELY 33 PERCENT OF THE COST OF EDUCATING HEALTH PERSONNEL

8. It is not fair, and it is not good economy for the citizens of Illinois to bear the expense of training physicians, dentists, nurses, and pharmacists for other States and the Federal Government.

9. The only fair and economical way to bear this expense equally is for the Federal Government to appropriate for approximately one-third the cost of medical, dental, nursing, and public-health education.

10. This argument not only applies for Illinois but all those States wherein reside medical schools because of the ready availability of charity patients and clinical facilities for training physicians, dentists, nurses, and public-health officers.

11. The claim that this cannot be done by the Federal Government without the Federal Government dictating what should be taught is an unfounded fear and challenge to the democratic representative form of government. The statement does not hold for compulsory health insurance, to which I am opposed, because compulsory health insurance, as shown in Germany and Russia, is conducive to the development of an attitude with rights and dignity.

The Federal Government should awaken to its responsibility and assume its share of the cost of training personnel for the health professions.

I believe that this foregoing point should be kept clearly in mind by the congressional representatives of the people of Illinois; namely, that it is not a economy move to oppose Federal aid to health education but a matter of equity in meeting a humanitarian and a national need.

I should add that the colleges of the health professions of the University of Illinois are not in critical need as regards the anticipation of a deficit in operating expenses, unless wages of employees are increased. However, for 4 years the people of the State have exerted much pressure on us to provide them with more physicians, dentists, nurses, and pharmacists and to accept for admission to our colleges of the health professions more young men and women of the State of Illinois who are qualified. Each year, because of lack of facilities, we must turn away over 400 students qualified to study medicine or dentistry.

So, when I make the foregoing point, I am making it for the people of Illinois and also for the people of other States who have to support colleges of the health professions for the people of States who do not have such colleges.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

A. C. IVY, Ph. D., M. D., D. Sc.,
Vice President.

TASK FORCE REPORT ON FEDERAL MEDICAL SERVICES

[Appendix O]

THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT, JANUARY 1949

* * * * *

1. That an initial survey of the acute emergency needs be made by the Public Health Service, with the aid of advisory groups representing the public, the medical schools, and those philanthropic foundations which have given so generously to medical education. Where financial problems of an emergency nature are found which threatens the survival of medical schools or the maintenance of high standards of medical education, emergency financial aid should be supplied promptly by the Federal Government if it is clear that the schools and their universities themselves are making maximum efforts.

2. That a long-range study of the economics of medical education be made to determine ways and means of insuring the maintenance of current output at present standards and of expanding output and elevating standards. This study should define the extent to which present facilities can be better utilized and need to be expanded.

3. A plan of fellowships for brilliant men, particularly those who evidence an especial interest in the fields in which there is the greatest shortage, including Federal medical service.

These recommendations are predicated on the principle of not diminishing the essential independence of the schools in professional educational policies, or their self-support to the full extent possible, or the private initiative now supporting them.

A sufficient principle on which to justify such Federal aid is that the Government is the largest single customer for medical personnel even in peace, and by far the greatest customer of all in war.

OCTOBER 12, 1949.

Congressman ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your telegram regarding H. R. 5940. I hope that it will have favorable action in committee and on the floor of the House.

JOHN S. HIRSCHBOECK,
Dean, Marquette University School of Medicine.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Boston, Mass., January 6, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: I hope that H. R. 5940, to provide financial assistance for medical education, will be acted upon promptly and favorably. The financial plight of the medical schools, particularly of the privately supported schools, is so serious as to call for immediate action. I urge your continued support of this bill.

Very sincerely yours,
JAMES M. FAULKNER, M. D.,
Dean, School of Medicine.

HARVARD SCHOOL OF DENTAL MEDICINE,
Boston, Mass., January 6, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: I want to add my individual word on behalf of the Harvard School of Dental Medicine to the joint letter I have just signed as a member of a group of deans of medical and dental schools in the State of Massachusetts. Our school strongly backed House bill 5940 to provide financial assistance to schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health. We have a small school in which we try to give a large amount of individual instruction and an opportunity for students to perform individual research projects in the laboratories. This type of instruction is expensive and our tuition, though high, does not begin to cover the cost per student.

As you may know, both the American Association of Dental Schools and the American Dental Association, through its house of delegates, have endorsed H. R. 5940 in principle. The American Medical Association cannot speak for the dental schools of the country.

Very sincerely yours,
JAMES M. DUNNING, D. D. S.,
Dean.

TUFTS COLLEGE MEDICAL SCHOOL,
Boston, Mass., January 6, 1950.

Hon. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: As dean of Tufts College Medical School, I am writing to say that we here at Tufts favor very strongly the passage of House bill 5940. If we are to continue to train medical doctors under the present standards of quality and quantity, we shall need urgently the provisions for aid which are provided in this bill. We hope, therefore, that you will do everything you can to bring this bill before the House and to secure favorable action upon it.

With full appreciation of your insight into these matters and all you have done for public health in this country in the past, I am

Sincerely yours,
DWIGHT O'HARA, M. D.,
Dean.

TUFTS COLLEGE DENTAL SCHOOL,
Boston, Mass., January 6, 1950.

Hon. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Fifth Congressional District of Wisconsin, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: As dean of Tufts College Dental School, I am writing to you to strongly urge your continued support of House bill 5940 for the provision of grants and scholarships for education in medicine, dentistry, and public health.

It was clearly shown during the hearings on this bill that there is a desperate need of funds for our professional schools responsible for training personnel to whom will be entrusted the health of the Nation.

As already noted by the Public Health Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the number at present being trained by our professional schools falls far behind the number lost annually by death and retirement, even without consideration of normal population increases. Unless the professional schools are able to obtain the necessary financial assistance, it will be impossible to train sufficient experts to effectively take care of the health of the country. Private beneficence can no longer be relied upon to provide adequate assistance, and the present desperate financial plight of the schools emphasizes the critical need for Federal aid.

As one who has had experience in the administration of Government-aided institution in other countries, notably in New Zealand and in India, the undersigned has no fear of undue government interference with professional teaching institutions. Furthermore, the present need for an expanded and more effective total health training program is too urgent for such unlikely considerations.

Early passage of House bill 5940 will do much to alleviate the present unfortunate and highly dangerous situation. For this reason I would once again strongly urge that everything possible be done so that high priority may be given to this bill by the Rules Committee.

May I extend my sincere thanks for your cooperation.

Yours very truly,
S. D. MARSHALL-DAY, *Dean.*

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT
AND STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE,
COLLEGE OF MEDICINE,
Burlington, Vt., February 23, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: As dean of the College of Medicine of the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College, with the consent of the president of the university, I am sending this memorandum to various Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate urging the prompt passage of H. R. 5940 to give financial aid to professional schools in the field of medicine and health.

The reasons for asking Federal tax support of such programs are as follows:

1. Both privately endowed and State supported medical schools are in desperate need of immediate financial support. Unless funds become available in the near future, some schools may close. Others, like the College of Medicine of the University of Vermont, will be forced to curtail teaching programs and possibly to reduce the number of students accepted. This at a time when pressure is greatest for expansion of schools and the education of more physicians.

2. At the present time the State of Vermont and the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College must add at least $3 to every dollar the medical student pays in tuition charges. Tuition is already higher than is considered compatible with the income of the vast majority of the families of our students.

3. The continual deficit of the College of Medicine of the University of Vermont, like many other university medical schools, has drawn heavily on university funds and has already necessitated serious curtailment of the university funds available for other important activities.

4. Approximately 45 percent of the graduates of the University of Vermont College of Medicine are either admitted as nonresidents of the State of Vermont or, as graduates, practice in States other than the State of Vermont. In this sense, all colleges of medicine are national institutions entitled to some partial Federal support.

5. State appropriations and voluntary gifts in general have not and will not be made in sufficient amounts to meet the costs of medical education. If appropriations from States and gifts from individuals are made, there is no liklihood that they will be available in time to meet the present financial crisis in medical education the country over.

6. Congress has already appropriated for defense upward of sixteen billions of dollars during the current year. This will be spent by the military services for the maintenance of adequate defense.

The Army, Navy, Air Force, and United States Public Health Services, charged with the problems of defense, have already turned to the colleges of medicine to recruit necessary medical personnel. Twenty percent of the graduates of the class of 1949 of the college of medicine of the University of Vermont entered one of these medical services. Vermont paid three-fourths of the cost of educating this personnel.

In the event of another war, there will be an even greater draining off of medical graduates into military services. The demands upon the colleges of medicine will become increasingly greater and will far exceed those of World War II.

7. Unless financial support is forthcoming in the near future, it is unlikely that medical colleges will be able to graduate adequate numbers of properly trained physicians to meet the increasing demands of the country at large, to say nothing of military demands for physicians.

8. The problem of our national health is the most vital. This can only be adequately met by a reasonable increase in the number of well-trained physicians graduated from properly supported colleges of medicine.

In general, the problem of medical education, its proper support and supervision, falls quite properly on the shoulders of the Association of American Medical Colleges. Its committee on financial aid to medical education has already explored the field of increased financial support. The committee has cooperated with the committees of both Houses of Congress in the study of proposed Federal aid. The committee has polled the medical colleges and has gone on record in favor of Federal aid to medical education. The committee has advocated suitable controls to keep medical education free from political or Government interference. All are agreed on the importance of this phase of the problem.

We hope you will support H. R. 5940 and see that it is given a prompt hearing on the floor of the House of Representatives. All medical colleges must in the near future prepare budgets for the year 1950–51. Hence the urgent need for prompt action.

We all hope that a note of false economy may not be used to defeat this important piece of legislation. The best economy in the field of medical education today is adequate support and expansion of the facilities now available in well-established medical colleges.

I will be very glad to answer any questions regarding the urgent need for this important measure.

Very truly yours,
W. E. BROWN, M. D., *Dean.*

JANUARY 27, 1950.

Hon. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

As chancelor of the University of Chicago and chairman of the committee on Federal aid to medical schools of the American Association of Universities, I want to bear urgent witness to the critical and immediate need of the medical schools of this country. President Conant's recent statement on the precarious financial condition of Harvard

Medical and Public Health Schools is applicable in my opinion to every school in the country training personnel for the professions concerned with health. The cost of providing instruction of high quality for doctors and other medical personnel far exceeds the funds available from tuition and other sources. Without operating funds, schools will be unable to maintain current enrollments—already dangerously low—and improve present standards of instruction. Public support in the form of Federal funds is essential if schools are to fulfill their public responsibility, providing enough well-trained personal to meet the health needs of the Nation. Whatever action may be taken on any other aspect of providing adequate health services, the country cannot afford to let existing shortages of trained health personnel increase in severity. I therefore urge your efforts toward prompt passage of H. R. 5940, feeling convinced that in its present form the bill affords adequate protection of academic and administrative freedom while providing reasonable control of the expediture of public funds.

ROBERT HUTCHINS,
Chairman of the Committee on Federal Aid to Medical Schools of the American Association of Universities and Chancelor of the University of Chicago.

MARCH 7, 1950.

EXCERPT FROM JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT, SUBCOMMITTEE ON LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Senate recommendations, including—

2. Federal assistance in training of doctors and nurses.

3. Federal assistance to existing medical schools and to establish new medical schools where needed.

Majority supporting: Senator SPARKMAN; Senator FLANDERS; Representative WALTER HUBER, Democrat, Ohio; Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, Democrat, Pennsylvania.

RICH opposed to health plan.

[From the University of Southern California Medical Bulletin of April 1950]

Why has the cost of medical education ben discussed earnestly at every meeting of the Association of American Medical Colleges held in the past few years? What is the situation in the Nation's medical schools? Is such grave concern justified?

The general rise in costs during and since the war has engulfed medical schools in serious financial difficulties. Engaged in a type of education which has always been highly expensive, they have recently been confronted with 30–50 percent increases in salaries, a 50–150 percent rise in the cost of equipment and supplies, and the added expense of increased enrollments demanded by the public.

Meanwhile, earnings on investments have fallen, and universities have suffered a decline in income which has become critical. To offset this somewhat, tuition has been raised, but in no school to a compensatory level. The result has ben a disastrous increase in the proportion of educational expenses not covered by tuition.

The seriousness of this problem is well illustrated by the experience of our own school of medicine, for which the figures in the table below are presented.

The most significant figures are those showing a rise of more than 450 percent in educational costs not covered by tuition and fees. These costs amounted to about $1,054 in the early 1930's for a 4-year medical education for one student. The cost of such an education today, above and beyond that portion met by tuition and fees, is more than five times as great, or about $5,884. On the basis of this figure, each class of 65–67 students requires an expenditure by the university of over $388,000 by the time it has graduated. Such an amount is not easily provided. It represents a considerable sacrifice by the university and is an annual contribution to the medical profession and to the community which deserves to be recognized.

The problem at our institution is not different from that at other medical schools, and the above figures coincide closely with those presented by Alan Valentine, president of the University of Rochester, in an address to the Association of American Medical Colleges in May 1948. He pointed out that for American schools as a group, tuition and fees covered approximately 70 percent of the cost of medical education in 1910, but less than 30 percent in 1948.

	1933–34	1949–50	Percent increase
Teaching budget [1]	$108,000	$555,175	322
Undergraduate enrollment	158	267	69
Total cost per student per year	$683	$2,079	204
Tuition and fees per year	$420	$608	47
Percent of cost covered by tuition	61	29	−53
Cost not covered by tuition, per student per year	$263	$1,471	458

[1] Not including funds for operation of teaching and research facilities (light, heat, telephones, etc.).

The resulting financial problem is particularly serious for those schools which are maintained by private universities, including those which are heavily endowed, and has obvious implications for the medical profession since for years 66 percent of all American physicians have graduated from private universities.

The medical schools of State universities have not entirely escaped the situation either, for they have been confronted with the same rising costs, and their increasing budgetary requests have been received by State legislatures with growing concern.

It is readily understandable, then, why both private and public medical schools are appealing so earnestly to their alumni for support. It is also clear why these schools, through the Association of American Medical Colleges, have finally turned to the Federal Government for aid, not only to support their research programs, but to provide necessary funds for at least minimal teaching expenses.

On August 3, 1949, the United States Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported favorably on a bill to provide Federal subsidies to medical schools. This bill, S. 1453, provides $500 for each medical student up to the school's average past enrollment, and $1,000 for each additional student up to 30 percent of the past average enrollment. Total payments may not exceed 40 percent of the school's budget. These subsidies are not scholarships, and Federal scholarships will not be awarded unless schools are unable to fill their enrollments. Funds under this bill would be provided for 5 years except scholarship funds which would extend over 8 years. Although as originally proposed this bill contains certain controversial provisions, an acceptable measure providing for such Federal aid may soon become law.

It will be almost impossible to prevent a gradual deterioration of medical education in the United States, and a fall in the standards of medical practice throughout the Nation, unless such Federal aid is provided, or unless markedly increased private philanthropic support can be obtained.

The University of Southern California is a private, nonsectarian institution. It stands for opportunity, individual initiative, and private enterprise. Together with other private educational institutions, it forms a stanch bulwark of our modern society. If its credo is to be better upheld, and if its position in our society is to be strengthened, the greatest proportion of its support must come from private citizens.

The financial need of our medical school is a grave problem. It must be given serious attention by every student, teacher, and graduate of the school, and every layman interested in its welfare. It must be placed before the public as sympathetically, clearly, and forcefully as possible.—R. B. B. and J. N. D.

THE CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Omaha, Nebr., May 4, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: I would like to call your attention to the present status of H. R. 5940 which is now under consideration by the Committee on Intertsate and Foreign Commerce.

It is believed that if the critical financial condition of most of the privately owned schools of medicine was known by the Members of Congress, the present bill, H. R. 5940, would be approved and passed with very few changes.

The average cost of medical education per student per year in the United States is about $2,500. The average yearly tuition paid by each of these students is about $600. The medical schools are, therefore, required to pay out of their own funds the difference between the cost of education and the tuition which amounts to an average of about $1,900 per year per student.

The Creighton University is opposed to the recommendations of the American Medical Association that Federal aid to medical education is limited to 30 percent of the school's annual cost of instruction. The Creighton University favors that the limit remain at not less than 40 percent of the annual cost of instruction as is shown in the present bill.

Section 372 of H. R. 5940 "Payments to schools for costs of instruction" is entirely acceptable to this school.

The Creighton University is opposed to the payments being made to the various States instead of directly to the schools because, as you can well understand, the private universities would not receive any of the funds because many of these States have laws forbidding the allocation of any funds to private schools.

The Creighton University naturally is opposed to any type of Federal control over medical education, but believes that her interests are adequately protected by both Senate and House bills. However, if provisions similar to those contained in section 2, S. 246, are desired by others interested in medical education these changes would be entirely satisfactory to the Creighton University.

If there is any doubt in the minds of any of the committee members concerning the attitude of the representatives of the privately owned schools of medicine regarding Federal aid to medical education, I recommend that the committee ask each medical school to send a representative to appear before the committee without expense to the Government and explain the stand taken by his school in this matter.

I am sure that it is the general opinion of the administrators of the privately owned medical schools that the matter of Federal aid to medical education is not the problem of the medical schools as the American Medical Association does not provide any funds whatsoever to help in the maintenance of the schools. The medical schools are independent organizations and, as such, their representatives should be asked to appear before the committee to give first-hand information regarding this subject.

Sincerely yours,
P. J. CARROLL, M. D., *Dean.*

MEHARRY MEDICAL COLLEGE,
Nashville, Tenn.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Without unforeseen and seemingly unavailable grants from private philanthropy and without Federal aid to medical, dental and nursing education as proposed in legislation now pending before Congress, Meharry Medical College of Nashville, Tenn., an institution that continues to train over 50 percent of the Negro physicians and dentists for this country, may be forced to curtail its program in 1950–51 below the standards required for national accreditation.

This would be a staggering blow to an institution that has successfully maintained national standards in the face of almost unsurmountable difficulties since its founding in 1876.

The administration, the faculty, staff, and student body, along with 3,000 loyal alumni urge that you carefully consider the plight of this and other privately endowed institutions when this bill is brought before you for decision.

We hope that aid will be forthcoming from your vote. With a prayer, we leave this important matter in your capable hands.

Sincerely,

M. DON CLAWSON,
President.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA,
DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE,
Charlottesville, May 6, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Member of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: May I urge that you, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, give favorable consideration to the Emergency Professional Health Training Act of 1950, H. R. 5940.

The financial status of many of the finest medical schools in the United States is insecure and it is generally agreed that unless Federal aid is obtained, the quality of instruction will deteriorate or some schools may find it necessary to close. Furthermore, we are under constant pressure to increase enrollment and produce a larger number of physicians to meet the needs of the country, yet cannot do so within the limitations of our existing staffs and facilities.

Certainly, the keystone of the health program is the production of an adequate number of well-trained personnel. I know of no better investment of Federal funds in the fields of health or education than one which would accomplish that objective.

Sincerely yours,

VERNON W. LIPPARD, M. D., *Dean.*

RESOLUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF URBAN UNIVERSITIES, OCTOBER 31, 1949

The Association of Urban Universities, whose membership institutions are carrying a large percentage of the burden of medical, dental, and nursing education, voices its approval of S. 1453, the emergency health training bill, which would provide outright Federal financial aid to institutions supporting education in these health fields.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS
AND SURGEONS,
New York, N. Y., May 19, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: May we express the earnest hope that your committee will have favorable consideration to the bill now before your committee proposing an amendment of the Public Health Service Act and Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants for professional education.

This is a matter of great urgency in the over-all problem of supplying adequate numbers of well-qualified physicians and other professional personnel to meet the needs of the country. Many of the professional schools are in serious need of financial assistance if they are to maintain their public responsibilities.

Hoping that this important legislation may have favorable consideration, I am,

Respectfully yours,

WILLARD C. RAPPLEYE, M. C.,
Dean and Vice President in Charge of Medical Affairs, Columbia University.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO,
Buffalo, N. Y., June 3, 1950.

Hon. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BIEMILLER: I am writing to urge you to vote favorably on the passage of H. R. 5940, the bill for the support of medical and other professional education which is to be considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on June 6.

The University of Buffalo, a privately endowed institution, now trains medical students, dental students, and nursing students. Plans have been prepared for the construction of a new medical school which will enable the university to increase by 25 to 50 percent the number of medical and dental students it can train. The University of Buffalo has increased the budgetary support of the medical school very considerably over the last few years, but cannot supply what is really needed to develop the present school to the full. It certainly needs Federal assistance to increase the number of graduates. The problem which faces this school faces all medical schools and universities in some measure. Hence the urgent need for the support of the proposed bill, H. R. 5940, on which I again urge your favorable action.

Sincerely yours,

S. P. CAPEN.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
Chicago, Ill., May 31, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The purpose of this letter is to make a statement with reference to the emergency health training bill, H. R. 5940, providing Federal aid to institutions engaged in training for the health professions. (The companion bill, S. 2246, has already been passed.)

The position of Loyola University, comprising a medical school, a dental school, and a school of nursing education, is as follows:

1. We earnestly favor the passage of H. R. 5940.

2. We understand that the American Medical Association wanted the financial limit of aid set at 30 percent. This, of course, would mean that the schools which most need the aid would get far less help than if the figure had been left at 40 or 50 percent of the total budget of the school is far more consonant with the purpose of the bill.

Any assistance that you might extend will be noted and appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

MICHAEL I. ENGLISH, S. J., *Regent.*

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF NURSING,
Milwaukee, Wis., June 1, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: We would like you to know that we are interested in bill H. R. 5940, relative to Federal aid to health education. If nursing schools and other schools engaged in health education are to continue to function as educational institutions, it is imperative that they receive Federal aid. We have over 500 students enrolled in our school. Of this number, about 150 are in the basic program, the others are graduate nurses preparing for teaching, supervision, and public health positions. We shall appreciate your efforts in behalf of bill H. R. 5940.

Very truly yours,

Sister M. THOMAS, O. S. F.,
Dean, College of Nursing.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE,
Louisville, Ky., May 31, 1950.

The Honorable ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: Thank you for having taken the time and trouble to reply so carefully and thoughtfully to my recent letter to you concerning the mental-health legislation. Thank you in particular for going out of your way to call my attention to the present status of H. R. 5940.

I did not know that the latter bill would be up for consideration on June 5, but I had already written Congressman UNDERWOOD in connection with that bill, as you have suggested. With some of the objections to the bill eliminated, as I understand they have been, I do hope that you will see your way clear to support it vigorously so that our medical schools can do the job they should do, but are not now able to, to the end that the welfare of the people will be better safeguarded.

Very sincerely,

J. MURRAY KINSMAN, M. D., *Dean.*

UNION UNIVERSITY,
ALBANY MEDICAL COLLEGE,
Albany, N. Y., May 11, 1950.

Hon. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BIEMILLER: I understand that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now has before it a substitute bill for H. R. 5940, a bill to aid medical education. I am familiar with the major changes made by the subcommittee and feel that these changes are sound and wise.

I know that you are well aware that the quality of medical care the patient receives from his physician is largely determined by the quality of medical education the physician has experienced. I know also that you are aware of the forces, completely outside the control of medical colleges, which have so greatly increased their costs in the past 5 or 6 years. Speaking only for Albany Medical College, although I think you will find similar situations at most other medical colleges, I can say that only if our income is substantially increased can we maintain the high level of medical education from which the public benefits so greatly.

In view of these facts, I hope that you will exert your full influence to secure passage of the substitute bill to aid medical education.

Sincerely yours,

R. S. CUNNINGHAM, M. D., *Dean.*

As far as I am concerned, the deaf, dumb, and blind attitude of the AMA on this subject is its number one crime against the public interest in this session of Congress.

AMA KILLED PERMANENT DISABILITY INSURANCE

The mounting tempo of AMA activity on the congressional front is also evidenced in our social security legislation. It was AMA testimony that was primarily responsible for the Senate's removal of a permanent disability insurance program from the social security

bill, H. R. 6000, after it had been approved by the House. Note the significance here. In the first session of this Congress the Senate approved Federal aid to medical education unanimously and the House was proud to include disability insurance as a progressive part of its broadening and improving of our social security system. In the second session, a House committee has tied the aid to medical education bill in knots and a Senate committee slashed the permanent disability insurance program to ribbons. Could it be that hundreds of thousands of dollars expended in lobbying in the interim are paying off?

The testimony of the AMA representatives on disability insurance is revealing in several other ways. For instance, although the AMA's national ruling group, the House of Delegates, was careful to oppose disability insurance only, several of its representatives delivered broadsides against the widely accepted principles of social security in general. And all spoke as standpatters who believed that any improvement in our present public health standards of systems would inevitably lead to the abysmal pit of "socialized medicine."

Dr. R. L. Sensenich, then immediate past president of the AMA and a member of the omnipotent board of trustees, had extraordinarily interesting reasons for opposing disability insurance—which would simply provide that people eligible for old age benefits who became permanently disabled before the usual age for retirement receive their benefits at that age. They are after all in equal need of funds and as deserving of them. In fact, many of those receiving old age benefits are better able to earn their own livings than those who have been early crippled by the accidents or illnesses so frequent in our complex society.

Said Dr. Sensenich about protecting these people:

> It will only multiply the opportunity for malingering.

The American people have been the subject of autocratic insult before, but that one is topped only by Dr. Sensenich's further remark:

> It places a brake on the incentive of the sick and disabled to desire recovery.

I hesitate to make serious answer to such patently insubstantial and slurring testimony, but the record of the permanent disability insurance program under the Railway Retirement Act is too perfect an answer to pass by. It is the unanimous opinion of those who have administered this legislation that there has been a minimum of anything that might possibly be called malingering, that anybody who can get well is only too happy to do so.

FOUGHT ENTIRE SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

There is other equally interesting testimony including that by the representative of the Colorado Medical Society who pronounced himself opposed to the entire social security bill. And there were no murmurs of dissent from his colleagues. I will only note one other statement here, one of particular interest to me because it comes from Dr. Gunnar Gundersen of LaCrosse in my own home State of Wisconsin.

Dr. Gundersen concurred in a statement that our state medical society surveyed the entire State in 1936–37 and found:

> Nobody in the State needing medical care but what had access to it from the standpoint of proximity and their ability to pay for it.

That statement ignores the bitter battles still being waged in Wisconsin's rural areas to get refugee doctors licensed by the State board—controlled by the State medical society—because of the desperate physician shortages in their areas. The statement blandly ignores the truth. There are plenty of people in Wisconsin, just as elsewhere, who need medical care who are not getting it because of shortages of medical personnel or of cash to pay for it. I suspect the State society's survey was made among doctors and the people who came into their offices, not those remote or unable to pay the price.

BLOCKED SCHOOL HEALTH BILL

How about item number three? Well, there is the rear guard action against aid to local public health units, the operational units of public health, the units which really carry the health battle in the field. Also the AMA can take credit for blocking the school health bill—a bill to strengthen health work for all children.

There is also the continuing battle against national health insurance, a battle waged with unremitting ferocity of phrase and word pictures calculated to lift the scalps of unsuspecting patients who never heard before that insurance was socialistic or that the Democratic Party was really the front for Marxist plotters against the welfare of the Nation. The story of that national health insurance struggle is properly one that concerns more than this one session of Congress, one that I want to recite as background for the AMA's remarkable recent achievements. But before I begin that story, let me complete the record for the Eighty-first Congress, the record of deadly dedication to the status quo summed up in a remarkable pamphlet distributed only to members of the AMA in attendance at what was called the Second National Conference of the National Education Campaign of the AMA in February of this year in Chicago.

AMA CAMPAIGN STRATEGY

Part II of this booklet is titled Campaign Strategy and Policies. It is written by Clem Whitaker, the male half of the husband-wife huckster team, the directors of this so-called educational campaign. For your edification, this is what it says, and again I quote exactly:

> From our standpoint, the fundamental question involved in compulsory health insurance is much more adapted to effective, clear-cut presentation than the hidden threat in a bill to provide Federal aid to medical education, the danger in a sickness-disability section of a proposed social-security program, or the entering wedge for socialized medicine that is adroitly wrapped in a school health bill.

I interrupt at this point in Mr. Whitaker's adroit presentation to raise the possibility that the hidden threats are hard to find because they are not threats at all, that they are neither dangerous nor entering wedges, that no one who proposes them favors socialized medicine. But, to continue with the master of medical ceremonies, Mr. Whitaker:

> No one of the fringe bills, by itself, would usher in a complete system of socialized medicine—

Note the adroit wrapping of understatement—

> but each of the bills is designed to achieve part of that objective.

Now Mr. Whitaker does not define what a fringe bill is, but the record would seem to indicate that it is any public-health bill. Which brings us to the most recent of the AMA's official positions on a measure involving the public health and security.

AMA BLOCKS SOLDIERS' DEPENDENTS BENEFITS

I quote from a United Press report of August 21:

> The American Medical Association today blasted as impractical and harmful to national defense a proposal to give Government medical care to dependents of men in the Armed Forces.
>
> Dr. Walter P. Martin, of Norfolk, Va., told a House Armed Services Subcommittee that the plan would have far-reaching possibilities of harm to the defense effort and would overload military hospitals with women and children.

The motivation of a statement like that is apparent almost on the surface. The provision itself was the product of the Defense Department's analysis of the situation, an attempt to see that the men we have called upon to make the only real sacrifice as a result of the Korean situation would not have double sacrifice inflicted upon them through the hardships of their dependents.

Did the AMA have a substitute proposal ready? No.

The issue presented by this opposition has not yet been resolved in this Congress, but the AMA's calm indifference to the needs of women and children is on the record in permanent fashion.

The foregoing recital certainly would indicate the AMA's interest in legislation on social and health matters beyond any question. But you say you have only talked about the bills they oppose. Certainly an organization with the professional standing and membership of the AMA has made some constructive, concrete proposals for improving the Nation's health. Certainly there has been some yea-saying to go along with all this nay-saying. But you will search in vain for any constructive proposal in this session initiated by the AMA.

LONG RECORD OF REACTION

Well, you may say, there is another possible explanation of all this that will not bring too great discredit on those who have misled the doctors of the United States. Perhaps, this is just one reactionary administration, a clique which has briefly seized power and has been responsible for this indefensible record during the period of the Eighty-first Congress. I am afraid that analysis fails too. Let us look at the AMA's history of activities up to and including

the arrival of hucksters Whitaker and Baxter as grand viziers to the hierarchy.

This is the history which led 170 of America's most eminent—and also conservative—men of medicine to send an open letter of protest to the AMA when its ruling group first voted a secret assessment of $25 per doctor for its multimillion dollar war chest. In this action, later supported by thousands who refused to pay the assessment despite fears of such reprisals as loss of hospital connection or of membership in the all important local medical societies, these doctors warned their fellow physicians and the American public:

If the funds are to be used for propaganda and legislative lobbying instead of developing a comprehensive medical-care program, we are heartily opposed to the levy and shall refuse to pay it, and we urge all physicians with a sense of responsibility for the future of American medicine to register their protest. The significance of stand-pat propaganda will not escape the public. This will add to the already firmly rooted suspicion that the association's objectives are primarily economic and selfish. * * * Now is the time to voice our disapproval of the leadership and policies of the association.

What did the AMA political lobby do? Let me quote Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican of Oregon, who told the United States Senate how this lobby retaliated against the distinguished pediatrician, Dr. Myron E. Wegman of Louisiana State University, one of the 170 signers: "This doctor, who is a member of the faculty of one of our leading medical schools, had been invited to lecture at a postgraduate course for practicing physicians in Arkansas to help improve their techniques in caring for babies and protecting the lives of babies." Senator MORSE then traced how the Arkansas State Medical Society brought pressure to force withdrawal of the invitation, although the program had already been published.

"As a result," Senator MORSE declared, "the doctors of Arkansas did not get the benefit of the knowledge of this expert on how to save the lives of babies. I am shocked at this callous disregard of basic rights by the American Medical Association and its allies and satellites."

DOCTORS FEAR RECRIMINATION

This is a specific instance—but by no means an isolated one—of the high-handed, repressive methods organized medicine will use to prevent individual doctors from expressing themselves against the AMA's vicious campaign against the President's health program. From virtually every city and State come reports of doctors who deeply resent the tactics of organized medicine, but who are forced into acquiescence, lest they jeopardize their professional careers. In Baltimore, for example, a prominent physician declared: "There are not three doctors in this whole city among all those who are for national health insurance who will dare to speak out in public debate. And one of those three is a Negro doctor whom the AMA can't hurt anyhow, since he is barred from the local medical society because of color."

Everywhere, doctors who want to support the President's national health program are afraid to state their position publicly. They know that recrimination will be swift if they accept invitations to speak on the radio, or address civic groups, or write letters to the editor or exercise their right as individuals to work for the program they believe will provide better medical care for all our people. And so these honest doctors have been pressured and intimidated into silence.

CALLED VOLUNTARY PLANS COMMUNISM

The AMA's record toward voluntary plans is an excellent demonstration of its emotional oppostion to even the most modest steps to extend adequate medical care to our people. Today, the AMA claims that voluntary plans by themselves can finance America's health needs. Faced with the demand for national health insurance, the AMA's lobby pays lip service to the very plans which it once so bitterly condemned. And even while publicly praising voluntary health insurance, behind the scenes, organized medicine is still trying to destroy those consumer plans which it cannot dominate.

Here are some high lights from that long, devious record:

In 1932, the AMA—now the great defender of voluntary insurance—blasted these plans in its Journal as "socialism, communism—inciting to revolution." It likened group medical practice to "medical soviets."

The AMA rejected the majority report of the famed Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, headed by the late Dr. Ray L. Wilbur, former AMA president, ex-Secretary of the Interior under Herbert Hoover. Thirty-five out of the forty-eight members of that committee urged that medical care be financed through voluntary prepaid insurance. Nine members of the AMA hierarchy signed a minority report hostile to voluntary plans. They said flatly: "These schemes have everywhere failed." The majority was for voluntary plans. In the AMA's usual fashion, the minority will prevailed and was espoused in the Journal as "Americanism versus Sovietism for the American people."

ORIGINALLY FOUGHT BLUE CROSS

The early history of Blue Cross proved that the policy of organized medicine was flatly hostile to voluntary plans. When Blue Cross began in 1933, it faced fierce opposition from local medical societies.

A half-baked scheme—

Declared the AMA Journal—

all sorts of hospitalization insurance schemes [are] mechanization of medical practice.

When the American College of Surgeons approved Blue Cross, the AMA's ruling clique promptly lashed out at this distinguished professional group, calling its recognition of Blue Cross "an apparent attempt to dominate and control the nature of medical practice." When Blue Cross plans offered subscribers X-ray and laboratory services, organized medicine again cried "invasion of private medical practice." It called the extension of these services "socialized medicine."

Thus, these cries of "Wolf, wolf, socialized wolf," were originally hurled by the great defender of the voluntary plans at these very same plans just a few short years ago.

When the AMA found itself unable to halt the growing public demand for voluntary insurance, it tried a new battle-plan. It set up its own Blue Shield plan offering limited surgical care. At the same time, organized medicine continued to use legal and professional pressures to block all consumer plans. Organized medicine did not drop its feud, however, with Blue Cross. In Wisconsin, for example, as late as 1940, the State Medical Society forbade local units to cooperate with Blue Cross.

In 1934, AMA declared as official policy:

All features of medical service in any method of medical practice should be under the control of the medical profession. No other body or individual is legally or educationally equipped to exercise such control.

ESTABLISHED MEDICAL MONOPOLY

Accordingly, in line with this new battle-plan, organized medicine secured restrictive laws in 22 States which prevented the public from organizing their own volutary plans. Thus, between 1939 and 1946, farmers, co-ops, labor unions, and other consumer groups lost the right to set up comprehensive insurance plans with qualified doctors and surgeons of their own choice.

In many instances, the consumer plans fought for survival and, backed by the public, they won. In Washington, D. C., a nonprofit prepayment plan began its fight in 1937 against the AMA—that great defender of the voluntary plans—and did not rest until it won it 6 years later. In 1943, the United States Supreme Court unanimously upheld a lower court conviction of the AMA and its local medical society for violation of the antitrust laws.

The public's fight for freedom to organize voluntary plans is continuing against organized medicine this very day. In San Diego, Calif., an independent nonprofit consumer plan has hailed the local medical society into court, charging it with a systematic drive to destroy the consumer plan through whispering campaigns, smear ads, and reprisals against the plan's doctors and patients.

In Oregon, too, local medical societies have been prosecuted by the Federal Government for conspiracy to monopolize prepaid plans and for resort to the same unfair practices as in San Diego. Some one hundred physicians have charged that organized medicine took action against them when they attempted to work with consumer plans.

This pattern is duplicated in many parts of this country. The Department of Justice has found it necessary to investigate some sixteen medical societies following the complaints of doctors and patients of consumer plans.

Even for its own plans, AMA enthusiasm has always been lukewarm at best. A proposal to put Blue Cross and Blue Shield on a national basis was rejected only 2 years ago, causing Dr. Paul Hawley, then director of both plans, to warn the leaders of organized medicine:

The demand for more comprehensive medical care and budgeting its costs has grown

within 10 years from a whisper to a roar. Our people will not be denied much longer. I emphasize that the welfare of our people must be given at least as much consideration as the welfare of the health professions. Too many physicians regard medical care as their exclusive prerogative. We must recognize that the consumer of medical care also has a great stake in it.

The basic reason for AMA rejection of Dr. Hawley's proposal was voiced as far back as 1936 when its then president-elect, Dr. J. Tate Mason, condemned voluntary plans as the start of a trend toward general socialization.

In another instance, when a voluntary rural prepayment hospital plan was launched at Elk City, Okla., the local medical society translated AMA obstructionist policy into unscrupulous action. The society eliminated the plan's founder, Dr. Michael Shadid, by the device of meeting, voting to disband, then reorganizing without his name on its rolls.

These are but a few examples that are taken from hundreds of instances of continuous obstructionist activity. In the face of this record, however, the American Medical Association has the cynical audacity to tell Congress that it supports voluntary plans and believes they can provide adequate medical care for all our people.

What is the reason behind this two-faced maneuver? In their Simplified Blueprint of the Campaign Against Compulsory Health Insurance, the AMA's highly paid lobbyists state baldly: "Defeating compulsory health insurance is the immediate job." In order "to get medicine off the defensive," they propose to promote voluntary health insurance.

But organized medicine has not limited its activities solely to fighting National Health Insurance. It has stepped again and again beyond the proper bounds of medical care to prescribe economic treatment for our body politic. Here are a few pills that organized medicine has tried to force down the public throat in the past:

FOUGHT TB REPORTING

First. Organized medicine opposed a generation ago the requirement that all cases of tuberculosis be reported to a public authority—the foundation of all tuberculosis control methods.

Second. Organized medicine opposed inoculation against smallpox, diphtheria immunization and other preventive measures against contagious disease by public-health agencies on the ground that it would hurt the economic interests of private physicians.

Third. Organized medicine fought workmen's compensation, denouncing it as "socialism."

Fourth. Organized medicine's ruling body unanimously opposed the National Tuberculosis Control Act a week before Congress unanimously passed it.

Fifth. Organized medicine opposed the first bills to grant Federal aid to the States to reduce infant and maternal mortalities. When Congress passed the Sheppard-Towner Maternity Welfare bill in 1921, the AMA house of delegates labeled the act "Federal bureaucratic interference with the sacred rights of the American home." Again in 1930, the same body again condemned the measure as unsound in policy and tending to promote communism.

CALLED SOCIAL SECURITY COMMUNISM

Sixth. Organized medicine took a jaundiced view of the Social Security Act, passed in 1935. Declared the AMA Journal:

> The Social Security Act is designed to work a revolution in the social and political relations of the people and of the several States to the Federal Government. To what extent it is constitutional and to what extent unconstitutional is a question that the journal cannot decide.

In behalf of the AMA Board of Trustees in 1939, Dr. Fishbein condemned old-age and unemployment insurance as a "definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism." The board of trustees cried that social security would "be the first step in the breakdown of American democracy, a beginning invasion by the State into the personal life of the individual."

Seventh. Organized medicine opposed the creation of venereal disease clinics. Again, it saw an invasion of private practice and an economic threat to doctors.

Eighth. Organized medicine opposed—and still does—the creation of free diagnostic centers for tuberculosis and cancer. These are viewed as further steps to socialized medicine.

Ninth. Organized medicine fought the American Red Cross plan of 1947 to set up a Nation-wide reserve of civilian blood banks. Free blood for transfusions made organized medicine see red, as usual. It castigated the Red Cross for "pushing socialized medicine." A number of local societies went even better. Said the New Orleans Medical and Surgical Journal in March 1948:

> The American Red Cross, while not politically dominated, operates with Government sponsorship; not with tax money, but with public subscription. The allotment of blood and its products by the American Red Cross should ultimately lead to the effect of having the Red Cross practice medicine. The transition from this arrangement to state medicine could become an imminent danger.

Tenth. Organized medicine has displayed varying degrees of hostility to the development of medical research and knowledge by such great foundations as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Rosenwald Fund, the Commonwealth Fund, the Milbank Memorial Fund, the Twentieth Century Fund, and the American Foundation. It has termed these efforts, which resulted in tremendous health gains for all people, "lay interference" and "intrusion."

THE GREAT-LIE TACTIC

This record of obstructionism, of opposition to every forward move, is just part of AMA's record of the last few decades. It would take many more hours to cover the full list of shoddy, ill-advised AMA policies which have repeatedly jeopardized not only our standards of health care, but also the professional integrity and freedom of our press.

Through a calculated public-relations campaign, organized medicine has sought to manipulate public opinion. The AMA's first front group was the National Physicians Committee, whose origins date back to 1938. It was organized and led by some high-ranking officers of the AMA, and separately set up merely to protect the AMA's tax exemption. The National Physicians Committee was financed by contributions from large patent-medicine corporations and from other sources which closed their eyes to the shocking and irresponsible tactics which placed all honest medical practitioners in bad odor.

The National Physicians Committee, like all well-controlled front groups, never deviated from the AMA line. It put to good use the tactic of the great lie, repeating over and over the smear that national health insurance is socialized medicine and that all its supporters are in effect acting on orders from the Kremlin. In the 7 years of its existence, this group spent well over $1,000,000 in its propaganda efforts and distributed more than 25,000,000 pamphlets. It published thousands of full-page advertisements, hurling the term "socialized medicine" over the radio, through the mails, and through every known technique of public relations, including the direct lobbying of Senators and Congressmen.

PUBLIC-RELATIONS FIRM QUITS

Responsible elements in the AMA protested against the National Physicians Committee and achieved a purely temporary victory when the public-relations firm of Raymond Rich Associates was hired to represent the AMA. This firm's excellent reputation, it was hoped, would help rescue the AMA's own name from the disrepute it was gathering under the direction of the National Physicians Committee. But after 17 trying months, Raymond Rich Associates confessed that the AMA showed no real desire to follow the truth. AMA politicos turned down Rich's honest recommendations, particularly one that urged dissociation from the National Physicians Committee. In its public statement of resignation, which was sent to all AMA officers and to Congress, this firm declared:

> The very integrity and sincerity of the association are at stake * * *. Stated simply, the association has yet to take unequivocal and effective action on the policies which it adopted on our recommendation last year: to seek the truth on the economic and social aspects of medicine, to put the public first, and to become adequate to its responsibilities.

Once freed from the moral restraints imposed by Raymond Rich, the National Physicians Committee swept on without rein. Two incidents in its checkered career indicate the depths to which it willingly descended.

The first concerns the pressures exerted on the American press through this lobby's unvarnished attempt to buy editorial support. Two years ago the National Physicians Committee placed large advertisements in journalism's two leading trade publications, Editor and Publisher and Publisher's Auxiliary. These ads announced cash awards for cartoonists totaling $3,000 for the effective portrayal of the meaning and implications of political distribution of health care services in the United States.

The contest's first rule declared that cartoons must have been published to be eligible. Just to make certain that all cartoonists understood that only anti-health insurance jibes were wanted, the National Physicians Committee printed the illustration which showed national health insurance as putting American people in the hands of a political quack while free enterprise was in a coffin ready for the graveyard.

There is no mistaking the National Physicians Committee's intent. Even so conservative a magazine as Editor and Publisher was shocked. In its next issue, it editorialized: "The contest rules leave no doubt that this is a subtle bribe to cartoonists to support or oppose certain political beliefs * * * in other words, large cash awards are offered to cartoonists for doing a propaganda job in behalf of the physicians' committee."

It is gratifying to note that doctors themselves joined with editors and cartoonists in condemning the ethics of the so-called contest. Fourteen nationally prominent physicians declared in Editor and Publisher that the National Physicians Committee did not speak for all doctors, and that they as physicians were ashamed of these tactics. The doctors further charged the National Physicians Committee with distributing canned editorials which misrepresented national health insurance and attempted to smear it as a collective doctrine which emanates from Moscow.

REPUDIATED BY JOURNALISTS

A number of newspapers made their positions clear. John S. Knight, editor of the Akron Beacon-Journal scored the contest. The Minneapolis Star, through its cartoonist, Al Judd, and the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator also stated publicly that they refused to place their editorial views on sale. Ralph L. Crosman, director of Colorado University's School of Journalism, wrote: "Everyone who understands the purpose of a free press in a democracy will deny the right of the committee thus to attempt to corrupt the press." A number of prominent journalists and professional societies urged that the contest be boycotted.

Public opinion thus frustrated the National Physicians Committee's attempt to buy editorial opinion. But nothing could reform these political doctors whose next trick was an unabashed stooping to racial and religious prejudice. The National Physicians Committee paid $3,000 to the so-called "Reverend" Dan Gilbert for a public letter addressed from him to all Protestant clergymen. The epistle began with the salutation "Dear Christian-American" and continued for four pages of thinly disguished anti-Semitism compounded with wholly irresponsible attacks on national health insurance, calling it a "real threat to religious liberty."

Wrote Dan Gilbert on this issue:

> This monster of anti-Christ * * * this monstrosity of Bolshevik bureaucracy * * * would establish quotas for the baby crop in the same way that the Agriculture Department sets quotas for farm production.

The National Physicians Committee sent this letter to all AMA members, hailing it as one of the few really vital pronouncements of an age. The National Physicians Committee asked that doctors, even at personal sacrifice, use the zero-hour certificate and return the envelope today with $250 or more.

Instead of checks, hundreds of protests poured into AMA headquarters. Indignant doctors pointed out what the National Physicians Committee had been so careful to conceal—that Gilbert was a former associate of Gerald Winrod, William Dudley Pelley, and the Fascist Silver Shirt gang indicted by the Federal Government for sedition during the war. These doctors also pointed out that the so-called Reverend Gilbert had not graduated from any recognized theological school and that his record as a rabid race baiter hardly qualified him to speak either in behalf of American medicine or democratic principles.

The determination of honest doctors throughout the country to dissociate themselves from such shameful practices finally forced the AMA to kill the National Physicians Committee this year. But even so, the journal of the AMA, in a farewell editorial, whitewashed the NPC, declaring it had been a leader in the defense of American medicine and had the approval of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association.

HIRES HUCKSTER FIRM

The failure of all these efforts to stem the growing public demand for national-health insurance compelled the AMA to even further last-ditch tactics. To build a war chest, they secretly voted the $25 assessment described earlier. To head their misnamed national education campaign, AMA hired Whitaker and Baxter, a California public relations firm with a long record of lobbying victories in behalf of State antilabor laws, sales taxes on consumers, and special interest measures ranging from utility corporations to dog-racing combines. For the services of these lobbyists, the AMA is paying $100,000 a year.

What sort of people are Whitaker and Baxter? What sort of professional ethics have they? Are they really conducting a bona fide educational campaign, exploring both sides of the issue, then leaving it to the American people to judge for themselves on the basis of all the evidence?

Their own record provides the best answer.

One of the chief recommendations of this firm was its proud boast that after helping to elect Earl Warren, Governor of California on a platform that included State health insurance, Whitaker and Baxter were chiefly responsible for directing the State medical society campaign that wrecked this proposal. Apparently, professional ethics have never troubled Whitaker and Baxter.

This propaganda firm made clear at the outset that the AMA's campaign would be an "education" campaign in name only. In their opening addresses they announced bluntly that American doctors were not to debate the subject of national health insurance in public. Their intent, clearly, was to deny the American people the chance to hear both sides of the question and make up their own minds. Rather than fair debate for both sides, Whitaker and Baxter prefer to rely on a saturation campaign which would lay down a barrage on the American public in their own words "of emotional fighting prose." Their goal is the distribution all over the country of 100,000,000 copies of such appeals to emotion, bias, ignorance, and fear.

Shortly after Whitaker and Baxter assumed command, the Minnesota State Medical Association blossomed forth with a resolution remarkably reminiscent of the tactics employed to buy editorial opinion by both the National Physicians Committee and Whitaker and Baxter. In a public statement, the Minnesota State Medical Association sacrificed its time-honored ban on paid advertisements by doctors to allow unlimited advertising space for "special greetings, announcements, messages, and other material." In explaining its action, the medical society declared:

> One frequent criticism heard from the press is that the medical profession expects the press to maintain the entire burden of indirect publicity from the doctors [against national health insurance] to the public without remuneration.

Thus, the State medical society is clearly offering newspapers paid advertisements in exchange for editorial support to block the President's program.

Unethical tactics such as this are causing doctors as much concern about Whitaker and Baxter as they felt about the National Physicians Committee. Let me quote from a letter which Dr. Thomas E. Mattingly, a prominent Washington physician wrote to the Washington Star:

> I was present as a visitor in our house of delegates when our new leadership was introduced and given a noisy vote of confidence. We, who revolted at politicians invading the Nation's sickroom now have a husband and wife publicity team directing our strategy. Miss Baxter is going to stop the socialization of medicine with a holy relic: By keeping politics out of Sir Luke Feldes' picture of The Doctor, she seriously proposes to satisfy our growing hunger for solvent social security within the framework of true democracy.
>
> Miss Baxter's husband, Clem Whitaker, is the atomic task force of our new public relations. With the fervor of an evangelist, he exhorted us about things done and to be done. If he missed a single suffocating cliche, it was not for lack of time. When he was through, we gathered that Oscar Ewing would never socialize medicine as long as Whitaker and Baxter had $3,000,000 to spend on tracts, holy relics, and stamps. As a family doctor, I have never been much for cure by testimonial. Whitaker and Baxter did not change my mind.
>
> As Dr. Fishbein was the repudiated symbol of our old reactionary leadership, Whitaker and Baxter are symbols of the new. We have turned healing over to publicity experts. In the future, if you are sick, listen to your radio and don't forget to open your morning mail. "Doctors" Whitaker and Baxter may be sending you a magic tract.

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR QUITS

Whitaker and Baxter may feel no qualms of conscience in the way they seek to mislead the American public through their so-called education campaign. But a little over a year ago, one of their key assistants, resigned. David

Brown, former editor of Liberty magazine, left his $15,000-a-year position as editorial director of the AMA's campaign after a few weeks because he could not stand Whitaker and Baxter's methods. The immediate cause of disagreement was Whitaker and Baxter's claim that the Department of Justice was seeking to intimidate the American Medical Association by bringing antitrust suits against certain medical societies, and by investigating others for possible action. Whitaker and Baxter have widely trumpeted those investigations as proof that the AMA was being persecuted for opposing national health insurance.

Did Whitaker and Baxter make even a passing reference to the United States Supreme Court decision in 1943 upholding a lower court conviction of the AMA as a medical monopoly?

Did Whitaker and Baxter acknowledge that antitrust investigations have been pending against a number of medical societies for some time?

Did Whitaker and Baxter offer one shred of evidence to support the claim that—in their own wild words—"a police arm of the Government (was) in a campaign to discredit American medicine and terrorize physicians into abandoning their opposition to compulsory health insurance."

Whitaker and Baxter certainly did not. Nor did they state the obvious truth—that these antitrust investigations were undertaken by the Justice Department solely because doctors and patients in county after county throughout the United States were fighting back against the monopolistic practices of organized medicine.

Whitaker and Baxter may have deliberately closed their eyes to these facts, but their editorial director, David Brown, could not do so in good conscience. Brown was obviously shocked when these irresponsible announcements were made by Whitaker and Baxter at a Washington press conference, and he investigated the charge privately, then resigned when he found no evidence to support Whitaker and Baxter's irresponsible headline efforts.

Nor have Whitaker and Baxter been above using outright fabrications in their propaganda. They have invented a spurious quotation allegedly from Lenin in an effort to smear their opposition. I exposed that lie in a speech to the House on August 26. I ask unanimous consent to insert that speech at this point in the RECORD.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION MISLEADS THROUGH FALSE QUOTATIONS

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I find myself rising in defense of this Nation against a ghost.

Yes, a sinister, unscrupulous, conspiratorial ghost who has been loosed upon us from the grave to threaten every cherished American institution.

His name, Mr. Speaker, is Vladimir Illyitch Lenin.

A GHOST WALKS

They tell me that the body, pickled and patched and preserved in perpetuity, lies under glass within a stone tomb in Moscow's Red Square.

I wish the ghost were there, too. I am very sure it does not approve of America, and if it does not like this country, I wish it would go back where it came from. I know there are many colleagues in this House who will join me in saying I do not want any part of this baleful Communist phantom.

We do not want Vladimir Lenin over here, man or ghost.

Our State Department has not issued him a visa. Our immigration authorities, our border guards, would toss him out on his ear the minute he reached our ports of entry or our national boundaries.

Then how did Vladimir Illyitch Lenin get over here? Who let him in? Who is shielding him and coddling him and quoting him as he goes about his errand of trying to sabotage American institutions?

Mr. Speaker, among good Americans Lenin is nobody's hero. But the historians tell us that neither is Lenin anybody's fool. I am sure he would be smart enough not to come over here of his own accord, to a country where he is not wanted, a country he would hate, and where—thank God—his philosophy has not a chance.

No, Mr. Speaker, Vladimir Illyitch Lenin is not here on a Cook's tour, or even voluntarily as a spy and saboteur. He has been yanked out of his tomb on Red Square, and smuggled through the customs lines by a group of ideological importers who have their own use for him here.

A GHOST TALKS

For example, only a few days ago, this apparition of Russian bolshevism was dragged by the heels across the consciousness of the House of Representatives. He was made to say to you—and I now quote right out of the phantom's mouth: "Socialized medicine is the keystone of the arch of the socalistic state."

End of unwritten and unuttered quotation from incorporeal source.

I say "unuttered and unwritten," Mr. Speaker, because these words which have been put into the mouth of the man who is dead were never spoken or set down by him while he was alive.

Actually, what you were witnessing when you heard them spoken before this House, or when you read them printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, was one of the greatest feats in the spiritual existence of mankind; namely, the bridging of the River Styx, the transmission for terrestrial ears of voices from the great beyond.

SAME QUOTATION USED BEFORE

There was an earlier attempt, Mr. Speaker, to perform this world-shaking feat. Some months ago this same voice of Vladimir Illyitch Lenin was heard to utter the same words—or so we were informed by an organization which called itself the National Physicians Committee—the busy and always open mouthpiece of the American Medical Association.

But the National Physicians Committee was out of its field. Their leaders were specialists in political lobbying, not mesmerism. They therefore made no claim of hearing the voice of Vladimir Illyitch Lenin, the dead. They simply stated that these were the words, these the sentiments of Vladimir Illyitch Lenin, the living.

Alas, Mr. Speaker, here too, the National Physicians Committee was shown to have erred. Apparently they were better lobbyists than they were historians. The research staff of the Library of Congress, among the ablest specialists in America in tracing historical documents and quotations, after making an exhaustive search of the entire collection of Lenin's public utterances and writings, reported that Vladimir Illyitch Lenin has never made such a statement.

QUOTATION CANNOT BE TRACED

Mr Speaker, I quote from a letter sent by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, and dated May 2, 1949, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: The purported quotation from Lenin to the effect that "Socialized medicine is the keystone to the arch of the Socialist state" has been the subject of considerable search from time to time. However, all of our efforts to trace this or similar statements by Lenin have been to no avail. Our Russian specialist, Dr. Yacobson, states that "the Senator's doubt as to the authenticity of this quotation is justified."

Very truly yours,

W. C. GILBERT.

Not that statement, Mr. Speaker, or similar statements—that is to say, anything like that statement—was ever made by Vladimir Illyitch Lenin. Not while he was alive.

To pursue the matter further, the same task of research was put before the Russian specialist of the University of Chicago. He, too, came back after long and arduous researches with the bewildered query, "Where did you ever find it? I can't."

Whereupon the National Physicians Committee itself was challenged to produce the source of its quotation. But there was only silence—a silence as deep and unfathomable as the tomb in Red Square where the body of Vladimir Illyitch Lenin lies in pickled perplexity, wondering when those Americans will leave his ghost alone.

AMA CONTINUES USE OF FABRICATION

And yet the American Medical Association has continued to bespatter the country with literature containing this phantom quotation. The AMA's high-powered and high-priced lobbyists, the advertising firm of Whittaker & Baxter, has produced a number of pamphlets trying to scare the daylights out of the American people. One of these, The Voluntary Way is the American Way, of which, I understand, over a million copies have been circulated, again repeats this fabrication, this completely spurious quotation.

It is therefore peculiarly interesting that I should be in receipt of a letter from Dr. K. H. Doege, president of the Wisconsin State Medical Society, admitting that the AMA has not been able to document this alleged statement.

His letter is as follows:

DEAR MR. BIEMILLER: I finally received a report from Whitaker & Baxter, of the National Education Campaign Committee of the American Medical Association, dated August 12. According to a Mr. Tod Bates, who signed the letter, the quotation is from page 27 of Lawrence Sullivan's book entitled "The Case Against Socialized Medicine," published by the Statesman Press, of Washington, D. C., in 1948. Mr. Sullivan's authority for this quotation has not been established. Apparently Whitaker & Baxter have made an effort to go behind the quotation in the Sullivan book, but because of translation difficulties, the enormous quantity of material by the prolific Lenin to be examined, and the fact that the statement may have been made orally, and never committed to record, they have not yet been able to provide chapter and verse for this quotation.

I am very sorry indeed that I cannot document this quotation. I suppose many of us go through life attributing expressions to certain persons without ever having any primary factual basis for the quotation. I can assure you that if I ever encounter anything more definite on this I will let you know.

Respectfully yours,

K. H. DOEGE, M. D.

All that the high-powered publicity boys of the AMA can come up with is that the purported quotation is carried in a brochure written by a notorious poison-pen artist. He does not document it, and, I repeat, the American Medical Association has not been able to find any human source.

FALSE QUOTATION, DANGEROUS AND IRRELEVANT

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I submit those responsible for bringing to America this

ghost who talks like a man, are not only confusing the true issues, but carried to a logical conclusion, might place our American institutions in real danger.

Before this House, just a few days ago, the words that were spoken across the void were quoted for the purpose of discrediting and discouraging those of us who advocate national health insurance as the only means of bringing medical care to all at a cost all can afford.

Actually, this posthumous utterance from the lips of Lenin not only has no relevance but is a deliberate perversion of the facts: The truth is that national health insurance is the opposite of Soviet medicine; in fact, it is our only bulwark against socialized medicine.

You have heard this pointed out and proven many times. But it makes no difference how often the provisions of the national health-insurance bill itself are read and shown to be almost the complete antithesis of socialized medicine. That term continues to be repeated, again and again, by those who hope to enlist fear on their side if they cannot enlist reason. Their aim is to scare the people.

Now they have Lenin doing it. They do not like national health insurance. So here is the formula: Call it socialized medicine, and tell the American people Lenin likes it. Anything Lenin likes, we do not like. We will have no part of it.

MISUSE OF FALSE QUOTE LEADS TO ABSURDITY

But, Mr. Speaker, that is a dangerous formula. It is so happened that Lenin liked public education, public schools.

If those who have smuggled Lenin's ghost into America are going to let him go around telling our people, through the mouths of Congressmen, what he liked and did not like, and if we let ourselves be guided accordingly, then what is to become of our compulsory public-school system? Are we to abolish them because Lenin liked public schools?

Shall we stop eating bread because Lenin liked it?

Lenin was one of the greatest exponents in his country of mechanized agriculture. Is this America's cue to scrap all our tractors and threshing machines?

Finally, although Lenin never made the statement attributed to him in this House last Monday on the subject of socialized medicine, he did have a great deal to say about the health of the people. He was all for it. Does this mean, Mr. Speaker, that because Lenin was for health we must be for sickness?

AMA USED TO CALL VOLUNTARY HEALTH COMMUNISTIC

There was a time when the American Medical Association called the voluntary health insurance they now advocate communism. That was a misnomer. If we are going to debate voluntary health insurance, let us call it by its true name, and not communism. And if we are going to debate as between voluntary and compulsory health insurance, let us not deceive ourselves that we are debating between communism and socialism.

Let us not call our public-school system socialized education because it happens to be compulsory.

Let us not call our workmen's compensation laws socialized insurance because they are enacted by legislatures.

AMERICA'S DOCTORS WILL NOT ACCEPT LIES

And let us not call health insurance socialized medicine merely because it is the logical and inevitable complement to much other legislation that has been passed to safeguard our American way of life.

I have an abiding faith in the integrity of the rank and file of the medical profession. I believe America's doctors are honest. I do not believe they will tolerate the spread of untruth—demonstrated untruth—even to win a point in the bitterest controversy.

I believe there are thousands of American doctors who do not like to see their profession demeaned by the wheedling, soap-selling techniques and sloganeering which are being employed by the political hucksters who are now speaking in their names to the American people.

These men are busy with their medical practice. They have neither the time, the opportunity nor the inclination to check such a matter as the writings and public utterances of Lenin or of anybody else the AMA lobby chooses to quote as authority.

But when they know deliberate untruths are being spoken by those whom our doctors are forced to pay as their organized publicity agents, I do not believe America's doctors will stand for such tactics.

AMA MUST WITHDRAW MISLEADING PAMPHLET

I believe these doctors, good Americans, and their fellow citizens in all other walks of life, will join me in demanding that the American Medical Association stop circulating the pamphlet entitled "The Voluntary Way Is the American Way," a scurrilous and misleading attack on President Truman's health program, which contains, among many other misstatements, the alleged but nonexistent quotation from Lenin.

In the name of common honesty, let the American Medical Association prove the authenticity of that quotation, or let them announce their intention to cease publishing it.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, let us ask the AMA to send the ghost of Vladimir Illyitch Lenin back to Russia and—for all time—leave him there.

Mr. Speaker, I renew my demand that this misleading pamphlet be withdrawn from circulation as an act of honest decency.

But apparently these actions of Whitaker and Baxter are only the beginning. The AMA has already promised an unprecedented multimillion-dollar advertising barrage to be laid down in the peculiarly strategic and political month of October.

TIE-IN WITH REACTIONARY GROUPS

The new management of the AMA is not content with its lobbying and political advertising campaign either. One of organized medicine's strangest adventures into alliance with other reactionary groups is a tie-up with the Committee for Constitutional Government, an organization whose prime mover, Dr. Edward Rumely, is now the target of the House Lobby Committee's contempt-citation proceedings.

State medical societies have bought and distributed tens of thousands of copies of John T. Flynn's hysterically anti-Fair Deal nonsense. The Road Ahead, a book distributed by the Committee for Constitutional Government in the hope it would persuade the emotionally unstable that the American people have been voting for the wrong leaders and policies for the last 20 years.

A more direct connection has been the participation of the AMA's top Washington lobbyists in the formation of the National Committee to Limit Federal Taxing Powers. Who were the fellow participants? Why, such Washington luminaries as Herbert ("Democracy Stinks") Nelson the big real-estate lobbyist, Representative RALPH GWINN, the paid columnist of the Committee for Constitutional Government, and all the other ultrareactionaries who believe that the Federal Government is not really here to stay.

While this more formal alliance is relatively new, the ideological tieup is a matter of history. Poor Dr. Fishbein, of whom one doctor wrote that he was sent to his prison cell without even the usual privileges of pencil and paper, was one of the most strident voices in America for 25 years, and the stridency was always at the prospect of change in the status quo.

AMA PRESIDENT'S SPEECH STRICTLY POLITICAL

One of his successors is no less noisy, no less committed to turning the clock back and keeping it in the calendar year of 1875. That is Dr. Elmer Henderson, new president of the AMA. In his inaugural address, for which the AMA bought national network radio time in one of the finest illustrations of bad judgment in organizational history, he delivered himself of some really resounding platitudes.

It was worth listening to for one reason, it once and for all put the AMA on the side of those conservative Republicans of the Gabrielson line and it showed exactly where AMA money was going to be spent during the campaign ahead. It accused the present elected representatives of the people of the United States—the men for whom a majority of Americans had cast their votes with respect and confidence—of being sick with intellectual dishonesty, avarice, moral laxity, and reckless excesses.

That, coming from the AMA.

I commented on Dr. Henderson's speech on June 29 at some length. Every thing I said then still holds. I ask unanimous consent to insert these remarks at this point in the RECORD.

THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association is now holding its annual meeting in San Francisco. The AMA is the country's largest scientific organization. By its very nature, the AMA must play a major role in the advancement of the national health. The delegates to its convention carry a tremendous responsibility to the welfare not only of this country, but the world. Those delegates represent the finest health facilities and the greatest fund of technical knowledge in medical history.

It is only natural that a good many Americans should have looked to San Francisco this week for guidance in many matters. If they heard the inaugural address of Dr. Elmer Henderson, incoming president of the AMA, they must now be looking elsewhere.

Just this Tuesday, with the United States in the midst of crisis, facing the possibility of a major war, Dr. Henderson ignored the urgent need to shore up our national health defenses in the shortest possible time. Instead he delivered a cliche-packed, reactionary tirade against the elected Representatives of our Government.

He attempted to ally the doctors of America, many of whom oppose Dr. Henderson's personal political beliefs, with the most extreme elements of right-wing conservatism.

Standing directly under Sir Luke Fildes' famous picture of a physician and patient with the AMA motto "Keep politics out of this picture," Dr. Henderson not only put politics into the picture, but did it with an unseemly violence and a resort to political mudslinging unmatched in the ordinarily dignified behavior of medical meetings.

Dr. Henderson's address rang with the patent insincerity of the huckster slogans

and phrases of the publicity team which now speaks for America's doctors in the name of the AMA. He attacked our Government as "sick with intellectual dishonesty, moral laxity, and with reckless excesses," and charged the administration with a campaign to gain control over all fields of human endeavor to make this a socialistic state. These wild charges and political mudslinging will become the head of an organization whose objective should be scientific progress.

The rest of Dr. Henderson's talk bears out the fact that scientific truth is not the goal of the present leadership of organized medicine. An analysis of his remarks will show that he used the same misrepresentations and distortions that many doctors and other thoughtful Americans have unhappily come to associate with the AMA. Here are a few examples:

First. In attacking national health insurance as socialized medicine, Dr. Henderson is merely repeating the same scare phrase that was used to characterize old-age and unemployment insurance and other measures passed by the administration with the enthusiastic support of the American people. The American people know that national health insurance is in fact the best protection against state medicine.

Second. In extolling American health records as the best in the world—which they are—Dr. Henderson proudly cited declining death rates resulting from tuberculosis, diphtheria, and smallpox as an achievement of American medicine. He neglected to add that the AMA fought against reporting communicable diseases, compulsory vaccinations for smallpox, and public provision for immunization against diphtheria—measures that made the campaign against these diseases possible. The AMA also called these measures socialistic. The decline in infant mortality also cited is largely due, as Dr. Henderson ought to know, to local and State public health departments and to the Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency.

Third. Dr. Henderson denies that there is a doctor shortage. Politicians, he says, are attempting to "create a crisis over an alleged shortage in this country; the ratio of doctors to population is higher than anywhere else in the world except Israel." But the AMA's own propaganda admits that there is a serious doctor shortage in many areas. Right now to bring every State up to the present standards of the 12 best equipped States, we need 20 percent more doctors—and that is just the basic minimum. The deans of the leading medical schools support Federal aid to enable their schools to enlarge their student bodies. And our Armed Forces have never been able to get the necessary numbers of doctors to meet a real crisis.

Fourth. Dr. Henderson points to our growing hospital system, stating that there are 1,500,000 hospital beds in this country now serving 16,000,000 patients. Is it a mere oversight that he did not also say that over two-thirds of these beds are operated by Government—local, State, and Federal agencies—because private hospitals have never met our needs.

But what is even more important, certain areas of this country are woefully lacking in hospital facilities. Dr. Henderson must know that only 14 counties in every 100 meet the minimum accepted standard of 4½ general hospital beds per 1,000 population. Four out of 10 counties where 15,000,000 Americans live have no acceptable general hospital.

Fifth. Dr. Henderson states that voluntary health insurance is the way to take the economic shock out of illness. He predicts that in a few years the problem will be largely resolved. What problems? Why the problem whose existence he spends so much time denying, the problem of adequate medical care for all. Dr. Henderson did not mention that Blue Shield plans with their limited coverage protect only 9 percent of the population and provide little other than protection for some types of surgery. He failed also to point out that only 2 percent of the American people have complete insurance protection such as they would get under national health insurance—because only 2 percent can afford such protection at the high rates charged by existing voluntary and commercial insurance plans.

Millions of Americans know from bitter experience that high-priced voluntary plans automatically exclude those who need protection most, the aged, those with chronic diseases, and those who simply cannot afford the high cost and the low benefits which the voluntary plans offer.

Dr. Henderson did not mention the AMA's own shabby record of opposing any voluntary plans which it cannot control—consumer, farm and labor cooperatives. In 1943, the Supreme Court convicted the AMA of monopoly practices in fighting one health cooperative and two more cases are before the courts right now for the same reason. The AMA's real attitude toward voluntary health insurance was summed up when the voluntaries first began, when they were described in an editorial in the AMA Journal as socialism, communism, inciting to revolution. For 20 years, the AMA took this official stand despite pressure from its own members to change. The change took place only when the AMA officialdom saw they must offer some substitute for a good comprehensive national health plan.

The charges levelled by Dr. Henderson this week might carry more weight if organized medicine had shown any inclination to work out a sound, constructive program for solving our health problems. So long as organized medicine turns its energies away from scientific advancement and toward irresponsible political attacks on our elected Government, so long will the AMA have to be regarded as a reactionary, self-seeking interest.

The oath of office which Dr. Henderson took Tuesday night over a Nation-wide hookup adjured him to "promote public health and welfare, to improve health standards of the American people, and to devote himself to the task of bringing improved medical care within the reach of the American people." How can Dr. Henderson live up to that solemn oath when he refuses even to admit that public health and welfare is a genuine concern, that health standards need improving, or that adequate health care is now beyond the reach and the pocketbooks of millions of Americans?

Dr. Henderson might well read carefully the address of one of his fellow speakers at the AMA convention, that of Brig. Gen. James Stevens Simmons, dean of the Harvard School of Public Health.

In his talk as reported in the New York Times, General Simmons pointed out that in the present uncertain international situation "all problems of health assume a dominant role."

In addition to the general problems of public health, he warned, we must be prepared to meet the entirely new threat of unannounced atomic and biologic warfare.

General Simmons might have added that we badly need more doctors and more nurses to meet these new conditions. Yet, the AMA continues its stubborn opposition to legislation to help failing medical schools meet their growing obligations.

As the general concluded, and I quote:

"I am also sure that the American physician now has his greatest opportunity to serve the Nation by giving his complete support not only to good medical care, but to preventive medicine and public health. The future security of the country will reflect the manner in which he fulfills this responsibility."

We have spoken of advertising campaigns, of alliances, of national speeches—all of which cost money. How much money has all this cost? Well, as of the latest lobbying reports filed with the House, the AMA lobby and its allies—big business, insurance, and real-estate lobbies—averaged about $10,000 a day every day from January 1 to March 31. There has been no slowing of that rate since and the millions-plus to be spent in October will jump even that astronomical figure. In 1949, the AMA alone spent $2,000,000 for these purposes and distributed 55,000,000 pieces of literature containing everything from its discredited quotations from Lenin to the downright lies about national health insurance.

In all this there is of course a moral, a moral so obvious that it need hardly be stated, but so important that it must be repeated over and over again.

The AMA, through a combination of circumstances, has become as selfish, as avaricious, as politically dangerous as the NAM. Those of us who serve in Congress have long recognized the NAM for what it is. We have refused to bow to its demands, to truckle to its point of view. We have recognized the obligations of the government to the people it serves and have acted on them regardless of the NAM. We have known that there could be no compromise with the NAM troglodyte, that it would always oppose any honest liberal, no matter how limited his liberal views.

Let us recognize that the same is now true of the AMA. You will not satisfy its crusted clique of phrasemongers with opposition to national health insurance, with refusal even to consider Federal aid to medical education. If you are for public housing or rent control, for an excess-profits tax or equitable labor legislation, the AMA will be on the side of your opponents. This is war and we might as well recognize it.

I, for one, accept the gauntlet. Until the doctors now buried beneath the hard crust break through and reorganize the AMA in the image of its many decent and progressive members, let it be war. Only I warn the AMA that it fights not just a vocal few, it fights the American people who want a decent health standard for all, just as they have wanted and for the most part achieved a decent living standard for all.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include a letter from the National Association of Woolen and Worsted Overseers.)

TEXTILE TARIFFS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House that over 2 months ago I asked for a hearing on my bill which would authorize the Speaker to appoint Members of Congress to be observers at the Torquay, England, Reciprocal Trade Agreement Conference. It is perfectly obvious,

as per this letter that I am inserting in the RECORD, that many of our industries will have great difficulty in having any business at all if the tariff is still further cut, and we certainly ought to have concessions if our people are to be kept at work. It is vitally important at this time that the economy of our country be strong.

Mr. Speaker, the letter I referred to is as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
WOOLEN AND WORSTED OVERSEERS,
Holyoke, Mass., August 22, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At our recent semi-annual meeting our association unanimously voted to send you this letter protesting against any further cuts in the textile-tariff rates because we honestly believe that they threaten the future of our industry and our jobs as well as those of the help under us in the textile mills of the country.

In this connection, we would like to give you an outstanding example in corroboration of our fears. If you will remember, Mr. President, after World War I the Japanese textile economy became highly developed. As a consequence, and because of its low-wage scale and longer hours of work Japan was able to undersell the world in textiles. The influx of Japanese wool and cotton goods into this country became so serious that the cotton industry of the South sent a commission to Japan to ask the Japanese textilists to not only stop increasing their sales of textiles to this country but to reduce them if possible. Our textile industry simply could not meet the ruinous prices of the Japanese under the tariff rates that then existed even with our modernized equipment in place. And this was before there was as much reduction in textile rates as now exists.

Moreover, what Japan did to the textile industry of this country and to other high-wage textile nations at that time, other low-wage textile countries were able to duplicate like, for instance, Czechoslovakia which undersold us on shoes, linens, and other textile items. So we ask you, Mr. President, in all sincerity how much worse will the situation become if the textile tariff rates are given a further cut that will enable the low-wage textile countries to sell their goods on our markets easier than before in competition with our textile industry operating under the highest wage scale in the world.

Multiply the examples of Japanese and Czechoslovakian potentialities with that of other low-wage textile nations out to sell us under still more attractive textile tariff rates and perhaps you can then understand our fears for our industry and our jobs.

For your own information the National Association of Woolen Worsted Overseers, established in 1885, is the largest organization of its kind in the world reaching into every mill in the wool-manufacturing industry. It is the parent organization of all the overseer group organizations that recently sent you a combined letter of protest against any further cuts in the textile tariff. The letter was headed by the Pennsylvania Textile Executives Association and we, as a body, voted to unanimously subscribe to its contents.

For your further information there are over 900 wool-manufacturing plants in the United States in which more than 4,700 production executives are employed. Under the direction of these men there are anywhere from 40 to 100 employees in each department of a textile plant so you can visualize that our association is one of high standing, influence, and authority in the production end of the textile industry.

Trusting that you will weigh as carefully as you can our strong reasons for asking that there be no further cuts in the textile tariff, we are,

Respectfully yours,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOLEN AND WORSTED OVERSEERS,
CHARLES AULERICH, *President.*
JAMES J. BURNS, *Secretary.*

P. S.—To you, a Member of Congress from the textile States, to whom we are sending a copy of this letter to President Truman—we ask that you add your unqualified appeal to the President and the State Department not to cut the textile tariff rates any further if we are to preserve our industry and our jobs from ruinous low price foreign competition. A note from you placing yourself on record will be most appreciated.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have tried never to impose on the membership of this body of legislators with political harangues meant only to pass the time, fill up columns in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and get pet gripes off my chest. I am not that eager to see my name in print, and I hope I never sink to that sort of demagogy. The time has now come to speak a piece which has been in a slow boil inside me for a long time. If my words seem to cut a little deeply in places, remember they have been honed against the sharp practices of the present administration.

It is beyond my powers of self-control, Mr. Speaker, to stand quietly while such a man as the President stoops to cut-throat politics against such a man as General MacArthur. It is common knowledge that the brilliance of MacArthur, the sheer genius of the man as a military leader, and his luster as a public figure has galled our last two Presidents to the raw. However, the better man of the two always managed to keep a civil tongue in his head, though he may have had to bite it now and again.

The lesser of our last two Presidents seems to have a tongue hung in the middle and loose at both ends—with a head to match. It is a shame that someone close to him did not joggle his elbow before he publicly spanked the man who has done more than anyone else to stop the Communists in Korea. However, this incident but proves again that the last two administrations have been in mortal fear that if and when MacArthur chose to challenge their policies publicly that the people would rally behind him in spite of everything the "free-lunchers" could do.

Consequently, any small quirk of a MacArthur finger prompts the Washington propaganda boys to jump on their mimeographs and race like crazy to the nearest headline in an effort to keep the American people from knowing the truth about this man and his heroic service to our country.

Like most of Mr. Truman's best laid plans, his criticism of MacArthur's statement about Formosa has backfired as usual. He meant to embarrass the general and squash his statement to the VFW encampment in Chicago; instead he made like Boston and by his banning of the statement caused millions to read it who otherwise never would have bothered.

Suffice it to say that Gen. Douglas MacArthur has done more to combat communism in Japan, on the very doorstep of the Kremlin, than the entire Truman administration has done to clear the Reds out of Washington.

The rebuke was pure precinct-level politics, as are 90 percent of the actions of H. Truman, incorporated. The whole sorry performance smacks of the back alley training the Missouri gang got under T. Pendergast, and as such is totally unworthy of the White House or the executive head of this country. This kind of spit-spat always follows the cutting of the presidential foot—in this case, the political embarrassment of trying to carry fumble-footed Louis Johnson against the people's wishes and trying to defend the indefensible record of Dean Acheson against the people's will, is making the President nervous.

The people of my district and I are sick to the teeth of this "'I love Harry who loves Dean who loves Alger who loves Stalin" business. This trend in Government has become a modern chain gang, with a distinguished Marylander bringing up the rear, whitewash bucket and all.

If the people of this country wonder whatever became of the sneaky little boys who used to write dirty words on outhouses, I can tell you where they are—they are in this administration behind mimeographs trying to destroy the reputations of better men than themselves.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the majority leader. I understand there may be a recess over next Monday, Labor Day. I think that is Consent Calendar day. Will there be another day designated as Consent Calendar day as a result of that?

The SPEAKER. That is a matter that will have to be taken care of in the future.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech before the VFW by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MURDOCK (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Dominion News.

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Sun Coast News.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and also to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a radio broadcast on the MacArthur episode.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter received from Director General James S. Simmons, connected with the School of Public Health of Harvard University, in support of the medical education bill not reported out of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7941. An act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 456. An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7941. To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8726. To amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to exempt from duty sound recordings for news broadcasts and in connection with moving-picture news reels.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, August 31, 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:

1656. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1657. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; 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. VINSON: Committee of conference. S. 4071. An act to provide allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the uniformed services, to suspend certain provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3019). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee of conference. H. R. 8028. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of the remaining Government lots in the town site of St. Marks, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 3020). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee of conference. H. R. 7302. A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3021). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 833. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9320, a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 3023). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. Report on proceedings against Edward A. Rumely (Rept. No. 3024). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUCHANAN: Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. Report on proceedings against William L. Patterson (Rept. No. 3025). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee of conference. H. R. 8594. A bill to provide for the acquisition, construction, expansion, rehabilitation, conversion, and joint utilization of facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3026). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. S. 3136. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the town of Mills, Wyo., a sewage system located in such town; without amendment (Rept. No. 3028). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 6862. A bill to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Wash.; without amendment (Rept. No. 3029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee of conference. H. R. 9038. An act to authorize the President to determine the form of the national budget and of departmental estimates, to modernize and simplify governmental accounting and auditing methods and procedures, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 3030). 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. DOYLE: Committee on Armed Services. 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 3022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 8877. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 3027). 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. BARING:

H. R. 9578. A bill to provide for the eradication and control of poisonous weeds, especially Halogeton glomeratus, on range and pasture lands in the several States and territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 9579. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research and experiments with respect to methods of controlling and producing precipitation in moisture-deficient areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KARST:

H. R. 9580. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 to provide for the deportation of certain citizens of foreign countries relieved from liabilities for training and service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 9581. A bill to provide that certain enlisted men retired for physical disability shall not be denied mustering-out pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 9582. A bill to facilitate wine production, to modify present requirements with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 9583. A bill to strengthen the national defense by affording further relief to persons in the military service of the United States through the suspension of the enforcement of civilian liabilities or obligations secured by home mortgages or by similar security arising out of the ownership of certain residential real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 9584. A bill to amend section 61 of of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 194), for the purpose of providing authority to the several States, Territories, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone to organize military forces and to provide for pay and allowances, travel, arms, ammunition, uniforms, equipment, medical, and other military supplies as deemed necessary to enable such forces to execute their internal security missions within or without their respective States and Territories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 9585. A bill to impose an excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 277. Concurrent resolution for the establishment of a United Nations Police Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. Con. Res. 278. Concurrent resolution to clarify responsibility for acts of aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 279. Concurrent resolution to clarify responsibility for acts of aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. Con. Res. 280. Concurrent resolution to clarify responsibility for acts of aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9586. A bill for the relief of David Bibliowicz, Sara Bibliowicz (nee Goldstein), and Azriel Bibliowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9587. A bill for the relief of Josef Bibliowicz, Margalit Bibliowicz (nee Katz), Abraham Bibliowicz, and Meyer Bibliowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 9588. A bill for the relief of Sonja Lohmann and her minor son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 9589. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 9590. A bill for the relief of Margaret K. N. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 9591. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Xanthos Volianitou Panagakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 9592. A bill for the relief of Dan Camil Manuila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 9593. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aurelia McGuire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 9594. A bill for the relief of Theodore C. Messerve; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 9595. A bill for the relief of Leonard Emanuel Irving; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 9596. A bill for the relief of Violet Saliba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 9597. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey perpetual and irrevocable rights-of-way to certain lands in the public domain and title in fee simple to certain other lands in the public domain to Kaiser Steel Corp.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1950

(Legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1950)

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

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Since it is of Thy mercy, O gracious Father, that another day is added to our lives, we pause in this quiet moment to dedicate them to the service of our fellow men. We give thanks with deep humility that we are summoned to live and give in such a time. Keep us ever mindful that we have been set apart to serve in a climactic hour, that our thoughts, our attitudes, our words, and our acts are not our own, but go out from this place to influence and to mold the structure of human relationships. For the fabric and fiber which we shall put into our task this day, prepare us now, we beseech Thee, O God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, August 30, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 30, 1950, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2868) to incorporate the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4029) to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3905) to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. WOODRUFF were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8546. A bill to amend the Philippine Property Act of 1946;

H. R. 9484. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the settlement of claims for losses and damages inflicted upon the Portuguese territory of Macao by United States Armed Forces during World War II in violation of neutral rights; and

H. J. Res. 537. Joint resolution making emergency appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. 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:

Aiken	Holland	Millikin
Benton	Humphrey	Morse
Brewster	Hunt	Mundt
Bricker	Ives	Murray
Butler	Jenner	Myers
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kefauver	Pepper
Connally	Kem	Robertson
Cordon	Kerr	Russell
Darby	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Donnell	Knowland	Schoeppel
Douglas	Langer	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Leahy	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Lehman	Sparkman
Ellender	Lodge	Stennis
Ferguson	Long	Taylor
Fulbright	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
George	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McClellan	Thye
Graham	McFarland	Tydings
Green	McKellar	Watkins
Gurney	McMahon	Wherry
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Williams
Hickenlooper	Malone	Withers
Hill	Martin	Young
Hoey	Maybank	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a temporary alternate Governor of the World Bank.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to submit petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and a letter, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 218)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, in the amount of $139,800,000, fiscal year 1951, for the General Services Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.