

Robert H. Paull
William L. Pack
Mortimer J. Prince
Forrest A. Pease
Norman L. Paxton
Thomas R. Perry, Jr.
James F. Phelan
William F. Payson
Norman E. Petersen
Gaylord S. Parrett
Frank H. Price, Jr.
Richard W. Parker
John E. Plummer
Elbert W. Pate
Robert J. Perkinson
John W. Palm
Ernest R. Peterson
David P. Polatty, Jr.
George R. Palus
LeRoy R. Powell
Clarence O. Payne
Irvin G. Peters
Donald F. Quigley
Robert D. Quinn
Donald A. Reader
William D. Rosebor-
ough, Jr.
William E. Rouse
Robert B. Rueger
William T. Roddy
William B. Rodman,
4th
Max V. Ricketts
George F. Roe, Jr.
James W. Reed
John W. Roberts
William C. Rivers
Leonard J. Reintjes
Thomas B. Root
Robert H. Rathbun
Benjamin F. Rowe
Raymond A. Robinson
David B. Rodman
Charles W. Rush, Jr.
Rex E. Rader
John F. Refo
Edward A. Rodgers
Joseph H. Rayburn
Frederick J. Ruder
Eli B. Rogers
Frank T. Ratchford
Andrew H. Reid
Lyle B. Ramsey
Frank J. Reiser, Jr.
Gerald M. Reeves
Albert A. Richards
Edward G. Rifenburgh
John H. Rockwell, Jr.
Joseph E. Reedy
John M. Reade
Everett E. Roberts, Jr.
Wesley H. Ruth
James V. Rowney
William H. Rowen
David M. Rubel
Alan Ray
Jack S. Ross
Carl C. Schmuck, Jr.
Edward C. Svendsen
James W. Steidley
Ralph C. Smith, Jr.
Pemberton Southard
Stanley R. Stanul
Kenneth Steen
Frederick W. Snyder
Julius F. Steuckert
Raymond J. Schneider
Richard J. Selman
Stewart W. Swacker
Burns W. Spore
Roy G. Shults
Eugene Sobczyk
Marion K. Smith
Howard L. Smolin
Robert M. Strieter
Tony F. Schneider
Louie W. Strum, Jr.
Edward C. Sledge
Weldo W. Simons
Milton J. Silverman
Charles G. Strum

John Sweeney
Charles W. Smith, Jr.
Lowell C. Savage
John W. Sullivan
Henry B. Somerville
James E. Shew
Stoughton Sterling,
Jr.
John F. Schreier
Herschel V. Sellers, Jr.
Wilson J. Sweeney
Henry E. Surface
John A. Skinner
Julian I. Schocken
Bruce T. Simonds
Joseph C. Spidler
Sidney A. Sherwin, Jr.
David M. Sharer, Jr.
Robert W. Savage
John T. Straker
James C. Smith, Jr.
Harvey B. Seim
Robert C. Starkey
Arthur J. Schultz, Jr.
Ross B. Spencer
Carl A. Sander, Jr.
William A. Shryock
Hugh B. Sanders, Jr.
Harry M. Simpson
Hoke M. Sisk
Bradford G. Swonetz
Frank M. Sanger, Jr.
Charles W. Smalzel
George S. H. Sharratt,
Jr.
Richard G. Sly
Charles N. Shane
William W. South
Thomas P. Smith, Jr.
Howard A. I. Sugg
Vining A. Sherman
Charles W. Styer, Jr.
Kenneth G. Simmons
Richard W. Shafer
Roy C. Smallwood, Jr.
Charles A. Skinner
Richard G. Shutt
Harvey J. Smith, Jr.
Roger F. Smith
John E. Tuttle
Vernon E. Teig
Edward A. Taber, Jr.
William G. Thatcher
Stephen R. Towne
William W. Trice
William H. Thornton,
Jr.
Edwin A. Tucker
Donald C. Tabb
Herman J. Trum 3d
Forrest A. Todd
William Tessin
Thomas H. Taylor
Ray C. Tylutki
Russell F. Trudeau
Robert L. Tully
William P. Tyler
Robert E. Tugend
John B. Thro
Charles P. Trumbull
Leopold R. Tilburne
James R. Thomson
Kenneth M. Tebo
Joseph K. Taussig, Jr.
Wallace A. Utley
Frank G. Vessell
Powell P. Vall, Jr.
August V. V. Vorndam
Arthur E. Vickery
Demetrius J. Vellis
Henry L. Vaughan
Hugh B. Vickery
Harvey O. Vogel
Markeson Varland
William C. Vickery, Jr.
Sam O. Violet
Eugene P. Wilkinson
Jesse D. Worley
Horace R. White
Frederick C. Wiseman
Thomas R. Weschler

Harry C. White
William E. Wiesert
Curtis C. Worley
George R. Wells
John W. Williams
Hubert P. Wirth
Samuel C. Walls
Malcolm E. Wolfe
John P. Wier, Jr.
Robert W. Windsor,
Jr.
Roger A. Wolf
Emmett W. Wood
Herbert E. Weyrauch
Richard M. Wright
John E. Whyte
William E. Westhoff
Herbert C. Weart
James T. Warns
Harry W. Wood
Donald G. White
Melvin H. Warner
Thomas B. Wolfe
Everleigh D. Willems
Warren Weeks
Hugh Wood, Jr.
Clarence C. Wright
Malcolm W.
Whitaker, Jr.
Leigh C. Winters
William H. Withrow
Robert H. White

For temporary appointment in the Naval Reserve:

Elliott H. Glunt
Merle MacBain
Lyle C. Read

John D. Rooney
Tad Stanwick

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate November 29 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert A. Lovett, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, turning aside for this hallowed moment from the violence and turbulence of these embittered days, we would hush the words of the wise and the prattle of the foolish. Let not the state of the world, plunged now into such tragedy and confusion, dim our faith in the ultimate decencies.

May the costly testings of these days be to us but as the refiner's fire, consuming the dross, bringing out the pure gold of our democracy. Teach us Thy lessons, show us Thy way, convict us of our follies, sober us by Thy chastisements, and make us the instruments of a durable peace, just to all nations and hopeful for all men. In this hour of crisis and tension, we lift our living Nation a single sword to Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. O'MAHONEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 29, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. LUCAS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate, beginning tomorrow, for an indefinite period, inasmuch as these Senators have been appointed by the Vice President to attend the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meeting in Australia, as delegates from the Senate. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope both Senators will arrive safely in Australia, after passing through those troubled waters.

Mr. TAFT. And we also hope that they will return safely.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; we also hope that they will return safely.

CREDENTIALS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk for filing the credentials of my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be read.

The credentials were read, as follows:

STATE OF GEORGIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Atlanta.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950, WALTER F. GEORGE was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Georgia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Herman E. Talmadge, and our seal hereto affixed at Atlanta, this 24th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1950.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] BEN W. FORTSON,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think we are all delighted to have presented the certificate of reelection of our distinguished and beloved colleague. May I ask the Senator from Georgia if it is intended now to ask for additional proceedings with respect to it?

Mr. RUSSELL. No additional proceedings can be had until January 3 next, because of the fact that the new term of the senior Senator from Georgia will not begin until the new Congress convenes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I had forgotten for the moment that we were not in the new session of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is in receipt of certificates from the Governors of Idaho and North Carolina certifying the election of new

Senators from those States. They are WILLIS SMITH, Senator from North Carolina, and HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Senator from Idaho. The Senators have already taken the oath of office.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICES,
City of Raleigh.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950 WILLIS SMITH was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of North Carolina a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term of 6 years, ending January 2, 1955.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor W. Kerr Scott, and our seal hereto affixed at Raleigh, this 28th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1950.

W. KERR SCOTT,
Governor of North Carolina.

By the Governor:

[SEAL]

THAD EURE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF IDAHO,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

CERTIFICATE

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950 HENRY C. DWORSHAK was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Idaho a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the unexpired term of 6 years, ending on the 2d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor C. A. Robins, and our seal hereto affixed at Boise, this 27th day of November in the year of our Lord 1950.

C. A. ROBINS,
Governor.
J. D. CY PRICE,
Secretary of State.

[SEAL]

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I send to the desk the credentials indicating the election of Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN to the Senate in the 1950 election.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be received, read, and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1950, GEORGE D. AIKEN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Vermont a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for a term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Harold J. Arthur, and our seal hereto affixed at Montpelier, this 21st day of November, in the year of our Lord 1950.

HAROLD J. ARTHUR,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL]

HOWARD F. ARMSTRONG,
Secretary of State.

NOMINATIONS OF ANNA M. ROSENBERG AND JOHN D. SMALL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If there are no additional routine matters to be taken up, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I withhold it.

Mr. BYRD. As in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably the nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, the position to which she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; also the nomination of John D. Small, to be chairman of the Munitions Board, a position to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. Action on these nominations was unanimous by the Committee on Armed Services. I ask that the nominations be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

INVESTIGATION OF INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I withhold it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 366) was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the Congress from time to time has enacted laws designed to protect the internal security of the United States from acts of espionage and sabotage and from infiltration by persons who seek to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence; and

Whereas those who seek to evade such laws or to violate them with impunity constantly seek to devise and do devise clever and evasive means and tactics for such purposes; and

Whereas agents and dupes of the world Communist conspiracy have been and are engaged in activities (including the origination and dissemination of propaganda) designed and intended to bring such protective laws into disrepute or disfavor and to hamper or prevent effective administration and enforcement thereof; and

Whereas it is vital to the internal security of the United States that the Congress maintain a continuous surveillance over the problems presented by such activity and threatened activity and over the administration and enforcement of such laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws

relating to espionage, sabotage and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effects of subversive activities in the United States, its Territories and possessions, including but not limited to espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organization controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpoenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. Subpoenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. The committee, or duly authorized subcommittee, shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, and is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of the heads of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 5. The committee shall from time to time report to the Senate the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable respecting necessary legislation. All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on March 1, 1952.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement in conjunction with the resolution I have just submitted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is there any objection to having a quorum call so that all Senators may hear what the Senator from Mississippi has to say?

Mr. EASTLAND. No; I have no objection to a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have a quorum call.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, when a request for a quorum call is made all business must be laid aside for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska withhold

his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WHERRY. I feel that if business is to be transacted we should first have a quorum call. However, if the Senator insists that I withhold my request I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I withdraw my request of the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I had suggested the absence of a quorum, but later withheld it because I understood some Senators wished to present routine matters. It is a different matter if speeches are to be made. We have unfinished business before the Senate, and I do not wish to have the unfinished business interrupted by speeches or discussion of irrelevant matters which have nothing to do with the business before the Senate. It seems to me that if we yield to one Senator we shall have to yield to other Senators as well. Therefore, I ask the Senator from Mississippi how long he expects to speak on the resolution.

Mr. EASTLAND. I desire to make a statement on the resolution which I have offered. The statement I desire to make covers a page and three-quarters. I also wish to read into the Record a statement on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] which is approximately one page long. I should judge my reading of the statements would take approximately 2 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement of approximately 3 minutes on the same resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Are there any other similar requests?

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am trying to find out what the situation is, if the Senator from Nebraska will bear with me for a moment. Are there any other Senators who desire to defer the calling of a quorum in order to insert routine matters into the Record? I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that if it will take only 3 or 4 minutes to present the statements I would have no objection to withholding my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not object because of the nature of the material to be discussed. However, I believe such statements should be heard by all Members of the Senate, and therefore I requested that a quorum call be had. It is immaterial to me whether we proceed without a quorum call. If the Senator from Mississippi wishes to make his statement without first having a quorum call, it is agreeable to me. I felt it would put all Senators on notice if we first had a quorum call. Furthermore, I think it is a good procedure to follow. However, I am perfectly willing to withhold my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska can make his request. It is utterly immaterial to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi so that he may proceed with his statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the resolution which I have just sent to the desk was prepared after consultation with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and other members of the committee whose names appear as sponsors. We have joined in sponsoring this resolution because we feel that the Committee on the Judiciary, which has handled much of the legislation of the Senate dealing with the problems of communism, owes a duty to the Senate and to the people which cannot be fully discharged unless the committee conducts a continuous study and investigation of the operation of our laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States, and the ever-recurring problems of the Communist menace in the United States.

Under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, each committee of the Congress is empowered to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and accordingly the Committee on the Judiciary is already vested with power, within the confines of its jurisdiction, to make certain investigations relating to our internal security. The purpose of the resolution is therefore to implement the power of the committee under the Legislative Reorganization Act and to provide funds with which to equip the committee in the discharge of its duty.

As one who has served on the subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary which have been working on legislation dealing with espionage, sabotage, and Communist infiltration, I am convinced that we are confronted by a task which must be the subject of continuous effort. If, Mr. President, it is sound for the Congress to set up watchdog committees to maintain a surveillance over the operation of our programs of expenditures at home and abroad, it is equally sound to equip the Committee on the Judiciary to maintain a watchful eye over our program to protect the internal security of this country.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to read a statement on the resolution prepared by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who is absent from the city of Washington at this time. This is his statement:

Over the course of many years there have been accumulated by various committees of the Congress substantial quantities of information respecting the scope and nature of the Communist fifth column in the United States, and the Congress has, from time to time, enacted laws which were designed to meet this threat.

The purpose of the Senate resolution is not to again marshal the factual material which has already been assembled and which demonstrates conclusively the deadly menace of the Communist fifth column, nor is it the purpose of the resolution to vindicate the judgment of the Congress in enacting the

laws which it has enacted to cope with the many facets of the problem.

One of the elementary truths respecting communism in the United States is that it is a dynamic movement which, with devilish cunning, constantly seeks new avenues of expression and escape from detection. One might wish that it were possible for the Congress of the United States to build a legislative Maginot line to protect us from Communist activity, but experience teaches us that we must be constantly alert to the new tactics which are being devised to evade our best legislative efforts. It is for this reason principally that the instant resolution has been presented to the Senate, so that the Congress and the people may constantly be informed of our progress in this fight.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, speaking as one of the cosponsors of the resolution now being presented, I wish to make a few remarks.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, just at this hour of terrible crisis, when the military might of communism has been thrown at the military forces of the United States and the free world, there is being published in American newspapers documentary evidence of the Communist conspiracy for espionage and sabotage.

The combination of those circumstances underlines the imperative need for the resolution which has been submitted by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] for himself and other Senators, including myself.

Short of invasion, this Nation has only one way of combating communism and its tactics internally. That is, moral force, backed by law. We have enacted a law, the Internal Security Act of 1950, carefully designed to protect the Nation against the Communist conspiracy. It is the proper and indispensable function of Congress at this moment to see that that act is vigorously and fairly enforced. It is, moreover, the proper and indispensable function of Congress at this moment to determine what further measures may be necessary to protect the Nation's securities and liberties against the ravages of the Communist conspiracy.

Both functions come within the province of the Senate Judiciary Committee. To serve those ends a thorough and continuing investigation of the Communist conspiracy, and the effectiveness of our efforts to combat it, is necessary. That is the purpose of this resolution. Need for its immediate adoption is clear and compelling.

This Nation and the free world are suffering at this moment from indecision in our external relations with communism. At this same moment we cannot sit idly by and permit indecision here at home to engulf us.

Mr. President, I hope immediate action will be taken on the resolution, and that it will be favorable.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the thirty-sixth annual conference of the International City Managers' Association, at Houston, Tex., relating to the establishment of a complete Federal civil defense program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Council of Men's Work, Church of the Brethren, Middle District of Iowa, Minburn, Iowa, favoring the establishment of peace through the United Nations rather than by force; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Michigan Milk Producers' Association, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing compulsory health insurance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of San Juan, Puerto Rico, relating to the recent attempted assassination of the President; ordered to lie on the table.

INCREASE OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ACCOUNTANTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the American Institute of Accountants, at its annual meeting on October 3, 1950, at Boston, Mass., relating to an increase of appropriations for national defense purposes.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the necessity for increased expenditures by the Federal Government for purposes of national defense makes even more desirable than formerly the greatest possible economy in administration of all departments of the Federal Government; and

Whereas only a part of the recommendations of the bipartisan Hoover Commission directed to the elimination of overlapping, duplications, and waste in the operations of the Federal Government have been adopted by the Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Institute of Accountants at its annual meeting at Boston, Mass., October 3, 1950, urges the Congress to enact legislation at the earliest possible time to give effect to the remaining recommendations of the Hoover Commission which have not yet become effective.

RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATIVE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a series of resolutions forwarded to me by Peter E. May, assistant executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative.

This distinguished organization is headquartered in 814 Tenney Building, Madison, Wis.

Several of the resolutions adopted at the twenty-second annual farmers' get-together conference of the Wisconsin council at the Hotel Loraine in Madison

on October 25 relate to State dairy problems, but I have assembled those resolutions affecting the Congress and national topics. I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues to this series of stimulating resolutions, and so I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATIVE, 814 TENNEY BUILDING, MADISON 3, WIS., ADOPTED AT THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL FARMERS' GET-TOGETHER CONFERENCE HELD AT THE HOTEL LORAIN, MADISON, OCTOBER 25, 1950

RESOLUTION 1. THE THREAT OF AGGRESSION

Our country faces a grave emergency, caused by aggressive forces which threaten to overthrow all self-governing free peoples. The Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative commends our Government in its efforts to unite with other nations to restore peace in the world. The council pledges its support of the rearmament program to the end that we in this country may continue to enjoy those freedoms for which the founding fathers fought and perpetuated in the Constitution of these United States: freedom to participate in government through our elected representatives; freedom of open assembly and discussion; freedom to worship according to one's own conscience; and freedom of opportunity to develop our lives and work after our own pattern. These we cherish. For these agriculture is willing to make sacrifices.

RESOLUTION 2. INFLATION

Wars and defense preparations are inflationary forces. They create demands for goods and services at a rate faster than it is possible to produce goods and services for meeting these demands. As prices go up the dollar buys less and less. It now takes \$1 to purchase the same amount of goods and services that could be bought for 60 cents in 1939.

The Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, urgently recommends that steps be taken to the end that government spending not connected with the defense program, and civilian spending be curtailed to the extent necessary in order that the demand for goods and services be kept within the limits of the country's ability to supply those goods and services.

The council further recommends that the defense program be financed in the largest feasible measure on a pay-as-we-go basis.

RESOLUTION 4. SELECTIVE SERVICE

We recognize the necessity for all groups in America contributing their fair share of the manpower needed for national defense in this emergency. For this reason agriculture is not asking for preferential treatment.

We urge that the policies of the various county selective service boards be interpreted and applied more uniformly. We ask that full consideration be given to each individual case based on the history of farm experience and any critical family situation that may be involved.

We recommend that consideration be given to the application of less rigid physical requirements as may still be consistent with public manpower utilization for military requirements.

RESOLUTION 9. REA

The rural-electrification program sponsored by the Federal Government through the Rural Electrification Administration has

achieved notable success in speedily bringing to American farms the benefits of electric service. When REA was established in 1935, only 1 out of 10 United States farms had central station electric service; as of June 30, 1950, 86.3 percent of America's farms were electrified.

We commend the Rural Electrification Administration on this achievement. We support the continued effort of the REA to expand its services to rural areas.

RESOLUTION 11. LABOR

There are many common needs, interests, and problems existing between farmers and laborers.

To appreciate the singular relationship between farmers and labor, it must be borne in mind that in their business structure farmers are the owners of capital. Farmers are the employers of labor and are the consumers of goods and services produced at the hands of labor. Labor people are likewise important consumers of agricultural products.

We believe that conferences between labor representatives and the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative are desirable and will result in better understanding of the problems that are common to labor and farmer cooperatives.

We heartily endorse and will help to foster conferences between agriculture and organized labor.

We believe that each economic group can and should promote the welfare of its own people. We agree that labor has a right to organize in promoting the welfare of workers.

By the same reasoning we believe that agricultural welfare can best be served by organizations and cooperative associations owned and controlled by farmers.

We believe the past and continuing efforts of organized labor to organize farmers have not been in the best interests of agriculture, and we will oppose the efforts of any non-farmer group to organize farmers.

RESOLUTION 12. AMERICAN DAIRY ASSOCIATION

We recognize the American Dairy Association as being an efficient means for the advertising, promotion, and sale of dairy products and that it has done very effective work, heretofore.

We of the council support the program now being planned by the directors of the Wisconsin and National American Dairy Associations.

RESOLUTION 15. BUTTER TO ARMED FORCES

It is our understanding that the Armed Forces of United States are being supplied with considerable amounts of butter substitutes and that the Commodity Credit Corporation has millions of pounds of surplus butter on hand. We, therefore, recommend that our Armed Forces be supplied with butter until such time as Government holdings of surplus butter are depleted.

RESOLUTION 16. CORPORATION FARMING

In recent years more vegetable processors have increased the size of their own farming operations. The council of agriculture believes—

(1) That this action reduces the farmer's bargaining power in obtaining fair prices and terms of sale for the vegetables he grows.

(2) A disproportionately larger share of the tax burden is assumed by the farmers in such communities.

(3) The fertility of the soil is exploited at a more rapid rate.

(4) Large numbers of out-of-State labor are brought into such communities, which creates uneasy social problems.

(5) The best long-time interests of agriculture can be served by family-type farming.

The council of agriculture, therefore, feels that this trend of corporation farming by canners is neither in the long-term interests of the public nor of agriculture.

RESOLUTION 18. MILK AND FOOD PRODUCTS AS A PUBLIC UTILITY

We are unalterably opposed to any movement on the part of any municipality or any other governmental agency to take over fluid-milk processing and distribution or any other phase of the food industry. We will oppose any action that may be taken before the legislature to legalize any such municipal authority as being detrimental to the interests of agricultural producers and consumers.

RESOLUTION 19. COOPERATIVE INCOME TAX

The income-tax laws and regulations covering cooperatives are not a handicap to other types of business organizations nor have they caused any serious loss of revenue to the Government.

The council of agriculture, therefore, requests our Congressmen and Senators to oppose any changes in the law governing income taxes on cooperatives.

RESOLUTION 21. LIVESTOCK DISEASE CONTROL

Wisconsin dairy and livestock farmers are dependent on sales of dairy and livestock and their products. Livestock diseases cause tremendous losses to farmers and to consumers.

We believe that the administration of livestock sanitation and disease control can be most effectively done through present administrative channels, and we commend the Department of Agriculture in its recent efforts to improve and expand the administrative program of this division.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GEORGE (by request):

S. 4211. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 4212. A bill to authorize and direct the Court of Claims to render judgment upon the merits of the claim of John J. Harte Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 4213. A bill making an appropriation for emergency repairs to the Canadian River siphon, Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. ECTON, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. NEELY):

S. 4214. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MAYBANK BEFORE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REAL ESTATE BOARDS

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on November 14, 1950, before the Forty-third Annual Convention of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, at Miami Beach, Fla., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STRENGTH OF UNITY—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Close Ranks," published in the Boston Herald of November 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SITUATION CONFRONTING US IN ASIA—ARTICLE FROM PATHFINDER MAGAZINE

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "No World War in Asia," published in Pathfinder magazine for November 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRAGEDY IN THE FAR EAST—ARTICLE BY WALTER WINCHELL

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Tragedy in the Far East," written by Walter Winchell and published in the Washington Post of November 30, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

Aiken	Gurney	Millikin
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Brewster	Hendrickson	Murray
Bricker	Hill	Myers
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler	Holland	O'Connor
Byrd	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kem	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Langer	Stennis
Donnell	Leahy	Taft
Dworshak	Lehman	Taylor
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Eaton	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McClellan	Thye
Ferguson	McFarland	Tobey
Flanders	McKellar	Tydings
Frear	McMahon	Watkins
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wherry
George	Malone	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Green	Maybank	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate as a delegate of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is unavoidably detained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to take the floor for a few moments in the endeavor to discover whether or not it is going to be possible to reach a unanimous-consent agreement to vote upon the motion of the majority leader to consider the Alaska statehood bill. Before propounding any unanimous-consent request, however, I desire to make a few observations about the condition in which we find ourselves.

There have been numerous reports and rumors that if the Alaska statehood bill should be made the unfinished business a full scale filibuster would be undertaken against it. As I said the other day when I opened the discussion on the subject, it is wholly within the authority, the power and the right of any Senator to take full advantage of the rule of unlimited debate in the Senate of the United States. It occurs to me, however, that in this crucial period of world history, when the present session, which opened on the 27th of November, must of necessity adjourn before the Eighty-second Congress takes over, we should clearly understand what we are doing.

Dispatches from Paris tell us that the whole French Cabinet resigned because Members of the French Chamber of Deputies were taking full exercise of their parliamentary rights; this at a period when the whole cause of human freedom and parliamentary institutions hangs in the balance.

Mr. President, it has been suggested that the two Territories should not be admitted to the Union. Arguments against their admission to the Union have been advanced by some Senators on and off the floor who are regarded as defenders of States' rights. I desire to point out that opposition to statehood is not support of States' rights.

Opposition to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii is really a declaration that the power of the Federal Government shall continue to be exercised over these Territories and over the people who live in them.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am one of those who object to transferring the sovereignty of Hawaii and Alaska from the Federal Government to new and untried State governments at this time, and I regard that position as being utterly consistent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I will say that there is no question before the Senate of transferring the power at this time. The bills in question, if they ever come before the Senate are authorizations to the people of the respective Territories to draft constitutions and to submit them to Congress. The Congress of the United States at some future time will have to pass upon the admission. So it is not a question now of transfer of authority at this moment or this year or possibly next year to a new State or States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming is either very skillfully splitting hairs or he is much more optimistic than I am as to the trend of world events. I hope and pray that within the next 10 or 12 months the skies will lighten and that the clouds will pass. But unless I very seriously misjudge the situation, we are in for a period of crisis for many years to come. I repeat, there is absolutely nothing that is inconsistent or contradictory in defending the rights of the States and in opposing the making of new States, which will fix an obligation on the Federal Government to defend their rights in case of any great emergency. Should these Territories be admitted into the United States, either today or next year, I would feel bound to fight for their rights as vigorously as I would defend the rights of Georgia or Wyoming, and I do not think I care to be placed in that position when we do not know but that a terrific blow will be leveled at one of those outposts either tomorrow or 6 months from tomorrow.

I have also been interested to note that many of those who heretofore have had no interest in States' rights, are now vigorously supporting Alaska on the theory that some rights of States are involved. Rights of individual citizens of the United States are involved; but in those Territories no States' rights are involved until the Congress wishes to assume the responsibility of creating States out of them and then defending them in their rights.

Mr. President, this comment is not personally directed to the Senator from Wyoming; but, to my mind, some of those who most vigorously espouse the cause of statehood, hope that statehood

will be achieved for those Territories in order to get more votes in the Congress in order to be able to take away the few rights which now remain to the sovereign States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, of course I understand the position the Senator from Georgia has taken. He made his expression, however, before I had completed my statement.

I say that failure to extend statehood to these Territories will inevitably result in the continued exercise of the power of the Federal Government over them, their resources, and their people. Because of the critical international situation in which we find ourselves, it will be necessary for the central government to exercise more power; and, in time, it may become very difficult indeed to loosen the hand of the Federal Government upon the resources and the Territory, particularly those of the Alaska area.

However, Mr. President, my point is merely to lay the preliminary basis of this discussion as to whether we are going to have a vote. I say that it seems to me a little strange and almost terrifying that in this hour of national danger we should be insisting upon full, parliamentary, technical rights. The time has come, it seems to me, when all the people of the United States, and particularly all of us who bear any of the responsibilities of government, must recognize the fact that free government is in danger throughout the world.

We cannot continue "legislation as usual." If it becomes necessary—and it is necessary—for us to appropriate large sums of money for national defense; if we are going to take further steps, as there is no doubt that we shall, to defend the soldiers of America who by our authority are carrying the Stars and Stripes in Korea; if we are going to defend those whom we have asked to defend us, we are going to make appropriations without limit. When we make those appropriations without limit, either we shall have a tremendous expansion of the deficit or we shall raise additional taxes.

We know that even now debate is going on as to whether we should pass a timid tax bill to protect special interests or whether we should pass a tax bill which will raise the revenue required to be raised in order that we may do the things we must do. Every Member of Congress who knows about the economic situation must realize that if we make the huge appropriations by which we are going to divert our industrial might to the production of the instruments of war, controls will be necessary.

We know that we cannot permit the cost of living to continue to rise. We know that we cannot permit rent costs to rise. We are talking about an extension of rent control for 2 or 3 months. Mr. President, if we really mean business in defense of the men we have sent to Korea, we cannot be timid about the things which must be done. If we are going to spend these days in a fruitless debate designed to prevent an over-

whelming majority of the Senate from voting upon this issue, then it seems to me the country ought to know it.

There are some of us who believe that the passage of these two measures is essential as an element of national defense. I was not engaging in oratory or in any appeal to the emotions when I said to the Senate the other day that the Territory of Alaska is separated from Soviet Siberia by only 58 miles across the Bering Straits. I was not engaging in an emotional appeal or a forensic flight when I said that Hawaii, in the center of the Pacific, is the focus upon which the oriental eye is now centered, and that the word will go out all through the Pacific area if the Congress of the United States, by the vote of the Senate, by the delays of the Senate, should say "No, you people in Hawaii may not come into the Union of States."

Mr. President, Hawaii and Alaska are incorporated Territories of the United States. Every lawyer in this body knows that an incorporated Territory is a Territory to which the Constitution of the United States has been extended in such a way that it can not secede from the Federal Union, nor can the Congress of the United States cut it loose, within the law. Territories are different from the mandated islands of the Pacific. They are different from other areas which have temporarily come within our control because the peoples there do not have an economic basis for freedom. These are incorporated Territories of the United States, and in the interest of national defense it seems to me to be clear that they should be admitted into the Union.

However, that is neither here nor there; that is only my opinion. I may be wrong.

One thing I am sure of is that we should have a vote upon the merits, and that we should not undertake now to prolong the discussion by debate upon irrelevant matters, when so many pressing things confront us to be done.

This morning the President of the United States at a press conference, so I am informed, declared that the Executive is now giving consideration to the use of the A-bomb upon the Red puppets of Soviet Russia. I am very glad that statement has been made; I expected such a statement to come from the President. I have no doubt that the President of the United States, who himself served in the Armed Forces during World War I, and General Marshall, the Secretary of Defense, who served in the armed services during World War I and who directed World War II from the exalted position which he held in our military forces, will exercise every military power of the United States to defend the American soldiers we sent into Korea. They are entitled to have that defense, but they are also entitled to know that their Congress in Washington is not wasting time in dilatory discussion over matters which so large a number of the Members of the Congress believe to be vital to the national defense.

Mr. President, I have spoken vigorously because I feel deeply, because I feel keenly. I want to see the democratic process continue here in the Capital of the United States and throughout the world. But we are in grave danger of losing the democratic progress. So, Mr. President, let us determine whether there is any possibility of reaching a unanimous-consent agreement to vote upon the motion of the majority leader to consider the Alaska bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the motion to consider the Alaska statehood bill shall cease at 4 o'clock on Friday afternoon, and that the Senate shall then proceed immediately to a vote upon the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, it may be that a quorum is required in this connection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I may suggest that we had a quorum call but a short time ago.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, am I not correct in believing that the rule does not require a quorum call under the circumstances?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that under the circumstances a quorum call is not required. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. EASTLAND. I object.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object if the Senator will make the request for Monday—a large number of Senators are absent from the city over the week end, and others plan to be out of the city on Monday. I do, however, wish to make a brief comment on the Senator's very impassioned and eloquent statement. The Senator spoke with more vigor and fervor than usual, and he is always a very vigorous and persuasive speaker. I merely desire to observe that there are some of us who are as firmly convinced that the ends of national defense would be served not by admitting these Territories to statehood at this time, as the Senator from Wyoming is convinced that their admission would defeat Russia's propaganda and perhaps save the country in the event of war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May we not decide that upon the merits, instead of upon a preliminary motion?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have stated that I do not intend to object, if the Senator will make the request for Monday. I think it is a very reasonable request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should be very much disposed to agree with the Senator and make the request for Monday.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is a fact, in my opinion, that today this country is in graver danger than it ever was during World War II. During World War II it was found necessary to place great areas in Hawaii under military law. Had Hawaii been a State of the Union at that time, that, in my opinion, could not have been done. It was thought necessary to do it during World War II, and it was done. If we are in the grave danger, which I apprehend confronts this Nation, the hand of the Federal Government in defending its

most vital outposts should not be tied in this period by admitting the two Territories to statehood and starting them off with new governments and with such rights as remain to the States. Such action, in my opinion, would be calculated to destroy the rights of all the States, because of the steps which it would be necessary to take in the States of Hawaii and Alaska, if they were admitted, for the reason that it would be impossible to apply a rule in Alaska, if it were a State or in Hawaii, if it were a State, that would not apply to the State of Pennsylvania or the State of Illinois, which are already in the Union.

Mr. President, I wish again to observe that I am not impressed by any argument, however eloquent, no matter how vigorously delivered, that is predicated upon the idea that we in the Senate should vote to combat Russian propaganda. The Senate would be chasing will-o'-the-wisps everywhere if it undertook to pass bills in order to nail lies. If we ever combat Russian propaganda, it is going to be because we put the simple truth against the great lie and hope and pray that an all-wise Providence will see that the truth prevails. For my part, I shall never cast a vote here, nor desist from speaking on this floor, with any idea that I am going to be able to defeat Russian propaganda.

The Senator from Wyoming eloquently explains the distinction between the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and Guam. Who is going to explain it to those behind the iron curtain, when Russia transfers its propaganda from Hawaii and Alaska to Guam, Samoa, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands? We shall have no one there with the legal ability which the Senator from Wyoming displays, to show them that there is any difference or any distinction. All that would happen would be that the Russian propagandists would strike out "Hawaii" and "Alaska" from their transparent lies about our imperialistic designs and our colonial concept, and insert the word "Samoa," or the word "Guam," or the words "Puerto Rico," and carry on the propaganda. Would it then behoove the Senate immediately to say we were going to grant statehood to Guam and to the Virgin Islands and to Puerto Rico, merely in order to answer the Russian propaganda?

In their propaganda the Russians have attacked the founding fathers who wrote the Constitution of the United States. There have been those who thought it was a great document. I believe it was Gladstone who said it was the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man. The Russians say that it was written by the malefactors of great wealth in the Colonies, in order to keep all of the people in bondage. Are we going to follow the concept that, because of Russian propaganda, we must take certain action? If so we will eventually get around to repealing the Constitution of the United States.

So I desire to serve notice on the Senate that, while I shall not object to voting on the motion to consider this bill, if the Senator from Wyoming makes the request on Monday, I shall not omit any

word that I intended to say upon the merits of the bill. I hope that no other Senator will be intimidated by what I regard as being a ridiculous idea, that the action of the Senate is going to result in the calling off of Russian propaganda. It cannot be done in that way. When people have no conception of the truth, and when they think a lie is preferable to the truth, Senators would then make of themselves a group of fools to endeavor to combat that kind of propaganda by passing bills. We would never catch up with the lie. We would be chasing shadows, and the will-o'-the-wisp would be a thing of substance compared to the action of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely rose—the Senator will excuse me for digressing—to say that I shall not be deterred one iota from addressing myself to the merits of the bill by the distinguished Senator's remarks, persuasive as they were, and I trust that no other Senator will restrain himself from expressing his opinion on this vital question.

This is not a claim bill to pay some unfortunate citizen who was run over by an Army truck. It is an important matter, and even if it is in the political platform of every town and parish, the United States should look carefully at any motion to bring new and additional States into the great sisterhood of States with the dignity the States used to enjoy, and which I hope can be in some small measure restored when we have saner days in this Nation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful that the Senator from Georgia has indicated that he will not object if I modify the request by substituting Monday for Friday. I intend to do that, but, first, let me say the Senator misunderstand me completely if he gained the idea that I ever said or thought that the passage of these bills would stop Russian propaganda. Of course, it will not. I said, and I repeat, that, in my opinion, the passage of these bills will be the answer to Russian propaganda in the minds of people who are ready to accept the American protestations of our support of self-determination. So, Mr. President, I now submit the modified request for unanimous consent to vote on the motion not later than 3 o'clock on Monday afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. EASTLAND. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder whether the Senator from Wyoming can give me an explanation of a matter which has bothered me somewhat during the last few days. The Senator may know that I was one of the original sponsors of the Alaska statehood bill. It was understood that the native population of Alaska was very much in favor of statehood. Yesterday and today, however, I have

received communications from certain persons claiming to represent the Indians, or at least the interests of the Indians, in which they state that the bill, since its introduction, has been amended in such a way as to deprive the Indians of certain rights, or of rights to a certain degree, which they now hold.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say without further ado that those reports are without a shred of basis and that the rights of the natives are preserved. The amendment to which the Senator refers is the amendment adopted unanimously, as I recall, by the committee, which merely provides that the Federal Government, by Executive order, shall not, during the pendency of the statehood question in Alaska and the drawing of the constitution, create new reservations by Executive order. That is very different from the story which has come to the Senator. That amendment preserves the rights of the Indians, and it gives to the people of Alaska the opportunity to show that they believe in native rights. I may say to the Senator that the record before the committee clearly demonstrates that in Alaska the natives have been received without any discrimination upon the basis of race, creed, or color.

Mr. AIKEN. However, the communications which I have received state quite clearly that the Indian population, or the native population, has reversed its position in regard to the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is erroneous, and, at the proper time, I shall be very glad to prove that to be the case. However, I desire to say to the Senator that, objection having been made to my request for unanimous consent that we should fix a time certain for a vote upon the preliminary motion to consider the bill, I, for my part, do not propose to participate in any dilatory speeches; so I am about to surrender the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator yields to me long enough to complete my statement, I should like to say that if, as the Senator says, the native population of Alaska has not reversed its position, and if the bill as written is satisfactory to me, I still wish to have it understood, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that I feel obliged to carry out the virtual promise which the committee has made to make the railway labor bill the first business of this session. I also wish to make it clear that in so voting I do so without prejudice to the Alaska statehood bill, which I shall still support if I find the native people of Alaska have not reversed their position.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator for his statement. With respect to the railway labor bill, I had intended to vote for it when it was before the Senate in August. I would still vote for it. When we opened the session on Monday I stated on the floor of the Senate that if the railway labor bill were not to be used merely as a device for preventing a vote on the Alaska statehood bill I would have no objection to its being considered. If it were to be taken up for the purpose of having a vote on it I would have no ob-

jection. Indeed, Mr. President, I am ready now to submit another unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the Senator making another unanimous-consent request, or is he submitting an amendment to the unanimous-consent request previously submitted by him?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I intended to make another unanimous-consent request. However, if the Senator wishes to apply the rule with respect to a quorum call, which I believe would be the correct procedure, I shall not make another request. I shall simply say what I had in mind. Perhaps a better time will be presented within which to make such a request. If unanimous consent were requested that at a time certain before the end of this week we should vote on the railway labor bill, which is now on the calendar, I would not object to such a unanimous-consent agreement. However, I wish to make it clear, definite, and certain that I have not expressed myself in opposition to the railway labor bill. The bill was put aside because on the day on which Congress reconvened the Senator in charge of the bill was detained, and the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare said he would be willing to have the bill laid aside in view of the urgency of the statehood bill.

Furthermore, it was clear when the Senate adjourned last September a motion to recommit the railway labor bill was about to be made, and probably would have carried. It is also clear that a rule has never been granted on the bill by the House Committee on Rules. Therefore it seems to me to be obvious that it would be futile to take it up with any hope of enacting it into law. However, I shall not object to the bill. On the other hand, the statehood bills have been passed by the House. If the Senate should pass them they would be sent to the White House. They will be killed if we continue to debate the motion to take up the first of the bills, or continue to discuss irrelevant matters.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to join the Senator from Wyoming in expressing the hope that an early vote may be had on both bills.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that the Senator from Vermont consult the leadership on his side and other members of the minority. I shall do the same on this side of the aisle. Then we can see whether or not we can agree on a unanimous-consent request. If it is at all possible to do so, I shall be glad to join the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. If I may be permitted to complete my statement, I wish to say that I am also fully cognizant of the fact that if certain Members of the Senate do not desire to vote on the statehood bill before the 1st of January, they have previously demonstrated their ample ability to postpone a vote. I should not want to let the Alaska statehood bill stand in the way of securing a vote on the railway labor bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no unanimous-consent request now before the Senate, is there?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is not.

Mr. WHERRY. The question is on the motion made by the majority leader to consider the Alaska statehood bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Vote.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for more than 15 minutes. In view of the fact that every Senator and nearly everyone else is concerned with the world situation I have caused to be prepared some very brief remarks which I should like to present to the Senate this afternoon. My remarks relate to the very important subject of how we should meet the impact of Russian propaganda or the Russian offensive.

Mr. President, for years everyone has been accepting as a fact that the Kremlin is seeking to take over the world. Today we are faced with the most significant challenge—and this is common language on the streets by everyone, both high and low—since the shooting stopped after the Second World War. The real question is: What are we doing about it? Or, to put it in another way: Where do we go from here?

With the advent of the twentieth century a new type of warfare emerged. The new type of warfare is organized psychological warfare, designed to capture the minds of men. Germany used it. Russia is now using it very effectively.

In the Reader's Digest of November there appeared an article by C. W. Boldyreff. To me it presented very challenging reading. It called to mind that 2 years before, when I was privileged to represent this body at a conference in Bermuda similar to the one which will be held shortly in Australia—and I happened to be the chairman of the delegation—we discussed the subject of how best to meet the Russian offensive. We discussed such practical things as penetration. We must remember that during the American Revolution and the War of 1812 the British at times used Indians against us very effectively. Mr. President, I should like to know what our leaders, military and executive, are doing in connection with meeting offensively the challenge which is causing the world to be in its present very serious condition.

There still seems to be a vague and confusing outlook as to what we are going to do about it. Our boys in Korea know what they have to do about it. Are we supporting them as much as we should? Let us look at the map; or, as one famous American has said, let us look at the record.

Since World War II, Russia has been rapidly expanding. One freedom-loving country after another has gone from freedom into slavery. Sometimes it has occurred through the blandishments and promises of cooperation of the Soviet Russian Government, sometimes by internal penetration, and sometimes by

developing the determined might of dissident elements. But in each instance, whether it be Poland, Czechoslovakia, or China, the net result has always been slavery. The question still remains: What are we going to do about it?

The Russian Government has adopted a concrete, realistic plan of penetrating all freedom-loving countries for the purpose of demoralizing them, mentally and spiritually from within, and resorting to force when necessary. For a long time the people of this country could not bring themselves to believe that their supposed ally in World War II was actually intending to bring about their destruction. But this picture is, I hope, rapidly changing.

Certainly with the Chinese troops pouring into Korea by the hundred thousand the very conscience of America is now alerted to the fact that the Kremlin has given the green light and that the Chinese are pouring into Korea on the orders of the Kremlin.

Professor Boldyreff, in his thought-provoking article, points out that by using a psychological offensive in the form of propaganda against the Russian Government, as distinguished from the Russian people, that it is possible to persuade the freedom-loving elements behind the iron curtain to strike a blow for freedom. I ask Senators to read that article in the November Reader's Digest.

Recently an attorney in Los Angeles, Ben S. Beery by name, has published a program for psychological offensive against the Soviet Government. He has had some experience in the propaganda field. He is familiar with the techniques used to destroy or undermine the confidence the enslaved people may yet have in their government. His plan is of such a comprehensive nature that I feel that the Members of the Senate of the United States and the American people should have the benefit of his program. It is worthy of going into the RECORD, and I ask that it be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit A.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the first place, it must be realized that we are actually in a war. We may call it a cold war, a warm war, or a hot war, but we are, nevertheless, in an actual war, fighting for our freedom. Mr. Beery has conducted serious research in the theory of warfare and eminent military authority for his premise that war consists of two things—physical force and the spirit with which to wield it.

Assuming that we are in an actual undeclared war, it is necessary that we make an attack upon the spirit of our enemy, the Soviet Russian Government, as well as being prepared with the weapons and implements of physical war.

According to Hanson W. Baldwin, Napoleon said:

There are only two powers in the world—the sword and the spirit. In the long run, the sword is always defeated by the spirit.

Therefore, let us build up our spiritual armament to take an offensive against the Soviet Russian Government. It so happens that behind the iron curtain

there are people who love freedom. It has been stated that of the 200,000,000 Russians, at least 190,000,000 of them are subject to the impact we could make, if we know how to make it.

The statement has been made that there is scarcely a family in Russia of which at least one member has not been liquidated or put into a concentration camp. Let us stop a moment and ask ourselves what kind of soil that creates if we have the yeast, the ferment, to plant. Think of it, there is not a family of which some member has not either been liquidated or put into a concentration camp.

There are people in Russia who want to have a representative government, who want to enhance the dignity of man rather than enslave them. I presume that in Russia they are called dissident elements. These elements must be appealed to, they must be organized, they must be prepared to hamper, obstruct, and eventually assist the free people behind the iron curtain to obtain their liberty. Our spiritual warfare must not be defensive. It must be offensive in substance.

Any nation that becomes defensive-minded has thereby established the prelude to disaster, and its ultimate decay. History reveals that no nation that has been on the defensive only has ever survived against the attack of an armed enemy. We must abandon forever the defensive attitude that has been adopted by some people in our Government, and become offensive-minded.

As a first step, we should establish a real vital propaganda agency that will carry truth to the people held in bondage by the Soviet Russian Government. We must carry the yeast or ferment to the 190,000,000 and arouse them, so that the people held in bondage by the Soviet government will feel that they want bondage no more.

I am not unmindful of the fact that there has been a purported crusade of truth. But it is not strong enough, and it does not go far enough to meet the serious need with which we are faced. It fairly well limits itself to giving truthful statements about the United States. According to eminent authorities, however, the people of Russia are not interested in how many automobiles we own. They are simply interested in what they can get by way of freedom and a better way of life if they have a representative government. Hence, rather than telling those people how good our conditions are in this country, we must try to drive a psychological wedge between the Russian Government and the Russian people.

This can be done in manifold ways. There are many who claim that our propaganda cannot reach the Russian people, and they look to the obstacles preventing our reaching the Russian people rather than looking to the ultimate goal.

When Hannibal wanted to cross the Alps and invade Rome, he was told by the faint-hearted that he could not cross the Alps that there was no way across the Alps, and he replied: "I will either find a way or make one."

As to these faint-hearted people who feel that we cannot get our propaganda to the Russian people, we can properly say, in the words of Hannibal: "We will either find a way or make one."

We can, if we have the will and the ingenuity, get this propaganda to the Russian people.

I was very much interested in an article I read in the newspaper a week ago Sunday, I believe it was, prepared by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], in which he spoke about the significance of building, at a rather small expense, television sets, which would penetrate the border states of Russia, which would set forth factually, by pictures, the things which are necessary to create the ferment in the soil about which I have been speaking.

Propaganda, however, is not enough. In addition to getting our story to the Russian people, we must also penetrate the iron curtain. It was once stated by a man of great courage that the things which man creates, man can destroy. The evil Russian Government has created the man-made iron curtain, and the inflexible determination of those desiring freedom can penetrate it. We well remember that the French felt that their Maginot line was an impenetrable defense, but nevertheless the hordes of Hitler found a way around it and overran it and the French people.

We can find a way around or through the iron curtain, and by the voice of truth dispel the fear and terror which now enshrouds the people in bondage.

Having decided with fixed determination to penetrate the iron curtain, we should immediately start—and this is important—to organize the underground movements and the unhappy elements behind it. There are many skilled underground operators in the satellite countries, and there are likewise many of them in some parts of Russia, such as the Ukraine.

That is what Russia has been doing, that is what she is doing in Korea today, that is what she is doing in the United States through her agents. I was one of those who joined in the resolution which was submitted today by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], which indicates that we here want to take the offensive, and that we should put a little iron in our system, so as to be able to meet the offensive of the Russians on our own soil with an offensive which will put them out of this country.

These people should be organized, they should be trained, equipped, so that they cannot only spread propaganda, but create further confusion and disruption within the Communist orbit. We cannot be so heartless as to simply feed these people to the Russian secret police. We must train them and equip them to protect themselves.

What are we doing in China today? We know that through the centuries there have been overlords in that country. I understand that there is considerable confusion in China today. Are we giving them a problem such as the one they are giving us? We have to fight

with 1950 weapons. We cannot use mid-Victorian technique in the atomic age.

But having trained those people, and having equipped them to protect themselves, and having given them the psychological tools, they with the aid of our outside propaganda, can possibly end this unhappy era, in which the world is divided into two camps, one consisting of those of us who love freedom and the dignity of mankind; the second, those who abhor freedom and want slavery.

The details of the Program for Psychological Offensive Against the Soviet Government, prepared by Ben S. Beery, an attorney of 912 Rowan Building, 458 South Spring Street, Los Angeles 13, Calif., are too comprehensive for me to give them at this time. Furthermore, they should be studied by every Senator. So I have asked that his plan be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, we can spend our time between now and Christmas debating what in my opinion are secondary measures. I feel that the real problem before America today is that of putting our house in order economically. I believe we have to recognize that with the additional demand from the President for a billion dollars, with the increased costs of preparedness, and with the demand to put into operation some law which will give us more military effectiveness, our duty is to seek to put our house in order so that no matter what may impact us, we will be able to absorb the impact.

Putting it concretely I think we should consider now, first, the most effective way of raising sufficient funds so that we will not further deplete the value of our dollar. Second, we should consider immediately the question of what should be done in relation to stabilizing prices and wages. Third, we should consider the matter of checking costs, in other words, the checking of procurement costs in the military. We spent \$50,000,000,000 for defense purposes, and yet when the Korean situation came upon us we were practically defenseless. I trust that when we spend the next \$50,000,000,000 we will receive dollar value for every dollar spent. But temptations are great, and it is our job as legislators, not to consider minor details and secondary matters when primary matters should have our attention.

Mr. President, on Tuesday last when the President of the Senate informed me that he had appointed me as one member of the committee to go to Australia to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, I considered the matter, and I may say that I had a great desire to go, because, as I have previously stated, I was one of the Members of the Senate who represented the Senate and the Government at a meeting held in Bermuda 2 years ago when the representatives of the British Commonwealth of Nations gathered there. But when the news broke from Korea I felt the situation was so critical in a world sense that, in view of those circumstances, I could not go to Australia. I so informed the Vice

President at that time. As a consequence I am not going on that trip. I feel that my place is here, that my job is here.

We do not know even from hour to hour, what the future may bring. Mr. President, I feel it is important that the Senate remain in session now to handle questions, small or large, that will come before us, and which must be solved. I wanted to make my position a matter of record, to indicate why, after the news broke in Korea, I made up my mind not to go to Australia.

EXHIBIT A

OUTLINE—PROGRAM FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL OFFENSIVE AGAINST THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

I

Definition of propaganda: Propaganda, for the purpose of this proposed agency, may be defined as the truthful teaching that:

(A) Man has an inalienable right to all liberty that does not infringe upon another's right.

(B) A government obtains its just powers through the consent of the governed.

(C) Any state that does not recognize the truth or I (A) and I (B) is of necessity opposed to all freedom loving peoples, and, if it seeks world conquest, it must be destroyed.

(D) The Soviet Russian Government and the governments of its satellites are embraced within the terms of I (C) and must be destroyed.

II

The objectives of propaganda are:

(A) To win converts among the people enslaved by the Russian Government to a belief in freedom, in a representative form of government, and in what is commonly called our way of life.

(B) To destroy the Russian Government and the governments of its satellites and replace them with governments that will truly represent the people governed, that will believe in freedom, and that will be freely chosen by the people to be governed.

III

The subjects of propaganda: The foregoing objectives set forth in II can be accomplished through propaganda which will:

(A) Undermine the confidence of the people in the Communist governments. To do this the propaganda should—

1. Expand and enlarge all differences and cleavages between the totalitarian governments and the people under their control.

2. Assist in the organization and development of underground movements in Russia and her satellite states.

3. Give instructions to these underground movements.

4. Give instructions (undoubtedly in code) to espionage agents operating behind the iron curtain.

5. Teach the enslaved people that their governments are corrupt and do so by telling them the absolute truth.

6. Compare the life of the people under the totalitarian regime with that existing in the freedom loving countries. This teaching should embrace the following fields: Economic, political, religious, educational, miscellaneous.

7. Show that the totalitarian governments plan world conquest.

8. Instill defeatism in the minds of those under the Soviet regime and show them that the ultimate result to them of the plan for world conquest will be disaster.

9. Alter the psychology of the enslaved people so that they will hate their own governments and crave freedom.

(B) Build hope for the future in the people now dominated by the Russian Government in the event they overthrow their mas-

ters. In order to do that the propaganda should—

1. Teach the enslaved people the meaning of:

- (a) Freedom of speech.
- (b) Freedom of the press.
- (c) Freedom of religion.
- (d) Freedom from unreasonable search and seizure.
- (e) Fair and just judicial proceedings.
- (f) How reforms can be obtained without revolution or violence.
- (g) The theory of free government and how it operates.

2. Amplify what their life could be like under a free government. As a complement to this, fear should be created in their minds as to what will happen if they fail to overthrow their present government.

IV

Philosophy governing our propaganda.

(A) It must consist of absolute truth.
(B) It must always constitute an attack on the totalitarian governments. If an answer to false propaganda is required, it should be coupled with an attack on the Communist regime and should never be defensive. All propaganda should always be offensive.

V

Means to be used:

- (A) Radio.
- (B) Literature.
- (C) Photographs.
- (D) Special items.
- (E) Public relations to inform American people of what is being done by the agency.

VI

Integration with other agencies and with departments:

In order to be successful, the propaganda agency must be integrated with other agencies and departments of our Government so that it can assist in carrying out and making effective their policies. As the basis for this integration proper liaison should be established with:

- (A) Department of Defense.
- (B) Department of State, and possibly Foreign Offices of other freedom-loving nations.
- (C) Department of Justice, particularly the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for security reasons.

VII

Organization:

This agency should be a separate agency not under the control of the Department of State, Department of Defense, or Department of Justice, but should cooperate with them. If possible, it should be arranged so that the actual propaganda could be disseminated under the name of the United Nations, and if this is done, there should be cooperation with similar agencies in the other freedom-loving countries.

The internal organization should consist of at least the following personnel and divisions:

- (A) Head of agency.
- (B) First assistant manager, who would be the assistant to the head of the agency.
- (C) Second assistant manager, who would be an administrative assistant to handle the office organization, personnel, budget, and finances, etc.
- (D) An executive committee consisting of the following:
 - 1. Manager.
 - 2. First assistant manager.
 - 3. Second assistant manager.
 - 4. Representative of the Department of Justice.
 - 5. Representative of the Department of Defense.
 - 6. Representative of the State Department.
 - 7. Head of analytical division of agency.
 - 8. Head of radio division of agency.

9. Head of literature and photographs division of agency.
10. Head of special events division of agency.
11. Head of public relations division of agency.
12. Head of methods of dissemination division of agency.

The executive committee should have the right to determine policies and operations to be undertaken within the scope of the work to be done by the agency.

(E) An advisory committee to advise the executive committee in regard to problems referred to it by the executive committee and in regard to other activities which it believes should be undertaken or considered. In this connection it is felt that the advisory committee should consist of representative citizens, particularly in legal, educational, religious, and scientific fields, who would receive no compensation but whose expenses would be paid.

(F) Divisions of agency.

1. Analytical.
2. Radio.
3. Literature and photography.
4. Special events.
5. Security.
6. Underground activities.
7. Military activities.
8. Research.
9. Budget and finance.
10. Personnel.
11. Public relations.
12. Methods of dissemination.

SUPPLEMENT

I. DEFINITION OF PROPAGANDA

The word "propaganda" at the present time has a rather odious connotation. This was not always the case, as originally it meant the teaching of religious doctrines to missionaries to enable them to convert pagans.

In 1623 Pope Urban VIII established a college in Italy for the teaching and training of missionaries and called it the College of Propaganda. The word was not popularly used from that time until World War I, when it was used to define statements intended to cause the Allies to hate all things German. In view of some of the exaggerations and distortions used during World War I, the word began to mean that which was distorted, and ultimately came to mean falsehood.

It is important that the word propaganda should mean the teaching of truth, and the whole program that is outlined is predicated upon the use of the absolute truth to cause the peoples now enslaved to abhor their slavery and to earnestly desire freedom. Hitler predicated his propaganda upon what he called "great lies"; we should found ours upon truth. It is realized that adherence to the truth may reduce, for a short period, some of the spectacular results that can temporarily be gained by falsehoods, but over a long time truth will be more effective.

To accomplish the desired result, people under Soviet domination must understand what liberty means and also appreciate the workings and operation of a free government. They can be shown that the Russian Government is their enemy as well as ours and that it must be destroyed.

II. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of propaganda, as set forth in the outline, namely, first to win converts to the cause of freedom, and secondly, to destroy the enemies of freedom, is similar to the fundamental foundation upon which Hitler based his propaganda organization. His definition of the objectives of propaganda was that the first task of propaganda was to win converts to the party, and the second task of propaganda was to destroy the existing order and replace it with the Nazi regime. The differences between Hit-

ler's propaganda organization and the one proposed are in their purposes and methods. Hitler's purpose was to destroy freedom, and ours is to preserve and expand it; his method was the great lie; ours is the truth.

III. SUBJECTS OF PROPAGANDA

A-1. Cleavages: All propaganda at first finds its most fertile soil among those persons who are dissatisfied with existing conditions. Study should continuously be made of all fields of activity behind the iron curtain to discover important sources of disagreement and hatred, and these should be continually exploited in an effort to intensify ill will of the people toward the Russian or its puppet governments.

Care must be taken to be sure that—

(a) The matter of discord is of sufficient importance to permit its exploitation to effect a sizable segment of the people.

(b) The facts concerning the disagreement will permit propaganda supporting our objectives.

(c) This particular effort may develop a new source of cleavage.

A-2, 3, and 4. Underground movements: The organization and development of underground movements and instructions to them are matters which should be undertaken only in cooperation with the Department of State and the Department of Defense. The greatest secrecy must prevail in this work, and in this field propaganda should be used only in furtherance of plans jointly approved by those departments and this agency. In considering these plans, only the representative of the Department of State, the representative of the Department of Defense, the head of the division of this agency on underground activities (Outline, VII, F-6), the head of the division of this agency on military activities (Outline, VII, F-7), and the head of the agency, or in his absence his first assistant, should be permitted to participate.

A-5. Corruption of Communist governments: Demonstration that the Communist governments are corrupt could be accomplished by telling facts. Statements made by Russian officials and by her controlled press could be compared with eyewitness reports and possibly by United Nations reports. This propaganda can be very dramatic and should always begin and end with the definite charge that the Russian Government and those of its satellites are trying to deceive the people (see supp. III, A-7, infra).

A-6. Life in Russia compared with life in free countries: The comparison between life under Communist governments with that in the free countries can be very effective. For instance, tell the number of hours a Russian laborer has to toil to get a pair of shoes and then compare it with the hours that an American works to get the same thing. Also, one could well compare the homes and comforts of workmen in this country with those in Russia. The program should begin and end with the suggestion that the enslaved people could have as good a life as free people if only they would overthrow their masters.

Similar work could be carried on in regard to the political, religious, educational, and other fields.

A-7. Russia's plan of world conquest: To show that Russia intends world conquest, statements of Lenin, Stalin, and others could be used and compared with Russia's present claims that it stands for peace. Also, the people could be told how Russia failed to consent to free inspection of uranium production and refinement when we consented to the control of the use of the atom bomb. This is a fertile field that can be constantly exploited.

A-8. Defeatism: When a people cease to believe in the righteousness of their cause, defeatism inevitably follows. The constant reiteration of the propaganda heretofore mentioned will develop defeatism. It can be

expanded by calling attention to the disaster that came to the German people when their bid for world conquest failed.

A-9. Change psychology of enslaved people: The alteration of the psychology of the people of Russia, and its satellite states, so that they would hate their own governments and crave freedom, will be the end product of all of the foregoing propaganda. This change in psychology can be accelerated by special forms of propaganda, created and changed from time to time and to suit the particular condition. This subparagraph is included in the outline to permit their development and use as the occasion arises.

B-1 and B-2. Hope for those held in bondage: Paragraphs A-1 to A-9 cover what might well be called destructive propaganda, as they are directed to the destruction of the Russian Government. These paragraphs, B-1 and B-2, may well be designated constructive propaganda. The borderline between the two types is somewhat hazy in certain instances.

For example, the educational matter, mentioned in A-6 can be used to undermine the Russian Government and at the same time to train the people to carry on a free government once it becomes established. Other examples could be given to show the borderline types, but little confusion will arise. B-1 and B-2 are constructive and primarily educational. The constructive and the destructive types should be interspersed with each other to accomplish the greatest effectiveness.

IV. PHILOSOPHY GOVERNING OUR PROPAGANDA

A. Truth must be the watchword of our propaganda, and any deviation from truth by any employee of the agency should be cause for immediate dismissal.

B. Our propaganda must always constitute an offensive operation; it must always attack, forever attack, attack here, attack there, but in every case—attack.

This is not similar to the problem facing the military commander. He must gage his effort with his supplies and his men. In the propaganda field, the facilities are always open to one so that he can attack. The fact that we have confined ourselves to the realm of truth does not limit us, as the enemy, Russia, is evil and she becomes no better because we have agreed to tell the truth about her. She is still wicked. The only limiting aspect of our propaganda is our ingenuity and our will.

For years, we have undergone attacks by Russia and now the initiative must pass to us, if we are to succeed.

It has been claimed that this will cause Russia to start world war III. Though there is a risk that this may happen, it is doubtful. In the first place, Russia has nothing but contempt for words, and in the second place, Russia will start a war only when she is ready and feels that she cannot gain her ends by other means.

If this program is instituted, the Soviet Government probably will pay little attention to it at first. Later, as the effect of our propaganda begins to be felt, she may well be so busy at home that she will be unable to do much about it. Her favorable opportunity for world conquest could be lost, because while she is being weakened by the propaganda, we will be getting stronger.

It should be borne in mind that this program does not replace military preparedness; neither does it in any way modify military strategy or tactics. It simply weakens one's enemy. In this case Russia, psychologically; it destroys her will to conquer, and makes her more easily subject to military attack. Hitler is reported to have said that he would never start a war without the moral certainty that the enemy would collapse from within at the first stroke of the military attack from without. He nearly won, and possibly could have succeeded, if he had remembered his own statement, and carried on what he called the psychological disloca-

tion of his enemies, so that they would have been ripe for destruction by the military attack.

V. MEANS TO BE USED

The means to be used by the agency requires little amplification, except that it probably should be noted that this plan makes use of the underground organizations now in existence in Russia and her satellites, and also those to be developed, for the purpose of distribution of literature and photographs.

Special items, D, include limited operations to disseminate propaganda in special ways and for unusual and specific results. It would also include the distribution of special forms of propaganda.

For instance, an F for Freedom program could be initiated along lines similar to the V for Victory plan used so successfully during World War II by the underground movements against the Nazis.

Imitation currency containing written propaganda could be scattered by agents in foreign cities. This is very effective for two reasons. First, everyone instinctively stops to pick up money. Second, as it is a crime behind the iron curtain to have foreign propaganda in one's possession, the person picking up this fictitious money will immediately drop it when he reads it, for fear of being caught with it in his possession, and the fake money is again available for some other person to pick up and repeat the process.

VI. INTEGRATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND WITH DEPARTMENTS

The proposed agency should be integrated with the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and with the Department of Justice. As to the first two, integration is necessary so that the propaganda agency can assist the Department of State and the Department of Defense, in carrying out their own policies and activities, with such propaganda as is needed. As to the Department of Justice, integration is essential for security reasons. Each employee should be constantly investigated for discretion and for loyalty, as any leak of information from this agency could be serious.

VII. ORGANIZATION

A. Divisions of agency: The functions of the divisions of the proposed agency probably should be explained in some detail as the mere name is not always descriptive of the work which this division would do.

A-1. Analytical: The purpose of this division is to analyze all broadcasts first, for their effectiveness, and second, for the size and type of listening audience that they develop. The activity of this division will involve cooperation with the Department of Defense, Department of Justice, and the State Department, to obtain their assistance in the determination of the size and type of the audiences and the effectiveness of the programs so the conclusions will be more accurate.

A-2. Radio division: This division will handle not only the technical side of radio broadcast, but will study the particular forms of broadcast which have the greatest appeal. In connection with this study, it will of course have to cooperate with the analytical division and it should study in great detail the format of statements and broadcasts made by the Russian and satellite governments to their own people.

Ridicule is an effective weapon, but what constitutes humor and ridicule in one country may be utterly ineffective in another. A study of the humor and forms of ridicule behind the iron curtain should be made and the form of humor and ridicule used in any broadcast by the agency should be patterned on the forms that are effectively used by the Russian and satellite governments.

ments know what form is effective for their particular broadcasts. Many of them are filled with vituperation and name calling. This must be effective or the Russian-controlled press and radios would not use it. A complete study of these forms must be made and all broadcasts must be keyed to the particular form which is found to be effective in the country to whom the program is directed. The same thing should apply to all dramatic presentations. These too, must coincide with the psychology of the people who will receive them.

The radio division would likewise be called upon to cooperate with representatives of the State Department, Department of Defense, and Department of Justice for the transmittal of instructions and information to underground movements and agents behind the iron curtain. There undoubtedly should be created a subdivision of the radio division which would operate in the greatest secrecy in connection with the transmission of messages to the underground movements and to agents abroad.

A-3. Literature and photography: This field has been fairly well explored by the Information Service now being operated as a part of the State Department. If the Information Service should be dissolved and its activities transferred to the new proposed agency, good assistance could be obtained from the experience of the Information Service.

There are two schools of thought as to whether the Information Service should be dissolved. One group believes that it should be dissolved because they do not believe that straight information about the United States has proven too effective. The other school believes that the Information Service should be continued and that the proposed propaganda agency should operate as a propaganda organization always attacking the Russian Government, leaving the field of information about the United States to the Information Service. There is merit in both views but it is felt that that portion of the Information Service that broadcasts the Voice of America should probably be transferred to the new propaganda agency where it could participate in broadcasting not only the propaganda programs but also information programs. In this way there would be planned diversity between the two types of programs and one would supplement the other.

It is thought that the name of the Voice of America should be changed to The Voice of the United Nations if the United Nations' approval can be obtained. This would insure cooperation from the broadcasting agencies of other members of the United Nations.

A-4. Special events: This division would handle special and novel types of propaganda and would cooperate with the other divisions, particularly the radio and methods of dissemination divisions, to make it most effective. This division, for instance, could handle the F for Freedom program, the imitation currency program, and other like items.

A-5. Security: This division would have supervision of personnel for security reasons and would of necessity work in close cooperation with the Department of Justice and Department of Defense. The personnel of this entire agency should be classified in such a manner that any employee can be discharged without a disclosure of the reasons therefor.

The matters handled by the propaganda agency would be of such a vital character that it should not be called upon to have to prove disloyalty upon the part of any employee before discharge, and discharge should not be regarded as necessarily being made on that ground.

A-6. Underground activities: This division would handle all instructions and other information to be conveyed to the underground

movements. It would of necessity operate in the greatest of secrecy. It possibly should check all programs distributed to see that they coincide with policies for conveying information to the underground movements. It would operate also in cooperation with the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice, and possibly also with the Department of State.

A-7. Military activities: This division is similar to A-6, except that it would be primarily interested in the transmittal of instructions to agents. It also would work in cooperation with the Department of Defense and Department of Justice. It might be deemed wise to combine A-6 and A-7 into one division. It will be noted that the executive committee contains no representative of either A-6 or A-7. It is felt that the omission of these divisions from the executive committee would increase secrecy.

A-8. Research: This division would, as its name implies, be engaged in research and would cooperate particularly with the radio division (A-2), literature and photography division (A-3), and special events division (A-4). There also would be some coordination between this division and the analytical division (A-1), although the analytical division is primarily engaged in determining the effectiveness of the programs issued and the audiences created rather than obtaining information for the preparation of propaganda.

A-9. Budget and Finance: This division would be charged with the duty of handling all financial matters and making adequate recommendations to the executive committee. It would of necessity make the accounting system coordinate with that used in regular Government accounting. It would be responsible for the preparation and submission to the executive committee of a budget for its consideration and would be charged with general office administration.

A-10. Personnel: This division would handle the same work that is ordinarily handled by a personnel office. It would have charge of the screening and hiring of employees. Before employees were hired, it would work in conjunction with the Department of Justice to determine whether or not such an employee would be a good security risk. It would keep all personnel records and would also, upon instructions of the manager or his second assistant, discharge employees.

A-11. Public relations: The American people are entitled to know within the limits of military and internal security, what this agency is doing, what it is trying to accomplish, and how it operates. This division would be charged with informing the public in this country with such information as was not secret under internal or military security, and for this purpose would cooperate with the press, and possibly arrange for a speaker's bureau which could provide a limited number of speakers throughout the country. It also should handle all complaints or criticisms of the agency, affecting its public support or its operations.

A-12. Methods of dissemination: The task of this division would be to develop new and novel methods for the dissemination of propaganda behind the iron curtain. There are, of course, two established methods—radio, and the use of underground movements and foreign agents. Other methods must be devised, developed, and made effective, and they can be if the vision and will to do so are present. The employees of this division will have to be men and women of great vision and some imagination. This division will directly cooperate with the research division, radio division, literature and photography division, and above all, the special events division. It would likewise perform such special tasks as might be assigned to it within its field by the manager of the agency.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate for the remainder of today.

PETITIONS IN BEHALF OF RAILWAY LABOR BILL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hold in my hand 76 petitions with a total of over 2,000 signatures sent to me by my constituents in Massachusetts. The petitions state:

We now understand this measure, S. 3295, is pending business before the Senate when Congress reconvenes on November 27 and should receive immediate consideration. Since time is therefore of the essence, we are taking this means of petition to remind you that we shall sincerely appreciate your voting favorably on this bill and giving it any other support you may be able to in order to secure its early enactment at this session of Congress.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the motion to displace the present unfinished business of the Senate, S. 3295, a bill to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements providing for union membership and agreements for deductions from the wages of carriers' employees for certain purposes and under certain conditions. I shall vote against the motion, not for the purpose of delaying the taking up of the bill which would give statehood to Alaska but because I believe the Senate should keep the commitment it made last September. If S. 3295 is taken up and disposed of, I then shall expect to vote to take up the bill for statehood for Alaska, if the majority party gives it the order of preference at any time.

When the Senate adjourned on September 23 last, S. 3295 was made the unfinished business. As I understood at that time, this was done so that we might proceed in orderly fashion as soon as we reconvened. Relying on the fact that the Senate in good faith had made S. 3295 the unfinished business and that there would be an opportunity to discuss it on its merits, many citizens of Massachusetts have written and petitioned me in the hope that this faith would be kept. I have told them that I am in favor of the general principles of this bill.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate should stick to the schedule which it set up for itself last September 19. While, of course, I would vote to displace S. 3295 if any measure were brought before us directly dealing with our national security in these very critical times, I cannot see that statehood for Alaska is of such immediate necessity that we should displace the present unfinished business. For the reasons I have given, I shall vote against the pending motion, which would displace the railway labor bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator whether in his judgment there is any prospect for an early vote upon the bill which is the unfinished business, the amendments to the Railway Labor Act?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope there is. I will say very sincerely to the Senator I understand there are two or three pend-

ing amendments which concern directly the language contained in the bill, which amendments are not greatly disputed. I may be wrong in that, but that is my understanding. There are some dilatory motions of which I do not approve and which I would vote to lay on the table.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wonder whether the Senator from Massachusetts has had the same information which I have had, namely, that debate upon the bill, the amendments to the Railway Labor Act, would be used solely for the purpose of delaying action upon the statehood bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I can truthfully tell the Senator that I have not had that information, either as gossip, underground, or in any other way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator it came to me directly from a member of the body who is himself an opponent of the statehood bill. It was for the reason I want to make it perfectly clear that the supporters of statehood do not want to delay action upon these bills, and feel that the Railway Labor bill is being used solely for the purpose of preventing action upon the statehood bills, that I have asked the Senate to vote on the motion to take up the Alaska statehood bill. So far as I am concerned—if I may say an additional word?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Alaska statehood bill is taken up I should be the first to have it laid aside temporarily for the purpose of disposing of the other bill if there is any opportunity of disposing of it—which I may say I gravely doubt.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that several people at home spoke to me when I was there, expressing their desire that the bill dealing with the amendments to the Railway Labor Act be considered. I have in my hand numerous petitions making the same request. It is difficult for people at home who do not know the procedure in the Senate to understand why one bill is displaced when they understood it was going to be considered. I committed myself, I hope honorably, to take up that bill and to vote on its general principles, and I want to carry out my commitment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure that the Senator always acts honorably and desires to carry out his commitments, but the people back home who have communicated with him are probably not aware that the Railway Labor Act amendments bill has been buried in the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives, which has refused to grant it a rule. They are probably not aware of the fact that the opposition to that bill was so great—in part coming even from railway labor—that before the Senate adjourned in September it was clear that a motion to recommit was about to be made, and probably would carry. So those who desire in good faith to advance the report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I think would do well to cooperate in the effort to secure a unanimous-consent agreement to vote upon this matter—a request which I shall be very happy to make, but

which I am sure, when it is presented, will demonstrate that the request for action on the Railway Labor bill is merely a design to prevent action upon the statehood bills.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In reply to the Senator, all I can say is that I have not received that information, and I do want to fulfill my commitments.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Why is not the railway labor bill under debate at this time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator was not present on the first day of the session. First, there was the unanimous-consent request made—and the Senator from Wyoming will correct me if I am wrong—to consider the bill providing statehood for Alaska, ahead of the railway labor bill. Unanimous consent was objected to. Then the motion we are now discussing was made by the majority leader.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a fact that the proponents of statehood for Alaska are delaying consideration of the railway labor bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I most respectfully say that I would not want to become involved in a dispute as to questions of procedure between two Democratic colleagues, for both of whom I have the greatest respect.

Mr. EASTLAND. But why is not the railway labor bill under debate at this time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator from Wyoming attempted to answer the question now asked by the Senator from Mississippi on that subject, and my oratorical ability is not equal to his.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Butler	Hayden	Neely
Byrd	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Cain	Hunt	Saltonstall
Carlson	Ives	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kern	Stennis
Donnell	Kerr	Taft
Ellender	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McClellan	Thye
Flanders	McFarland	Wherry
Frear	McKellar	Wiley
George	McMahon	Williams
Gillette	Martin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators; and Mr. BRICKER, Mr. HILL, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. TAYLOR answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed

to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a further delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MYERS, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. WATKINS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I do not rise to make a dilatory speech. I wish to voice my opposition to the motion which is now pending to consider the Alaska statehood bill. I also wish to voice my opposition to the passage of the bill. It is very difficult to understand why at this time in the world's critical situation it should be deemed of importance to bring forward a bill to grant statehood to Alaska, to be followed by a bill to grant statehood to Hawaii. Certainly there is nothing at all to indicate that such measures are so pressing or vital that they should be taken up at this time at the expense of the consideration of urgent and important matters which now confront Congress, the people of the United States, and the world.

I do not subscribe to the theory that it is necessary or essential to pass a statehood bill for Alaska or for Hawaii in order to satisfy the propaganda machines of the Soviet Union. It has been suggested that to grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii would be a good answer to the charges which are made against America, of aggression, imperialism, or any other purposes America may have in mind with reference to its dealing with other nations of the world. If the long standing and consistent history of America through all the intervening years in her dealings with other nations has not demonstrated and established the fact that she has no imperial designs whatever, certainly we cannot do so by passing a bill granting statehood to Alaska or Hawaii.

We have demonstrated throughout our past history in dealing with other peoples of the world, especially with those who came under our directorate, that we had no purpose except to serve the territories or islands of the sea which came into our possession as the result of war. For example, we have granted independence to the Philippine Islands. We have granted independ-

ence to Cuba. We have not sought to keep in subjection any people of the world. Therefore, there is no basis for any charge that America does not intend to deal generously with any of its possessions.

Personally I would be entirely willing to grant independence to Hawaii. I have no desire to keep the islands of Hawaii permanently as a part of the United States. I am not in favor of taking any islands of the sea or other territory not contiguous to the mainland of the United States and making them a permanent part of the United States. I believe we should limit the privilege of statehood to Territories which are contiguous and adjacent to the mainland of the United States. If there is any reason for going out to the islands of the seas and taking them in as States, there will be no place to stop. If the Hawaiian Islands are granted statehood, the argument will be made that Puerto Rico also should receive similar treatment. There would then be no reason for denying such a claim. I believe we should adhere to our original concept in dealing with the islands of the sea that come into our possession, with the idea of benefiting them and putting them on a firm foundation. We have always done more for all the islands of the sea which have come into our possession than has been done by them for the United States.

Another point I wish to make is that when we have so many vital matters pending in Congress and before the country we should seek to get unity in the United States. I believe unity to be the supreme need in our Nation today. We should not take up the time with discussion of controversial measures which do not vitally affect the United States. Why should we spend our time in such discussion? We should discuss matters which are of vital concern and which affect the unity of the Nation, and not spend our time in discussing controversial measures on which there is wide difference of opinion.

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

Mr. HOEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. One of the proponents of the bill stated that the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States would give us a bulwark and spearhead against subversive activities. I wonder whether the Senator would state if it is his opinion that granting statehood would give us such a bulwark and spearhead against subversive activities. Does not the Senator think it shows the extremes to which proponents of the measure are resorting when they make such arguments?

Mr. HOEY. Undoubtedly so. I regard that as no more than an oratorical flourish. There is no basis or justification for such an assertion, and there is no proof that granting statehood to Alaska would furnish any spearhead or bulwark against subversive activities of attacks against the United States. We have already done all that can be done to build Alaska and Hawaii as strong as we can make them. Granting statehood to them would make no contribution to that end.

Mr. President, it is rather interesting to note who it is that advocates statehood for Alaska. It is a well-oiled propaganda machine. In Alaska itself there is a wide difference of opinion on the subject. The last time an election was held in Alaska, some 2 or 3 years ago, approximately 16,000 votes were cast, 9,000 were cast in favor, and a little less than 7,000 were cast against. I understand that since that election there is even a greater division in Alaska.

This morning I heard the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] raise the point whether or not the Indians in Alaska were not now in opposition to statehood. I have information on very reliable authority that last Friday in Craig, Alaska, a convention was held by the Brotherhood of Natives, which represents the Indian population of Alaska, which numbers one-fourth of the population of the Territory. Governor Gruening went to the meeting to make a speech, because he knew that the Indians were rising up against statehood for Alaska. He made the speech with the idea of having the convention adopt a resolution in favor of statehood for Alaska. He spoke for a long time. When the resolution was offered not a single delegate to the convention voted in favor of it. On the other hand, they adopted a resolution against it, and adopted it because of a certain provision in the bill. A great many of the Indians had voted for statehood when the question was before them originally, 2 or 3 years ago, but this bill contains a provision I should like to read. I do not know how much it would affect them, I am not passing upon that, but I know that they think it would deprive them of their ancestral heritage, and therefore they are opposed to the bill. This is the provision in the bill to which they object. It is section 5, subsection (1):

(1) Pending action by the people of Alaska and the Congress as provided in this act, no reservations for use and occupancy of the natives of Alaska shall be designated in the Territory by authority of any law of the United States, and no act of Congress applicable to Indians not now applying to the Territory of Alaska shall be made applicable to the Territory except by specific authorization of the Congress.

They feel that this would deprive them of the right to reserve for their own use any part of the lands they inherited from their aboriginal ancestors. I do not know whether it would have that effect or not, but they at least think so. As a result, this Native Brotherhood Assembly, representing practically all the Indians of Alaska, voted unanimously for a resolution not to agree to the bill, and they refused only last Friday to vote for a resolution recommending statehood.

Mr. President, I mention that to show that in Alaska, when the vote was taken 2½ years ago on the proposition of whether or not they would like to have statehood, and there was no such provision in the bill, the division was almost even, or about 3 to 2. The Indians having given their verdict against it, in all probability if an election were held now the proposal would not receive a majority of the votes cast in Alaska.

We hear reference made to this bill having passed the House by an overwhelming majority. That is not a fact. A majority of the House has not voted on the bill; but a majority of those voting on the occasion when the bill was passed did support it. There are 435 Members of the House. One hundred and eighty-six voted for the bill, one hundred and forty-six voted against it. More than a hundred did not vote at all, as they were absent. Therefore, in attempting to ascertain who is for the bill and who is against it, certainly it must be admitted that there is not a preponderance of opinion in favor of it among the people of Alaska or the people of the United States.

Another matter which I think is worthy of consideration is that when we are asked to make Alaska a State, we are asked to take into the Union a Territory larger than any State in the Union and with a smaller population. The total population of Alaska is between 110,000 and 120,000. But they are not all permanent residents. Included in that number are about 12,000 Government employees in Alaska, in many agencies, some of whom have their families with them, so that they form 26,000 or 30,000 of the population.

Furthermore, there is an Indian population which numbers about 30,000, or more, and of course that includes Indians and the Eskimos. It should be borne in mind also that a great deal of public work has gone on in Alaska not connected with Government employees, but projects maintained by the United States Government, on which a large number of people are employed, and a number of those have been counted in the census as temporary residents of Alaska.

Therefore, when we analyze the situation, we find that the population of Alaska amounts to no more than the population of an average county in the United States, and yet we are asked to vote on the preposterous proposition of granting to Alaska statehood, and giving her two United States Senators to represent about what is an average county in a State in the United States. It seems to me that is going far afield in the matter of determining the right of a particular element of our people to have statehood.

It has been said there has been great development in Alaska, and that Alaska has enormous resources. Alaska does have great resources. It did have a great deal of gold. In the year 1941 there was mined in Alaska \$28,000,000 in gold. Yet in 1949 there was mined only \$8,000,000 of gold. So that gold production has dropped from \$28,000,000, in 1941, to \$8,000,000 in 1949. Taking all of Alaska combined, with its vast area of 365,000,000 acres of land, we find that only three-tenths of 1 percent of the land is in private ownership. Of this vast area of 365,000,000 acres only a small number of acres are owned by private individuals. Ninety-nine and seven-tenths percent of the total acreage of Alaska is owned by the United States.

There is talk about Alaska being a rich country, and there is much land there. Yet, in the whole domain of Alaska there are only about 600 farms. That is not

any more than we find in an average county in the United States. In my State of North Carolina, or in the State of Missouri, or in the State of Pennsylvania, there are about as many farms in a single county.

When we come to think about the Territory of Alaska, and the wealth of Alaska, and the resources of Alaska, we find that they have not been developed because people do not want to stay there in the extremes of climate which are found there. California has developed marvelously because of its climate and its resources. Alaska has not been developed, not because it has been a Territory, but because of the extremes of climate, and the fact that there is no appeal to people to go there and remain permanently. Most of those who have gone to Alaska have gone for the purpose of exploration and development, and to get what they can, and when they accomplish their purpose they return to the United States. The same process has continued through the years, and will continue.

Merely granting statehood will develop the resources of the country; the granting of statehood will not make the land inviting, and those who do not like the climate or other conditions which exist there will not remain. Therefore it is far afield to say that all Alaska needs is merely to be granted statehood, and that she will proceed with her development.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to make another suggestion to the Senator from North Carolina. As he knows, I have served a great many years on the Committee on Appropriations, and so far as I can recall we have never turned down a request looking to the aid and betterment and upbuilding of the Territory of Alaska. The present occupant of the chair [Mr. McCLELLAN] will join me in that statement, I know, because he is a member of the committee. So far as I can recall, I do not remember any bill of any kind intended to help the great Territory of Alaska being turned down. I know the Senate has been unusually considerate of the Territory of Alaska, and has helped it along in every way.

Looking at the matter solely from the standpoint of the Territory of Alaska, the land and the people, I doubt if there would be as good a government there, if statehood were granted, as now exists, because our whole country seems to feel that we should look after the people there and help them, and we do that.

I desired to call that to the attention of the Senator in connection with what he has just been telling the Senate. He is correct in what he says, there is no doubt, and I am sure no one in Alaska would complain that their government is a poor government because their needs have not been taken care of.

When we come to a State, we find conditions very different. In one sense, as conditions now exist, the people of Alaska are the wards of the United States Government. If Alaska took on statehood, I doubt very much whether that situation would continue. So, looking at the

matter from the standpoint of the people who reside in Alaska—and there are not many of them—it would not be as well for them to have statehood as to continue under the present condition.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee, who is the very able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. What he says is absolutely accurate.

In that connection I desire to call attention to the fact that last year the budget contained \$71,000,000 for Alaska. There is talk about Alaska paying taxes and not having representation, and it is said, "Here is taxation without representation." The total amount of taxes paid by Alaska to the United States last year was a little more than \$18,000,000. Yet we paid back to them \$71,000,000. So our administration over them is a very benevolent sort of administration. We certainly are not taking advantage of Alaska, and she is not suffering because she does not have Senators here or Representatives in the House of Representatives.

Of course, Alaska has a Territorial Delegate in the House, and he is very able and alert, and very attentive to his duties in looking after the interests of Alaska. But aside from that, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has said, since Alaska is a Territory, the obligation is felt by the Senate and the whole Congress to see to it that Alaska has every consideration for her development and for all the projects which are needed.

Presently the taxes in Alaska are higher than in any State of the Union. The taxes under their own government budget are about \$8,000,000. The United States pays the expenses of the Territorial government, and for other purposes it pays more than \$70,000,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Mr. HOEY. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the taxes imposed in Alaska now, for purely local Territorial purposes, are higher than any tax we have in any State in the Union? If that be true, it is a fact which is new to me.

Mr. HOEY. That is my information about the matter. I have not verified it fully, but the source of my information, I think, is reliable.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator understand from the figures he has, and which he has given to us, that this tax burden would be tremendously increased if statehood were granted?

Mr. HOEY. It would be more than doubled.

Mr. STENNIS. If they cannot carry such a burden, where will the money come from? Will it come from any other source than the Federal Treasury?

Mr. HOEY. Not at all. Presently their own budget is about \$8,000,000, and the United States makes contribution to the Territorial government and the agencies which the State would have to provide for, if Alaska were made a State, amounting to more than \$10,000,000. That is the situation which now confronts the

people of Alaska. When we consider these figures we can better understand the problem, and realize that the people of Alaska would not be benefited by the granting of statehood.

In line with what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKEL-LAR], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has said, the budget for Alaska for the fiscal year 1951 amounts to about \$112,000,000. We are going forward and making provision for additional development of roads, and for other projects in Alaska. Alaska is receiving preferential treatment already, instead of being denied any of its rights or any of the opportunities for development.

A few moments ago I mentioned the payment of taxes by the people of Alaska to the Federal Government and the contention that they do not have adequate representation here. I do not think I need to emphasize that any more than to say that that condition applies always to any Territory. Alaska has the representation in the form of a Delegate in Congress, who is reinforced by a sense of justice on the part of the Members of both Houses of Congress, who will see to it that the interests of the Territory are adequately provided for, and that the Territory is not discriminated against.

Mr. President, I was thinking about the conditions which exist in Alaska, and about the Territorial government. Some time ago the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] submitted a resolution providing for an investigation of a condition which existed in Alaska, with reference to the Territorial government and certain interests in Alaska undertaking to put over a deal or the United States with respect to the Palmer Airport. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Government, and was considered by the subcommittee of which I am chairman. In view of the information furnished by the Senator from Nebraska, we felt some further investigation should be made.

Following that I sent to Alaska a representative of our staff, an attorney, and an investigator. They went into the matter rather fully. Of course, the investigation was simply a preliminary one. Their investigation disclosed, however, the methods adopted by some of those who are now proceeding to try to bring about statehood for Alaska, in their efforts to obtain money from the Federal Government.

As Senators know, Congress has passed the National Airport Act, under which the Government gives aid and assistance to the States in the building of airports. Under that policy the Government pays 25 percent of the cost of the acquisition of sites for airports, and then sometimes as much as 75 percent of the cost of the construction. The Palmer Airport Association filed an application with the CAA in connection with the Palmer Airport. The matter was under negotiation. They later, however, conceived the idea of obtaining enough money from the Federal Government both to pay for the site and for the building of the airport. In order to do that they cooked up this

sort of a scheme: They entered into negotiations with those who had the title to the airport with the idea that those who had the title should deed it to the Territorial government of Alaska at a stipulated sum of \$150,000. It was agreed at the same time that after that deed had been made and the payment had been given, those to whom the money was paid would refund \$145,000 of it, leaving the site to cost only \$5,000. That was done.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of the original transfer which was made. I also hold in my hand the original check which was given for the \$145,000 refund to the Territorial government, after the association had made the purchase, solely for the purpose of filing that with the United States and undertaking to secure a large appropriation.

For instance, under date of April 11, 1950, the Palmer Airport Association, of Palmer, Alaska, transferred 127.94 acres of land to the Territory of Alaska for \$150,000. As I say, I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of the transfer of the title.

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

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. How much of that figure was the Federal Government to pay?

Mr. HOEY. What they were doing was this: They were going to file an application to receive pay from the Federal Government, and in doing so they would set forth how much the site would cost, and then the Federal Government was supposed to pay 25 percent for the acquisition of the site. That was done under the general law which covers such procedure in relation to the building of airports through the country. The amount represented was \$150,000. That was done on April 11, 1950. On April 17, 1950, the Palmer Airport Association executed this check which I hold in my hand—it is the original check—for \$145,000, and returned it to the Territorial government, showing that they were only receiving \$5,000 for the site.

In line therewith they amended their application for assistance from the United States, on the basis of which they would be entitled to receive \$37,500 in connection with the site. In addition to that they were going to receive three-fourths of the cost of construction. So they filed a new application. When they filed the latter application, they asked for a total of \$293,500, or \$163,500 more than they had asked for in the January 9 application.

Before that time they had made a smaller request. The admitted purpose was to have the Government pay both for the site and all the cost of the airport base.

This, of course, is a private concern. It is not a Government concern. But it was dealing with a matter which concerned the Territory of Alaska. Territorial officials were joined in the matter. The active members of the organization helped to put through the proposition which would have defrauded the Federal Government by which they would have obtained money on the basis of a site

which was costing much less than had been indicated. They had spent considerable money on the airport, some \$58,000, but even when they had the United States engineers appraise the airport their total appraisal of everything connected therewith amounted to only \$131,000. They had gotten some friendly appraisers to make appraisals. One appraisal was \$150,000. Another appraisal was \$175,000. That is the basis on which they filed the application, and changed the amount to \$193,500.

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

Mr. HOEY. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. What was the date of the transaction?

Mr. HOEY. April 7, 1950, was when they obtained title, and they issued the refunding check on April 17, 1950.

Mr. STENNIS. Would the Senator mind pointing out what it was that brought the matter to light, and what stopped the transaction? What caused those concerned to recede from their position?

Mr. HOEY. I imagine the investigation did. I do not necessarily mean the investigation made by my subcommittee, but the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] made a speech, in which he called attention to the matter and gave information about it. The matter was discussed on the floor. When the resolution was referred to our committee I asked that the matter be held up until we could make an investigation. The investigation has not been completed, but it has gone far enough to show the facts I have set forth.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand the Senator, he, as chairman of the subcommittee, had to request the Department of the Interior to hold up the matter.

Mr. HOEY. Yes. We notified the Department of the investigation and asked that nothing further be done until the matter had been looked into.

In order that there may be in the RECORD a statement as to the orderly process of the proceeding, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a short summary made by a member of the investigating committee. The statement shows what processes were adopted and what method was followed in connection with undertaking to put over this matter.

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

Alaskan officials of Division of Aeronautics planned to collect, retroactively, funds from the CAA in order to reimburse itself for moneys spent on the Palmer Airport prior to the passage of the required enabling act, which act became effective on June 1, 1949. Territory of Alaska had spent approximately \$50,000 prior to June 1949. Territory not legally entitled to any Federal matching funds until after grant agreement negotiated. On November 23, 1949, George Schwamm, Director of Division of Aeronautics, and Stanley McCutcheon, attorney (also member of Territorial legislature), submitted request for Federal aid of \$94,750 against total estimated cost of completing Palmer Airport of \$130,000. Project application submitted on January 9, 1950, upon receipt of advice that Palmer Airport included in CAA allotment, and estimated Federal share of costs

reflected as \$94,750, same as in previous requests for aid. Federal aid authorization of this amount rejected by Alaskan officials under date March 15, 1950, one month after CAA authorized grant agreement. New project application submitted March 15, 1950, wherein estimated Federal share is \$145,125, while sponsors' share would be \$148,375. Total estimated cost was shown as \$293,500, or \$168,500 more than January 1950 application. Increase due to alleged error in that Territory did not own land at Palmer Airport until April 11, 1950, when check issued to Palmer Airport Association for \$150,000. Palmer Airport Association returned \$145,000 to Territory. Territory to grant association the right to reacquire the airport and donate it to the town site of Palmer when and if Palmer became incorporated. Land actually cost Palmer Airport Association approximately \$10,000, but no deed or written agreement executed by original owners to anyone until April 1950 and thereafter. Deed prepared not legally proper nor ever recorded. Three friendly appraisals submitted report to Schwamm, valuing property from \$155,000 to \$171,000. Corps of Engineers appraisal of identical acreage is \$27,626. Balance of funds to credit of Division of Aeronautics at time, \$150,000; check issued was only \$147,569.14. McCutcheon confessed he did not know what statements appeared in project applications submitted to CAA in January 1950 and in March 1950, notwithstanding fact he certified to legal accuracy of statements made. Stated he may have certified that he was giving the Territory back to the Russians. McCutcheon caused Palmer Airport Association officials to place a value of \$150,000 on the airport land in order that Territory could receive 25 percent thereof credit in matching funds, \$37,500. Roland Snodgrass, secretary of Palmer Airport Association, admitted "selling" three friendly appraisers on idea that land was worth at least \$150,000. Governor of Alaska in touch with Chris Lample, of CAA, in effort to get Federal aid for funds spend by Territory prior to passage of enabling act. Lample hand carried both project applications at Washington, D. C., in order to expedite and answer any questions which might be raised by Washington CAA officials. Local officials not as yet contacted. Schwamm admitted Territory did not intend to pay out any of its funds in completing Palmer Airport to No. 3 status. Advised no appropriation covered by Commissioners for expenditure of funds on Palmer Airport in 1950. Nevertheless, prior to investigation by this subcommittee, Schwamm advertised and entered into contract with low bidder to complete airport at cost of \$121,277.70, and, in view of contract, Territory obliged to spend funds to meet payment, notwithstanding fact that no appropriation made therefor. Schwamm has attempted to collect 75 percent of construction cost expended in 1950, but payment of Federal funds held up pending completion of instant investigation. Also noted that William Lavery, member of Aeronautical Commission, was told by Schwamm that Frank Barr appointed in his place for "expired" term. This action taken before end of term and without obtaining his resignation.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I brought that to the attention of the Senate because I feel that the matter is sufficiently vital to justify us in giving it sincere consideration. I believe there should be still further investigation before we pass upon the matter.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Sen-

ator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I inquire of the Senator from North Carolina if the men representing the Alaskan Territorial government who participated in this transaction did not include the Speaker of the Territorial house of representatives?

Mr. HOEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is it not correct that the Territory of Alaska in the 1949 act established a commission to deal with aviation and communications? I believe it was called the Alaskan Aeronautics and Communication Commission. Is it not correct that that commission was established by an act of the Territorial legislature in 1949?

Mr. HOEY. That is true, as shown by the investigation made by our representatives.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then was not the speaker of the Territorial house made chairman of that commission, a man by the name of Stanley McCutcheon, I believe?

Mr. HOEY. The record will show that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Was it not the duty of McCutcheon, in the position he occupied, to certify as to the total ownership of the land which was involved in the applications for Federal aid for the airport construction and also for the acquisition of the land?

Mr. HOEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, two applications were made. In the first application they certified that they owned this land and that it was of a certain value—as I remember, approximately \$30,000. When that application was approved by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in Washington, and when the application was returned, is it not true that the same commission in Alaska, representing the Territorial government of Alaska, rejected the approval, and then submitted the second application, in which the same man, a member of the Alaskan commission, Stanley McCutcheon, in the second certification certified that they did not own any of the land, and therefore made application for \$150,000?

Mr. HOEY. That is correct, and that is set forth in the memorandum which I had inserted in the Record a few moments ago.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then it appears, does it not, from the investigation made thus far—and I understand that these facts are substantially undenied by the principal parties involved, whom representatives of the staff of the Senator's committee have questioned in person about these matters—that it was a scheme to actually misrepresent the facts and to defraud the Federal Government of sufficient funds not only to pay the Federal Government's part of construction but also of sufficient funds to pay the Territorial government's part of both the acquisition and the construction costs?

Mr. HOEY. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Territorial officials of Alaska who have that authority actually participated in the scheme, which was discovered, and which the able Senator has called to the attention of the proper authorities; and action by the Senator and his committee has prevented the money from being paid and has prevented the fraud from actually being consummated.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

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

Mr. HOEY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sorry I was not present to hear all the Senator reported; but if I correctly understand what he has stated, it is that a complete and detailed investigation of this transaction will be made and a report submitted to the Senate as soon as possible.

Mr. HOEY. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the Senator from North Carolina indicate when that will be available?

Mr. HOEY. As I indicated before the Senator entered the Chamber, one of the assistant chief counsel for the committee and one of the investigators went to Alaska and obtained this preliminary report, and submitted it. The report gives the information which I have given. Practically all of it is uncontradicted; practically all of it is shown from the record.

In order to make a further investigation, it will be necessary to examine witnesses. Our committee expects to go forward with the investigation of the matter and to procure the full information.

However, the facts I have mentioned are those which are shown on the records and the papers and by the admissions made by those who were contacted by the staff representatives in Alaska.

Mr. BUTLER. I may say, Mr. President, that this matter was called to my attention during the committee hearings on the statehood bill. I think the members of the committee, on both sides, regardless of party affiliation, are entirely fair. I wish to say, for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that I have been on that committee for a number of years, and I have never seen any matter handled by it on a partisan basis.

At the time when I made that disclosure, it was suggested that the matter was entitled to be investigated, and, therefore, I submitted the resolution which was the basis of the investigation which the Senator from North Carolina has been conducting.

If the information which was brought to me, and which I reported, was correct, it is a very important matter to be explored thoroughly and to be reported to the Senate before we take action on the Alaska statehood bill, because the people involved are, as a group, those who are managing practically all the public affairs and questions in the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Nebraska that the first information I had about any of

this matter was when his resolution was submitted and was referred to our committee.

Of course, the Senator from Nebraska very kindly furnished the information he had. Based upon that information, the committee was of the opinion that the matter should be investigated; and therefore we proceeded immediately.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not the plan of the chairman of the subcommittee to subpoena witnesses?

Mr. HOEY. Yes. We expect to examine the witnesses later. This preliminary investigation was completed about a week ago. We expect to examine witnesses and to go into the facts fully. However, we felt that since the statehood matter was now under discussion, the Senate should have the benefit of this preliminary investigation which shows matters which are not disputed and which are sustained by the record.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield at this point?

Mr. HOEY. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. At what time did the investigation begin?

Mr. HOEY. The investigation in Alaska began about 2 or 3 weeks ago.

Mr. ANDERSON. When was the resolution submitted?

Mr. HOEY. I should say that the representatives of the committee went to Alaska about a week or so after the recess was taken. As soon as the resolution was submitted and was referred to our committee, we began here on the investigation. We looked into the matter somewhat. Then, after doing that, we decided that we should send the representatives to Alaska. That was done.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the committee call in any persons from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who might previously have made an investigation of this matter?

Mr. HOEY. They did not.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the committee call in the Governor of Alaska?

Mr. HOEY. The staff members visited Alaska and called everyone there who might have information about this matter. However, we decided that, in addition, we wished to summon witnesses for a full hearing and to give full attention to all aspects of the matter, and to have the hearing as soon as possible.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would the Senator's attitude be any different if he could have before him uncontradictable evidence that \$150,000 had been spent on the airport?

Mr. HOEY. I do not think that is the matter in controversy.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is very definitely the matter in controversy. Statement is made, with reference to the airport, that there is no question about what took place.

It is like a person who engages a good lawyer to help prepare his income-tax returns, so as to be able to obtain the maximum benefit. In the case of this particular airport, the question is not whether \$150,000 had been expended, but the question is whether \$150,000 had

been expended by the private individuals who owned the land.

The work of clearing the airport had been completed. There had been a terrific expenditure of money on the smaller airport. When the larger airport was required, it would obviously have been unfair to pay the private owners of the land for work done by the Territory of Alaska, work subscribed to by private individuals in Alaska. All those factors went into the matter.

One hundred and fifty thousand dollars had been spent. If it had not been spent, I think that would be an interesting fact for the committee to develop.

However, so far as I can find out, the Senator's committee has made no effort to ascertain whether \$150,000 was spent, but only has tried to determine whether the holdings of the private owners of the land were worth \$150,000. It is admitted that they were not.

The only way the people of Alaska could be taken into consideration was by means of proceeding in the way these people did.

I do not think the Government was defrauded of a single dime. I think the matter was handled in the way that has been followed over and over again in this country in cases in which precisely the same recognition has been given—although not in exactly the same fashion—to expenditures already made by private individuals.

That is why I am hopeful that the Senator from North Carolina will join us in trying to get this bill to the floor of the Senate, so that we may expose and explore these various matters and may get reasonable explanations for them, instead of refusing to permit the bill to come before the Senate and have them discussed before the final passage of the bill.

I am quite sure that my distinguished friend, the Senator from North Carolina, whose reputation for fairness is so strong that I need not comment on it, will eventually find that the facts are as I have outlined them, namely, that the expenditure was made, that there was no question as to the total investment of funds, but that the private owners of the land, who are private citizens of Alaska, should not have profited out of the enterprise, through the money they had turned into the development of a smaller airport, which now is to be developed into a larger airport.

Mr. HOEY. I say to the Senator from New Mexico that of course our committee had no previous notions or opinions regarding this matter. We were called upon to make the investigation, and we began it. I sent the staff to Alaska to get all of the facts in this connection. I directed them to obtain the information as fully as possible.

When they returned, they made this preliminary report, and said they thought it would be necessary to summon certain officials in order to get a full statement of the facts.

Mr. ANDERSON. They are here now. Would it be objectionable to summon Governor Gruening, who today is in Washington?

Mr. HOEY. I do not know whether we could hold a committee meeting today, but I should be glad to take up the matter at any time and to have all the facts developed.

However, I do not think this matter should be rushed. I think the persons in Alaska who have any connection with the transaction should have full opportunity to present the full facts, and I think all the facts should be laid before the Senate. I cannot understand why there is such a hurry to get this matter handled or why it should be pressed until we can investigate it.

After all, when we pass a statehood bill, that is the end of the matter. This is not a question which I think should be gone into hurriedly or ill-advisedly or without giving it full consideration. I should want full opportunity given to explain all aspects of it.

However, when the Alaskan Territorial government pays \$150,000 to the Palmer Airport, with the agreement and understanding that they are going to refund \$145,000 back to them, I do not understand how such a transaction could be considered as being open and above board.

Mr. ANDERSON. This subject was before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in June, when the committee reported the bill. It had been my request, and that of other members of the committee, that this question be fully investigated. Somehow or other, it has not been investigated.

Mr. HOEY. The first time it came to us, we acted on it. It came when the resolution was submitted in the Senate and was referred to our committee. The full committee, through its chairman, referred it to a subcommittee, and it was taken up. I knew nothing about it in advance. I had not heard of any investigation. I did not know that the matter had been brought up before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Our investigation was merely to undertake to ascertain the facts.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HOEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to inquire whether the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has made an investigation of the subject. If a thorough investigation were made by that committee, the facts might be disclosed, and it might not be necessary to conduct a further investigation. If such an investigation has already been made by another committee, I am not aware of it. Has the Senator from North Carolina information that another committee, having original jurisdiction over the Territory, has made such an investigation?

Mr. HOEY. We had no information that any investigation of that type had been made, and the only reason we made it was that the resolution was referred to us, as the distinguished Senator from Arkansas knows.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The resolution was referred.

Mr. HOEY. We had no desire to interfere in any way, but, when the resolution was referred to the full committee, and later to our subcommittee, we proceeded to consider the subject. Had I known that an investigation had already been made, I certainly should have inquired about it in order to see whether it was really necessary for us to go forward.

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

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I desire to make sure that the RECORD shows that I do not question in any way the manner in which the distinguished Senator from North Carolina has handled the investigation, or the speed with which he has handled it. I only say that the subject came before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in June, and I should like to have seen it investigated immediately. I think it should have been investigated, either by that committee or by the Senator's committee.

Mr. HOEY. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that if there are any additional facts, I should be very glad to have them. I should be very glad to incorporate such material or the results of any other investigation which might add to our knowledge of the facts.

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

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Before the Senator concludes, I should like to subscribe to the statements made by the able and distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], who is chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and to state that during the 2 years in which I have had the privilege of serving on the Appropriations Committee, I know that we have undertaken to deal generously with Alaska in all of its problems with reference to public improvements and other matters which are now the responsibility of the Federal Government, and which will become the responsibility of the State government if and when Alaska is admitted to statehood. I know that the Appropriations Committee and its able chairman have been most sympathetic toward her every request. Each request has received appropriate consideration; and, as I recall, in practically every instance Alaska's requests for funds have been granted.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, I had about concluded all I wished to say. As I said in the beginning, I am not making a dilatory speech. I am not trying to delay consideration of the bill. However, I do not believe that this motion ought to be agreed to. I do not believe that statehood should be granted to Alaska. When we undertake the task of admitting another Territory to statehood, it becomes an important matter. When a Territory is ready for statehood, and when its admission would be of benefit to the people of the Territory and to the United States as a whole, I do not believe it should be denied admission. I do not believe that

the granting of statehood to Alaska would confer any benefits upon the Territory of Alaska. I am quite sure that it would not confer any benefits upon the United States. Under such conditions, I think the Senate could very much better occupy itself in the consideration of matters of present vital concern and importance, than in debating this question, which could very well be debated next year, or the year after, or 5 years from now, without any detriment to the public good.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gurney	Millikin
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Brewster	Hendrickson	Murray
Bricker	Hill	Myers
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler	Holland	O'Connor
Byrd	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kem	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Langer	Stennis
Donnell	Leahy	Taft
Dworshak	Lehman	Taylor
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Eaton	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McClellan	Thye
Ferguson	McFarland	Tobey
Flanders	McKellar	Tydings
Frear	McMahon	Watkins
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wherry
George	Malone	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Green	Maybank	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). A quorum is present.

THE KOREAN SITUATION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a cartoon published in today's issue of the Washington Evening Star. The cartoon shows an elephant and a donkey, both pretty much scarred up, after what seems to be intended to represent a fight. In the background is shown a radio set. From the radio set are issuing the words "United States faces gravest danger. Chinese Reds drive UN forces back in fierce attacks." Then both the elephant and the donkey look up and say, "Hey, there's a war on."

I presume the inference intended to be drawn from the cartoon—and I am not finding fault with it—is that the Republicans and the Democrats in Congress are fighting while there is a war going on, and that they are unaware of that fact.

Then I find a subheading in the same issue: "Nation in peril, action needed, Secretary says"—meaning Secretary Acheson.

Then I find down below that the Secretary is quoted as saying, "Must be ready for worst." Below that the following:

"No one can guarantee that war will not come," Mr. Acheson said. "The present crisis is extremely serious"—

And so forth.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I should like the Senator to advise whether or not the radio depicted is a Capehart machine?

Mr. CAPEHART. Now if I may continue—

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The purpose of the question was to find out whether or not the reception was good.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall not answer the able Senator from Ohio, because, frankly, I am in no frame of mind—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. CAPEHART. To make answer to such a remark as that; and I shall not yield to the Senator from New Mexico at the moment either.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator for his kindness and patience.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I shall be very happy to yield. Go ahead.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would not the answer be dependent upon who is listening to the machine?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I rose to talk about this cartoon, not to criticize the newspaper. In the cartoon we find the words, "Hey! There's a war on!" I should like to ask a question. What war? The President of the United States has described the Korean incident as a police action. The Secretary of State in a speech last night said, "No one can guarantee that war will not come." What does the President of the United States call what is going on in Korea? And what does the Secretary of State mean when he says, "No one can guarantee that war will not come." Well, is war here?

My next question is this: What do the President of the United States and the Secretary of State want the Congress to do? What bill is there before the Congress that they would like to have passed immediately in respect to what the President of the United States calls a police action? The Secretary of State evidently ignores the fact that there is a war because he says, "No one can guarantee that war will not come."

To me the situation is serious. I am certain it is serious to every other Senator. I know it is serious to the 200,000 American boys who are in Korea.

I shall not take the time to read much more matter appearing on the front page of the newspaper, which describes in great detail how a division of our marines has been caught in Korea.

But what does the President of the United States want the Congress to do? What does the President of the United States want the American people to do tonight? The President of the United States is the only person in the United States who has access to all the facts. I do not have access to them. No other Senator has access to the facts. The Senate as a whole does not have access to the facts. Only the President of the United States is in possession of all the facts. Why does not the President of

the United States give the facts to the American people? Why does not the Secretary of State give the facts to the American people? Why does not the President of the United States tell Congress what he wants Congress to do, or what he thinks Congress should do in order to help in this situation, because he and he only has the facts?

Why is it necessary to publish a cartoon such as I am looking at here, which leaves the impression—it must leave the impression, and I presume the intention was to leave the impression—that the Republicans and the Democrats in the Congress were fighting while a war was going on? That is not going to build up morale in the United States; and I do not think it is going to build up morale in the United States for the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to deny the fact that there is a war.

I do not believe anyone can successfully contradict what I am going to say. I know that many Senators might well rise and say that the senior Senator from Indiana did not vote for all foreign-aid measures, and they would be correct. But I do not think anyone can successfully contradict what I am going to say, and that is that the Congress of the United States has given the President and the Secretary of State, if not everything, then practically everything they have asked for in respect to foreign affairs, and have given them everything they have asked for in respect to the present Korean situation. What more do they want? What do they want the Congress to do? What do they want the people to do? Why does the Secretary of State say, "No one can guarantee that war will not come"? Why does he make that statement when we are at war today? Why does he make the statement, which was listened to last night by I do not know how many million people, that war may come?

If the situation is serious, and it is serious—it is always serious when a nation is at war, if we are at war, and we are at war—why does not the President of the United States consult with the Congress of the United States? If I remember correctly—and I do—the President of the United States did not ask for a declaration of war when he moved into Korea, or when the United Nations moved in, if Senators care to put it in that way. The President of the United States did not ask Congress for a declaration of war the other day when the Chinese Communists moved in.

He has not come before a joint session of the United States Congress and reported to the Congress and to the people, and said, "Here are the facts. Here is the situation. Here is what I think we ought to do."

Senators will remember that in the late days of the Congress, before we adjourned in September, the Congress passed what was known as the 1950 Defense Production Act, and that act—and I believe I know what I am talking about, because I am a member of the committee which held hearings in connection with it—gives the President of the United States the right to control, 100 percent,

the domestic economy of the Nation. It gives him the right to control prices and wages, and to ration. It gives him the right to return to wartime controls. Yet he has only put into effect a very small portion of the powers conferred on him by that act. He is controlling credits on durable goods. He is controlling credits on housing. He has reduced the use of aluminum for civilian goods about 35 percent, and maybe a few other insignificant provisions of the act have been put into effect.

I am asking these questions as a Member of the United States Senate. With 260,000 American boys fighting in Korea, I am asking the questions.

I do not like to have the people of my State say, "What are you doing?" I am receiving, as I know other Senators are receiving, literally dozens and dozens of telegrams and letters. I have received many of them today after Mr. Acheson's speech of last night. Then I pick up this newspaper and I see the cartoon on its front page.

I rise to ask the President: "What do you want Congress to do? What do you want the people to do? Are we at war or are we not at war? What can we do as a Congress that we have not already done?" The people, if I judge their temper correctly from my mail and the telegrams I am receiving, are becoming a little bit dissatisfied in respect to the Congress. They wonder why Congress is not doing something.

What can we do? What should we do? How can we do anything without having the facts? The President and the President only has the facts. I know I would be willing and I know every other Senator would be equally willing and anxious as I am, to sit here day in and night out to do whatever is necessary to win the Korean War. We cannot do it until the leadership of our Nation tells us what should be done. We can appropriate more money; we can raise taxes. However, appropriating more money at this time possibly will not help the boys in Korea. We have already appropriated billions upon billions of dollars.

So, Mr. President, I close by asking the President of the United States to tell the American people the facts, based upon the information he has, inasmuch as he is the only person in the United States who has access to all the facts. Let the President tell the Congress what laws he thinks the Congress should pass, and let the President tell the American people what he thinks they should do.

I think the time has arrived when that should be done. I am hopeful that the President will do so, because I do not think we are helping the world situation or that we are helping ourselves when the Congress is put in such a light as it is as a result of the cartoon to which I have referred, which is absolutely unfair, unwarranted, and unjustified, because I am certain that the Congress will do whatever is necessary to be done in time of war.

Mr. President, I do not know how other Members of the Senate feel about the matter; but so far as I am con-

cerned, it is war, and it has been war for many, many months. Why our leadership and the President and the Secretary of State do not recognize it as war, but continue to try to fool the American people into believing that it is a police action, I cannot understand. I repeat that the Secretary of State himself, when speaking to the American people, said:

No one can guarantee that war will not come.

Now war is here. It is not coming; it is here now.

I repeat that I cannot understand why the President and the Secretary of State do not so inform the American people, and why they do not come before the Congress and tell the Congress what they think should be done; because they, and they alone, have the facts.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. Lucas to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Gladly.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, yesterday some questions arose as to certain statements. I now ask unanimous consent that I may read briefly from those statements and may supplement them by having certain matters printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New York, if that is permissible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator request that he be recognized for that purpose at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New York?

Mr. ANDERSON. I should be happy to do so either now or at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to make the statement now?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose, with the understanding that the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico will follow those of the Senator from New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; provided I do not thereby lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The further remarks by Mr. ANDERSON appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. LEHMAN's speech.)

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the real issue here in connection with the Alaska statehood bill is whether Alaska is prepared for statehood and whether granting statehood to that Territory would be in the best interests of the United States. As a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I was in almost constant attendance at the hearings in April of this year when the issues were thoroughly explored. Before the hearings, I felt that Alaska

should become a State; at their conclusion I was convinced of it. The granting of statehood would be in harmony with tradition. Every argument which has been raised on this floor and elsewhere against Alaska statehood is, on analysis, discovered to be merely a re-statement of the same arguments made against admission of the western territories. The analogy between them and the arguments against the admission of Alaska in almost every instance is strikingly similar.

I am one of the representatives of the State which, in point of population, is the largest in the Union, and my State pays into the Federal Treasury more tax revenue than any other State does. It is my firm belief that the people of the State of New York do not object to the fact that the approximately 130,000 citizens of Alaska will have with statehood, the same representation in the Senate as do the almost 15,000,000 people of New York State. I make that statement with deep conviction, because during recent months in my home State, while I was a candidate for reelection, I publicly declared time after time my endorsement of Alaska statehood; and I found general acceptance there of the proposition that this Nation would be aided by adding this Territory to the Union of States. Long ago, our forefathers made the decision that representation in the United States Senate should be on the basis of political areas, not population; and who is there to say that this system of government, giving as it does proportional representation in the House of Representatives, has not worked well for the people, has not caused this Nation to flourish and to grow and to become the leading country of the world?

In the Union of the Thirteen Original States, there was wide disparity as between the populations of the several States. For example, Virginia had over 500,000 people, while Delaware had only 37,000. Indeed, at that time Virginia had more than double the population of my own State of New York; and later, when Indiana was admitted in 1816, Virginia and Pennsylvania and New York each had over a million persons within their borders, while Indiana had less than 25,000. When Illinois became a State 2 years after Indiana, it had only about 50,000 people. In those days, too, and later, arguments were made—but they never prevailed—that it was wrong to give a handful of people the same voting strength in the Senate as was enjoyed by the more populous States. Who could say now, and who would say, that it was a mistake to admit Indiana and Illinois?

It is contended that there is nothing in statehood itself to bring about progress. The only answer is that progress has always come when statehood was granted. Perhaps this is due partly—and it might be even principally—to the fact that the people of a State are released from long-distance government and are given greater latitude and greater opportunity to shape their own destiny.

For the sake of the RECORD, let me list here the populations of some of the

States at the time of their admission, other than Indiana and Illinois, and the

populations at the same time of Virginia, Pennsylvania, and New York:

State	Date	Population	Virginia	Pennsylvania	New York
Vermont.....	1791	85,425	747,610	434,373	240,120
Kentucky.....	1792	73,677	747,610	434,373	240,120
Tennessee.....	1796	60,000	880,200	602,368	589,051
Ohio.....	1802	42,366	880,200	602,368	589,051
Louisiana.....	1812	76,506	974,600	810,091	959,049
Mississippi.....	1817	75,448	1,065,366	1,049,458	1,372,812
Missouri.....	1821	66,586	1,065,366	1,049,458	1,372,812
Arkansas.....	1836	52,240	1,239,797	1,724,033	2,428,921
Florida.....	1845	72,000	1,239,797	1,724,033	2,428,921
California.....	1850	92,527	1,421,661	2,311,786	3,097,394
Oregon.....	1859	52,465	1,596,318	2,906,215	3,880,735
Nevada.....	1864	42,491	1,596,318	2,906,215	3,880,735
Idaho.....	1890	82,385	1,655,080	5,258,113	6,003,174
Wyoming.....	1890	60,703	1,655,080	5,258,113	6,003,174

¹1840.
²1850.

I wish to draw particular attention to the States which were admitted within my lifetime. Idaho, in 1890, had a population of 82,385. At the same time, Virginia had a population of 1,655,000, while Pennsylvania had a population of 5,258,000, and New York, a population of more than 6,000,000. Wyoming, admitted in the same year, had a population of only 60,700, while Virginia had 1,655,000, Pennsylvania 5,258,000, and New York, more than 6,000,000. So it is clear that Wyoming had less than 1 percent of the population of the State of New York, yet it was willingly admitted into the Union of States, and certainly has proved to be a great asset to the United States.

In his remarks on Tuesday, the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] expressed concern over the fact that such a small amount of land in Alaska has moved into private ownership. It is correct to say that that fact is not unknown to Alaskans who advocate statehood, and they have urged that statehood would play a measurable part in correcting the situation. The junior Senator from Mississippi stated that the two Senators from Alaska would represent only 1,500 square miles of land or "just about the size of one good county in Minnesota or two counties of Mississippi." I hope I may be permitted to point out to my friend from Mississippi that he is badly in error. Senators from a State of the United States represent, not the land which is privately owned alone, but all the land within the borders of the State. If the rule is that private land and private land only is entitled to have a voice in the United States Senate, then I suggest that some changes should be made in many other States of the Union. I do not know how much State-owned land there is in Arizona, for instance, but the records show that the Federal Government has title to 73 percent of the land there. In the great State of California, 45 percent of the land is federally owned. In Colorado the percentage is 38; in Idaho, 65; in Nevada, 85; and in Utah, 73. So we should not for a moment accept the proposition that only in Alaska has the United States Government title to a substantial part of all the land.

Even more importantly it should be said, and emphatically, that not only would Senators from Alaska represent the total area within the borders of the

State, but the very bill upon which I hope the Senate will act makes provision for conveying to the State 22,000,000 acres of land. That would not only enable the State to accelerate the process of increasing private ownership of land but would allow the State government to retain for the benefit of its people land which should remain in public ownership. We should note well, too, that the decision as to which part, if any, of this State-owned land shall remain in public ownership will be made by the people of the State themselves and not by distant government.

If we were to accept, even improperly, the suggestion that Senators have a right only to represent that portion of their States which is under control of the State itself or is privately owned, let us make inquiry as to what the Alaska situation would be. I am informed that conveying 22,000,000 acres of land to the State of Alaska would give the people of Alaska a land area greater than is contained in each of the following States: Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, and South Carolina. So the contention that Alaska Senators would represent only the equivalent of a couple of counties in Mississippi or one county in Minnesota falls precipitately of its own weight.

This is not the first time, as has been said, that the United States Senate has faced the proposition of admitting a Territory unconnected with the present States. In a day when transportation was far, far slower than it now is, there was a gap of 210 miles between Tennessee, the nearest State, and Louisiana when the latter was admitted. And California was 470 miles away from Texas, the nearest State, when California entered the Union.

The President of the United States has declared that the passage of this bill is highly important for our national defense and also for the sake of our Nation's prestige abroad. The Department of State has declared in formal testimony before our committee that the grant of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii would be most meaningful and significant for the support of our world policy.

I am not a military expert and do not pretend to speak as one. Certainly, however, we must give full faith and credit

to the recommendations of the President of the United States and of his military advisers who are and must remain responsible for the defense of this country and of its interests in these perilous times. We must give full faith and credit to the advocacy of statehood by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Among the supporters of Alaskan statehood, in addition, are General MacArthur, General Eisenhower, and Admiral Nimitz. Certainly these men understand the advantages of statehood for the national defense.

These military men understand, as we all do, that the inclusion of these Territories in the Union as States must inevitably result in greater attention being given in the Congress to the defense needs of these areas and, what is equally important, to the fuller participation of these areas, their population, and their resources in all the defense undertakings of the Nation.

Alaska's contribution to the national defense consists not only of the air bases and other military establishments located there, but also in the cooperation and participation of the inhabitants of Alaska in national defense undertakings—not only in the defense of the area of Alaska, but of the entire Nation. A uranium mine developed in Alaska or a lead or zinc or other mineral deposit developed there can be a vital contribution to the national defense. Statehood will stimulate such developments.

I need not labor the point about how important the admission of these two Territories as States is for the sake of our prestige in the world and our foreign policy. The Far East especially is vitally interested in what we do with Alaska and Hawaii. The grant of full statehood to these two areas with their melting pot complexions, in the case of Hawaii, and with the large proportion of Indians and Eskimos in the population of Alaska—will help convince the peoples of the Far East that Americanism is a way of life, a way of freedom whose aim is equality of citizenship status for all. Statehood for Alaska, and Hawaii will help convince the peoples of Asia that racialism is not a part of our democratic philosophy.

I need not emphasize how vital this is for the sake of victory and for the sake of unity among freedom-loving peoples.

I hope that the pending motion is approved and that the Senate will agree without further delay to take up these vital measures.

During the delivery of Mr. LEHMAN'S speech,

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at this point let me say that some question was raised as to when Alaska became a Territory. As early as 1896, the Supreme Court of the United States held, in effect, that Alaska was a Territory, in the case of *The Steamer Coquitlam v. United States* (163 U. S. 346). I now ask unanimous consent that a citation from that case be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

As early as 1896, the Supreme Court of the United States held, in effect, that Alaska

was a Territory. In the case of *The Steamer Coquitlam v. U. S.* (163 U. S. 346 (1896)), the Court stated:

"Alaska is one of the Territories of the United States. It was designated in that order (referring to the order of this court assigning the ninth circuit) as has always been so regarded. And the Court established by the act of 1884 is the last resort within the limits of that Territory. It is, therefore, in every substantial sense the Supreme Court of that Territory."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Alaska was a Territory from the time of annexation in 1867. That question was decided squarely in 1905. I ask unanimous consent that a citation relating to that matter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

That Alaska was a Territory from the time of annexation in 1867 was decided squarely in 1905 when, in handing down the Court's opinion in *Rasmussen v. United States* (197 U. S. 516), Chief Justice White stated:

"Indeed both before and since the decision in *Downes* against Bidwell the status of Alaska as an incorporated Territory was and has been recognized by the action and decision of this Court. * * * It follows then from the text of the treaty by which Alaska was acquired, from the action of Congress thereunder and the reiterated decisions of this Court, that the proposition that Alaska is not incorporated into and a part of the United States is devoid of merit, and therefore the doctrine settled as to unincorporated Territory is inapposite."

Mr. ANDERSON. In that connection, Mr. President, there is a concurring opinion by Mr. Justice Harlan. I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from it printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The result is summed up in the concurring opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan who said:

"Immediately upon the ratification in 1867 of the treaty by which Alaska was acquired from Russia that Territory, as I think came under the complete, sovereign jurisdiction and authority of the United States, and, without any formal action on the part of Congress in recognition or enforcement of the treaty, and whether Congress wished such a result or not, the inhabitants of that Territory became at once entitled to the benefit of all the guarantees found in the Constitution of the United States for the protection of life, liberty, and property."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the decision cited article III of the Treaty of Cession. I ask consent to have that Article printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The decision cited article III of the Treaty of Cession which reads: "The inhabitants of the ceded territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within 3 years, but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion. The uncivilized tribes will be subject to such laws and regulations as the

United States, may from time to time, adopt in regard to aboriginal tribes of that country."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a list of laws subsequent to the Treaty of Cession and prior to the organic act by which Alaska was considered de facto a Territory. There are some six of those laws. I ask unanimous consent to have a citation of them printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The laws subsequent to the Treaty of Cession and prior to the organic act by which Alaska was considered de facto a Territory are:

Act of July 20, 1868, concerning internal revenue taxation;

Act of July 27, 1868, extending the laws of the United States relating to customs, commerce and navigation and establishing a collection district;

Revised Statutes of 1873-74, sections 1954-1976 carrying forward these previous provisions;

Act of May 17, 1884, constituting Alaska a civil and judicial district and establishing a civil government, providing for a governor and other offices and for a district court and making general laws of Oregon applicable to the Territory;

Act of March 3, 1889, establishing a criminal code and code of criminal procedure; and

Act of June 6, 1900, making further provisions for civil government, including a code of civil procedure.

It was not until 7 years after the Supreme Court decision in 1905 in the *Rasmussen v. United States* that Congress enacted the so-called organic act for Alaska, August 24, 1912.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a question was asked as to what military leaders have advocated statehood for Alaska. First let me say that Louis Johnson submitted a letter on that subject to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on April 18, 1950. As then Secretary of Defense he urged the admission of Alaska into the Union. I ask unanimous consent that his letter, together with subsequent letters written by him and by the Acting Secretary of State, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, April 18, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This letter is further in response to your communication of March 30, 1950, in which you make reference to two bills, H. R. 331 and H. R. 49, which, if enacted, would admit the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, respectively, into the Federal Union as States. Because I understand that your committee intends on April 24 to commence hearings on H. R. 331, which concerns Alaska, and to hold hearings beginning May 1 on H. R. 49, the Hawaiian proposal, I address this letter to you for the purpose of expressing the concurrence of the Department of Defense in both proposals.

As you know, the administration has repeatedly expressed itself as favoring Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood and both proposals have again and again been introduced by the President. On January 4, in his state of the Union message, President Truman

urged that the Congress during 1950 grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. The enactment of H. R. 49 and H. R. 331 would, I believe, effectively accomplish this objective.

You asked in your letter of March 30 as to whether from the point of view of national defense, it would be advantageous to extend statehood to Alaska and Hawaii, and you inquired specifically as to whether statehood would give greater strength to our military position in those areas than does the present territorial type of local government. It is obvious that the more stable a local government can be, the more successful would be the control and defense of the area in case of sudden attack. There can be no question but that in the event of an attack any State would be immensely aided in the initial stages of the emergency by the effective use of the State and local instrumentalities of law and order. By the same token it would seem to me that, as persons in a position to assist the Federal garrisons which might exist in Hawaii or Alaska, the locally elected governors, sheriffs, and the locally selected constabulary and civil-defense units all would be of tremendous value in cases of sudden peril. Therefore, my answer to your question is that statehood for Alaska and Hawaii would undoubtedly give a considerable added measure of strength to the overall defense of both areas in event of emergency.

I am not attempting in this letter to endorse the specific language of either of the bills under consideration, but I do wish strongly to support the principle of granting immediate statehood to both the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii as in the best interest of the United States and of all its peoples both here and in the Territories.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, September 15, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have just received your letter of September 13 asking me if I would like to express any views with respect to statehood for Alaska and Hawaii in addition to the views which I expressed in my letter of April 18 to you.

I have nothing to add to the views I have previously expressed on this subject, other than to say that recent events in the Pacific seem to me to give added point and emphasis to the statements contained in my letter of April 18.

With warm personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 19, 1950.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This is in reply to your letter of September 12, 1950, regarding the Department of State's views on bills for admission of Hawaii and Alaska into the Union, and inquiring whether recent events in Korea have in any way caused the Department's views to be changed.

The views of the Department as set forth in the letter of April 20, 1950, have not been modified by the development of the Korean conflict. Indeed, the Department believes that the Korean situation has increased the urgency for favorable action on these bills and has rendered more compelling the reasons set forth in my letter of April 20, 1950.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. McFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. ANDERSON. So far as other representatives of the Armed Forces are concerned, let me list only a few. For instance, Gen. H. H. Arnold, now deceased, was a member of the National Committee for Alaska Statehood. Of statehood he said:

Upon Alaska our future may well rest. What, then, would be better; what would insure a greater provision for our future than to recognize that most important area and make it a State, equal to our other 48 States?

Gen. William Donovan, wartime commander of the OSS, is still another high military figure who favors immediate Alaska statehood. He is a member of the National Committee for Alaska Statehood.

When Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, was in Tokyo in November 1949 he talked with General MacArthur about Alaska statehood. General MacArthur told Governor Gruening he would be glad to serve as a member of the National Committee for Alaska Statehood. So General MacArthur became a member of that committee.

Admiral Chester W. Nimitz' adherence to Alaska statehood is revealed by the fact that he is a member of the national committee to advance the cause of statehood. Admiral Nimitz signified by letter his belief that Alaska should be a State, and at that time he accepted membership on the national committee.

Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd is not only a member of the National Committee for Alaska Statehood but has lent active and continuing support to the cause of statehood for Alaska.

Finally, Mr. President, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, when speaking in Denver on September 16 last, urged that Congress enact the Alaska statehood bill without delay. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from his remarks on that occasion, as they appeared in the Denver Post of September 17, 1950, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ALASKA, HAWAII STATEHOOD SEEN AS SIGN TO WORLD

Quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood will show the world that "America practices what it preaches," Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower said Saturday in a brief talk to 1,500 Denverites gathered at the freedom bell.

The famed war and peacetime leader declared admission of the two Territories is "in conformity with the American way of life," granting them self-government and equal voice in national affairs.

PRACTICAL SYMBOL

Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood will serve to the people of the world as a "practical symbol that America practices what it preaches," Eisenhower said. He said he hopes Congress would soon pass admission legislation now before it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Finally, Mr. President, I hold in my hand a statement by Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War, strongly supporting statehood for Alaska. This statement was addressed by him to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I conclude by asking unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF ROBERT P. PATTERSON, ATTORNEY AT LAW AND FORMER SECRETARY OF WAR, NEW YORK CITY, SATURDAY, APRIL 29, 1950, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS ON ALASKA STATEHOOD

I strongly support passage of the Alaska statehood bill.

When Secretary Seward in 1867 negotiated the treaty for purchase of Alaska Territory for the sum of \$7,200,000, the cynical spoke of Alaska as "Seward's ice box" and condemned the transaction as a flagrant waste of public funds. Time has proved that Seward's treaty was one of the wisest steps in statesmanship ever taken by our Government. Time has also made it clear that the final step in recognition of Alaska—statehood like that of the 48 States—should be taken promptly.

When an American citizen moves to Alaska from New York, Illinois, Texas, or Oregon, he is nonetheless an American citizen, living on soil that has been American for 83 years. Why should he lose the right to participate in the Nation's affairs?

I support statehood for Alaska on many grounds. In simple justice to the 100,000 Americans who live there, Alaska should be the forty-ninth State. Some may say that 100,000 are not so many people; but half of our present States did not have 100,000 inhabitants at the time of their attainment of the status of a State.

I also believe that statehood will be to the advantage of the entire Nation—politically, socially, economically. There can be no question that the resources in Alaska, rich but now largely latent, will be developed more rapidly when Alaska is recognized as a State, a full-fledged partner with the other States.

I will not take the time of the committee with detailed discussion of these matters, but will confine what I have to say to the advantages the United States will derive in national defense by recognition of the claims of Alaska for statehood.

I am thinking back to those anxious days in 1942, 8 years ago, when the Japanese threat to Alaska was one of our gravest concerns. We had lost command of the Pacific for the time being. Our route to Alaska by sea—and we then had no other access—was uncertain. The Japanese had seized Attu and Kiska in the Aleutians, and no one knew what they would try next.

In the War Department we were well aware of how weak our defenses were. We did our best to expand the chain of airfields that ran from Minnesota up to Fairbanks. We started the Alcan Highway, locating it where we did as a support for those airfields. We undertook the Canol project for a supply of oil to be delivered from northwest Canada to Alaska, expensive, it is true, and severely criticized at the time, but thoroughly sound as a war measure.

It was brought home to me at that time that our chief difficulty in defending Alaska was the problem of supplying military forces there. It would do no good to place troops there if they could not be maintained, kept equipped, and moved from place to place. A solution to the supply problem in Alaska was the key to success in defense of the United States against attack from the northwest.

Alaska was not lacking or deficient in most of the raw materials needed for supply of military forces. It had timber, minerals, petroleum. What was lacking, what was deficient, was the population to develop the available resources. The Territory was so thinly peopled that the resources in the soil could not be converted into useful products save on the most meager basis.

Five years later, in 1947, the War Department made an intensive study of Alaska de-

fense under "cold war" conditions. There was general agreement that the defense of Alaska was vital to the defense of the United States and that the defense of Alaska should be geared to air operations. There was also general agreement that nothing would strengthen our defenses in Alaska as much as an increase in population, to the end that the basic resources of the area might be utilized for supply of the defending forces.

What was true in 1942 and in 1947 is true in 1950. The prime need in national defense, so far as Alaska is concerned, is a growing population. In Soviet Russia a need like that would be met by establishment of slave-labor camps, as has been done across the Bering Straits in Siberia. That will never be our way. But in the interest of our national security we should neglect no measure that will persuade enterprising citizens in suitable numbers to settle in Alaska and take their part in development of industry, agriculture, transportation, and other facilities there. The granting of statehood to Alaska, I am certain, will stimulate the growth of population, will promote the utilization of resources, and will strengthen the national defense.

On these grounds, as well as on those outlined earlier in this statement, I advocate passage of the Alaska statehood bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from New York very much for granting me this courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to consideration of the Alaska statehood bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	Hayden	McKellar
Byrd	Hendrickson	McMahon
Capehart	Holland	Magnuson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Maybank
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Donnell	Kerr	Russell
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Lehman	Stennis
Ferguson	Lucas	Taft
Frear	McClellan	Wherry
George	McFarland	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be instructed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. IVES, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KEM, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MYERS, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. SALTONSTALL,

Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am about to propound to the Senate a request for a unanimous-consent agreement. Before doing so, I should like to take a moment or two to discuss the pending question, namely, the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill granting statehood to Alaska.

I merely refer to the letter which was addressed to the Vice President of the United States on November 27 by the President of the United States. Everyone is familiar with that message, which is to be found on page 15772 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Without reading the entire message again, I merely refer to the last paragraph, reading as follows:

For these reasons, I urge that the Senate give the highest priority to the statehood measures before it and complete legislative action on them before the present Congress adjourns.

For that reason, Mr. President, on November 27, shortly after the Senate convened, the majority leader moved the immediate consideration of the Alaska statehood bill.

In view of the days of debate which have continued since that time, it is quite apparent that there will not be a vote on the statehood bills. In other words, it is impossible to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement on the part of the Senate even for the Senate to vote on the motion to consider the bill providing for statehood for Alaska.

There cannot be any question in my mind but that the statehood bill is far more important than the railway labor bill which the Senate had under consideration when Congress adjourned in September. However, some Members of the Senate believe they are obligated to do all they can to have the Senate go through with the railway labor bill, in view of the fact that they made certain promises to leaders of various labor organizations who are interested in that measure. Before the adjournment was taken in September, those Senators promised certain labor leaders that they would do all they could to have the Senate proceed with the consideration of the railway labor bill upon the return of the Senate in November.

However, in view of the very earnest message from the President of the United States and in view of the fact that he asked that the statehood bills be considered on the highest priority list, when the session resumed I immediately moved, on Monday last, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Alaska statehood bill.

Mr. President, after making those brief remarks, I now desire to propound a unanimous-consent request dealing directly with the railway labor bill. I now ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of December 4, 1950, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate pro-

ceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment or motion which may be pending or which may be made to Senate bill 3295, a bill to amend the Railway Labor Act and to authorize agreements providing for union membership and agreements for deductions from the wages of carriers' employees for certain purposes under certain conditions, and upon the final passage of said bill; provided, that commencing at the hour of 2 o'clock, on December 4, the time between 2 o'clock and 4 o'clock shall be divided equally between the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]; provided further, that no amendment not germane to the subject matter of said bill shall be considered or received; and provided further, that after said hour of 4 o'clock, on December 4, debate upon any amendment or motion shall be limited to 5 minutes on the part of the author thereof and 5 minutes by the chairman of said committee.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object—although I do not intend to object—let me say that I conferred with the majority leader, and I stated that the hour of 4 o'clock would be acceptable, so far as I knew, to Senators on this side of the aisle. Since that time I have conferred with a Senator who is absent at the moment, but who is interested in offering an amendment. That Member cannot return until Monday. I wonder whether there would be any objection if the distinguished majority leader would modify the proposed agreement so as to provide for the vote to be taken at 5 o'clock, and then let the time between 2 and 5 o'clock be equally divided. That would give that Senator ample time to present his amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to comply with that request, and I modify the unanimous-consent request accordingly. The result will be to divide the time between the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the Senator to wait a moment, please; I believe we are developing a little difficulty in regard to the proposal, and I should like the Senator to wait long enough to permit me to make a further observation.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall wait until the Senator from Nebraska concludes his conference with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I am in a very accommodating mood.

Mr. WHERRY. It seems that other Members of the Senate are very much interested in having the vote taken at an earlier hour. Therefore, if it is agreeable to all other Members of the Senate, suppose we let the proposal remain for the vote to be taken at 4 o'clock.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, Mr. President, I return to my original proposal.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that the Senator from Illinois knows that I am very anxious to have action taken on the railway labor bill, and I am very anxious to see the Senate pass the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I had the Senator from Alabama in mind when I propounded the request.

Mr. HILL. The agreement would end debate on all amendments, and it makes provision as to amendments which are germane.

There is an amendment which I understand is to be offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. I have not had an opportunity to consider that amendment, but certainly there has been no ruling on its germaneness. I am sure the Senator would not want to get himself into a position where that amendment would be in order, with no debate to be had upon it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Alabama refer to an amendment which has not yet been offered to the bill? Has not the Jenner amendment already been offered? If it has not been offered, then let us recall that in the unanimous-consent proposal the distinguished majority leader has provided that unless an amendment is germane, it shall not be offered or received. Is not that so?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the proposed agreement covers that, as follows:

Provided further, That no amendment not germane to the subject matter of said bill shall be considered or received.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as the Senator from Nebraska knows, the Jenner amendment is what has commonly been referred to as the FEPC amendment. Anxious as we are to obtain action on this bill, yet I do not think we can rest until we know that that amendment is not germane to this bill.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The proposed agreement provides that the Senate vote on the bill and on all amendments thereto. I am trying to protect the rights of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who is the Senator about whom I spoke, relative to offering the amendment. I am perfectly willing to have the agreement provide that the vote be taken at 4 o'clock. I am not sure that the Senator from Indiana can even return here by that time, but I should like to protect his rights.

I am glad the Senator from Alabama raised the question he did raise, because I certainly feel that the Senator from Indiana should have a right to offer the amendment. If it is not acceptable, it can be voted down.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senator from Alabama and all other Senators who are interested in the amendment of the Senator from Indiana that, regardless of whether it is or is not germane—and personally I do not believe it is germane; I do not believe it has any business being attached to this bill—if the amendment is offered and if it is considered, upon the making of a motion to table the amendment, I shall vote to table the amendment. I do not know whether that assurance is sufficient satisfaction to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I am glad to hear the distinguished majority leader say that about the amendment. However, it is now nearly 5 o'clock. I wonder whether the Senator will withhold his request until the Senate convenes tomorrow at 12 o'clock, so that we may have a better opportunity to consider the amendment and to see what may be its effect, and particularly to determine whether the amendment might be germane or might be nongermane.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee has worked hard and long. We have the rent control bill ready, and we have asked the Printing Office to have copies of the testimony available to the Senate on Monday. I think it very unwise to bring up a very controversial issue pertaining to civil rights in connection with a railroad bill.

I am in agreement with the request of the Senator from Alabama that unanimous consent be granted to vote on the railway labor bill on Monday.

I should like to propose to the Senator from Illinois, if he will permit me to do so, that the Senate take up the rent control bill on Monday. I shall object to consideration of the railway labor bill until I distinctly understand that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] will withdraw his amendment relating to FEPC. Therefore, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield before he takes his seat?

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

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am going to object to any unanimous-consent agreement in regard to a vote on anything having to do with FEPC. For years I have fought in the Senate for constitutional government. I know that the railway workers of the United States, with whom I am in sympathy, would never want me to agree, in connection with a unanimous-consent proposal, to have the Senate vote for something of that sort.

I realize that the distinguished majority leader will vote against it, but I do not know how other Senators will vote. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the occupant of the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Do the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement which

has been propounded by the distinguished majority leader bar consideration of an amendment which has been discussed here, and which involves FEPC? Would that amendment be germane or would it not be germane, if it were offered, under the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair will say to the distinguished minority leader that it is not in order to request a ruling from the Chair upon a parliamentary situation which has not developed. The Chair could not make such a ruling until the amendment was offered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show, then, that the minority leader is not objecting in any way to the unanimous-consent request. In fact, I am in favor of it, except that, on amendments, I want an understanding that any Senator who feels he has a right to offer an amendment shall be permitted to do so before the hour of 4 o'clock, or at any time after 4 o'clock, under the 5-minute rule.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall be willing to withdraw my objection, if the Senate will unanimously agree at this time not to accept any amendment to the railroad bill having to do with FEPC. I ask unanimous consent for such an agreement, because I do not know who will occupy the chair when the question arises. As the Presiding Officer says, it is impossible to rule on a parliamentary question until it is developed. Only then can the occupant of the chair rule upon it. But if the Senate will give unanimous consent at this time not to accept any amendment relative to FEPC, I shall be willing to withdraw my objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HILL, and Mr. KERR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment. The Chair understands that the Senator from South Carolina has made a unanimous-consent request that no FEPC amendment which may be offered will be regarded as germane.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Presiding Officer is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact that this particular amendment has been submitted by a Republican colleague of mine who is not present, and who, I think, should have a right to be heard on whether he thinks it is in fact germane, I think it most unfair to proceed this afternoon to rule out his amendment by a unanimous-consent agreement, and I therefore object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the FEPC bill is one which was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The bill which is the subject of the unanimous-consent request also came from that committee. As chairman of the committee and as one of the sponsors of the FEPC bill, I should like to say that I shall vote against an FEPC amendment, if offered as an amendment to this bill, and I think every other member of my committee will also vote against the amendment if offered to the bill. I hope the unanimous-consent request will be granted, and that we may proceed with the bill. If we do that, I am sure we can control the votes in such a way that such an amendment, if offered, will not be agreed to. If the request is granted, we shall have a vote on the bill. I do not know what further assurance can be given than that.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely want to say that no one has a higher regard and esteem for the distinguished Senator from Utah than myself, but I do not know who is going to be here when the amendment is to be brought up, and I do not know who is going to occupy the chair at that time. I intend to object to a vote on any measure which has anything to do with FEPC or which has anything to do with unconstitutional and un-American government.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think we should clear the atmosphere as between the statement made by the Senator from Utah and what my good friend from South Carolina has in mind. I feel, as does the Senator from Utah, that I must object to any FEPC amendment being attached to this particular bill, but I was merely wondering, if my friend from Utah will give me his attention for a moment, whether the Senator from Utah objects to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana applying to the pending measure only, and not to any other bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Since the question has been asked, it seems to me that the FEPC amendment is not germane to the bill, and that is the way I would consider it if I were confronted with defending the bill on the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The point I wish to make clear is that according to my understanding the Senator would object to an FEPC amendment, whether it applied to a general bill or whether it applied to the pending measure only.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should object under either of those circumstances.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I also would object.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say I agree with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] that this particular amendment is not germane to the railroad bill, but, as individual Senators, it is not our prerogative to rule on that question. There should be an official ruling in regard to it. In my view it is a mistake to offer such an amendment to this bill. However, a colleague in this body has a right to offer such an amendment and to have an official ruling on it. It has been offered, and I think it would be a great mistake for us to follow the policy, by unanimous consent, of ruling out, in effect, a colleague's amendment. If he in good conscience and good faith believes that it is germane and wants to offer it as a part of this bill, I think he should have an opportunity to offer it, and we should then have an official ruling, which will at least have value as a precedent in the future. That is the only reason for my raising the objection to the unanimous-consent request offered by the the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. I merely think we must protect each other in matters of procedure in the Senate. I should feel very much better about it if we could at least delay this matter until our minority leader can get in touch with the Senator from Indiana and find out his wishes in regard to it. We may be able to get assurance from the Senator from Indiana that he does not intend to press his amendment; but he has offered it, it is on the table, and therefore I am not in favor of taking away, by unanimous consent, in his absence, what I think is a very important procedural right of his.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have been around here quite a while, and I have observed that the Senator from Nebraska is usually pretty alert about these things. He was not on his feet objecting a moment ago to the request made by the Senator from South Carolina, and I assumed that he probably had had a conversation with the Senator from Indiana. Perhaps he can clarify the situation.

Mr. WHERRY. I have had a conversation with the Senator's office. The only reason I was not on my feet more quickly was that the Senator from Oregon got the floor ahead of me, and objected to the request. What I should like to have done is, I think, impossible. I requested an interpretation as to the germaneness of this proposal. I can understand that that question cannot now be determined. If the question were raised, it would finally have to be settled by the Senate, anyway. So, in keeping with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, I think all that is left for us now to do is to protect the rights of the Senator from Indiana. I regret very much that there is no way for us to arrive at a decision, unless Senators want to consider the Jenner amendment as having been already submitted, and to have it considered as one of the amend-

ments offered before 4 o'clock. I do not think there is anything else that can be done.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, we have been here now practically all week, and we have had nothing before us but civil rights. We have had the civil-rights issue injected into the discussions of the statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska.

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

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not yield, if the Senator please. I have yielded to Senators for about an hour, and I should like to say but one word. We now have the civil-rights question raised in connection with the railroad bill. I am fearful of taking up the rent-control bill, lest someone will seek to attach to it the FEPC bill, the poll-tax bill, or some other bill; in which case we shall again have the civil-rights question before us.

Mr. President, in all seriousness, it seems to me the time is coming when practically every bill that comes along, to which someone is objecting, will be made the occasion of some Senator seeking to attach the FEPC or the poll tax or some other bill involving the civil-rights issue. I should not like to see that happen. I probably shall not see it myself, because I shall soon be out of this Chamber. However, it seems to me that that is exactly what we are coming to. In other words, when we are trying to get a vote, for instance, upon statehood for Alaska, we are confronted with a filibuster, because it involves the question of civil rights. In the case of the railroad bill, we have the same situation. An effort is made to attach an FEPC amendment to it, a filibuster results, and we cannot reach a vote on that bill. I do not know where this kind of procedure is going to lead, but it seems to me to present a question of some seriousness so far as attempting to expedite the business of the Senate of the United States is concerned. I merely make that observation in passing. The Senator from Ohio had a conference when he returned to Washington, at which he said that about all we were going to do, he thought, was to meet and adjourn; and I am not so sure, as a result of this situation, but that he may be right.

Now we return to the railway labor bill. We have tried to get a unanimous-consent agreement. I do not think we can get one so long as an effort is made to attach an FEPC amendment to the bill until those who are vitally interested in civil rights legislation—and I believe they are rightly so interested—can find out whether they can defeat the motion. Until such time we shall be unable to get a vote on the bill. Under those circumstances, we could sit for a month without getting a vote on the bill. We could not get a vote until Senators who are interested in civil rights legislation know where they stand. That is the situation, Mr. President.

The Senator from Indiana offers an FEPC bill as an amendment to the railway labor bill. I do not know whether such an amendment would be germane. Perhaps it is. I do not know. It would concern labor, of course, but I do not know whether it would be considered germane. I do not believe it is proper

to offer such a bill as an amendment to the Railway Labor Act, and I would vote against it, even though I have fought for FEPC legislation.

Mr. President, I should like to get along with the business of the Senate. I should like to have something accomplished during this short session. The Senator from South Carolina has a rent control bill to present. I hope we can pass such a bill on Monday. We cannot debate it before Monday. Probably we shall be able to take it up on Monday, instead of taking up the railway bill. I hope no Senator will try to defeat it by seeking to attach an FEPC amendment to it, although I am not certain that that will not be done before we get through with the rent control bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, what is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to a consideration of the Alaska statehood bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that objection was made to the original unanimous-consent request which I made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced that objection was heard.

Mr. LUCAS. That was my recollection. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said he was not certain that the Chair had made such announcement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not hear the last statement of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I want the RECORD to show that objection was made to my original request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that he announced that objection was heard. Thereafter another unanimous-consent request was made, to which objection also was heard.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the way I understood the situation, but the Senator from Wyoming was not certain that the Chair had made the announcement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a moment ago the distinguished majority leader made reference to the fact that the civil-rights question had come up twice already during this special session. He recited two occasions on which that question had apparently intervened. Of course, the Senator knows that not only the Senator from Florida but other Senators who attach considerable importance to defeating certain portions of the so-called civil-rights program do not take the position that such program is involved in the question of Alaska statehood. At this time the Senator from Florida wishes to invite the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the fact that not only on the two occasions to which he has referred has the civil-rights question come up in debate during this special session, but there was a third occasion also on which it came into the discussion on the floor of the Senate, which perhaps the Senator from Illinois has failed to note.

The third occasion was my incorporation in the RECORD yesterday afternoon of the distinguished speech of the Honorable James A. Farley, which he delivered a few days ago at Tampa before the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, in which he found occasion to clearly state that in his judgment the civil-rights question was being rapidly solved in a peaceful and understanding way in the South. He said:

To threaten the South with drastic Federal legislation is the last way to approach these problems. And we are a long way now from that last way.

I continue to quote from Mr. Farley's speech, which I had hoped the Senator from Illinois would have noted yesterday and might even have discussed with the President of the United States:

The President might well in the interest of national as well as party unity summon the leaders of the South to solve these problems on a regional and a State basis. To pass a law, especially a Federal law, is never the best way to correct an injustice. Free men in whose hearts there lives a sense of justice and common sense can generally be trusted to do what is right.

I had strongly hoped that the Senator from Illinois had noted this third discussion of the important civil rights question. If he has not so noted it, I hope he will read the remarkable analytical and very wise address of that distinguished American, James A. Farley, on the occasion just mentioned, as incorporated in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Florida has given me some advice as to what I should do. I suggest that he and Mr. Farley go to the President of the United States and present that thought to the President.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his suggestion, but I understood that he had frequent conferences with the President of the United States on the matter of the legislative program, and I had hoped that he would discuss this subject with the President.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY (REPT. NO. 2585)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have before me a prepared address on the rent control resolution. It would take me 2 hours to deliver it. It contains a review of some speeches I delivered previously on the same subject. I shall not deliver it this evening. The address has been given to the press because I understood the subject was to be brought up today. Of course, if we are to stay in session, I shall be glad to stay as long as it is necessary. I shall be glad to stay until 11 o'clock, if necessary. However, the address, which I have already given to the press, will not be made until tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 207, which was approved by the committee by a vote of 10 to 2. It would continue rent control under State direction and municipal control during January and February 1951. Thus the new Congress would be afforded an opportunity to write a proper defense rent

control law. I submit a report on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 207) to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, was placed on the calendar.

SENATOR FROM FLORIDA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at this time I desire to file with the Senate a certificate signed by the Honorable R. A. Gray, secretary of state of Florida, certifying that the Honorable GEORGE A. SMATHERS was elected United States Senator at the general election held in Florida on the 7th day of November 1950, for the 6-year term beginning next January 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The credentials will be received, read, and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF FLORIDA,

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, R. A. Gray, secretary of state of the State of Florida, do hereby certify that GEORGE A. SMATHERS at the general election held on the 7th day of November A. D. 1950 was elected United States Senator, having received the highest number of votes for said office at said election.

The whole number of votes cast for said office at said election was 313,215, of which GEORGE A. SMATHERS received 238,987 votes, John P. Booth received 74,228 votes, as shown by the election returns on file in this office.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Florida at Tallahassee, the capital, this the 21st day of November A. D. 1950.

[SEAL]

R. A. GRAY,
Secretary of State.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to read into the RECORD the following radiogram which was received today by JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii:

Wednesday's casualty list reports four more Hawaii soldiers killed in Korea, five wounded, one of these for second time, and five missing. Brings total to 77 killed, 284 wounded, 82 missing, 2 prisoners of war.

This brings the total casualties from Hawaii to 445. At this rate, of approximately 1 per 1,000 population, the casualties for the United States as a whole would be 150,000.

Mr. President, I also desire to insert in the RECORD at this point a cablegram which I received this afternoon from the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], from Honolulu.

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

HONOLULU, November 29, 1950.

Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Wish to advise you of following statement concerning admission of Hawaii and authorize you to use statement in any way which will be helpful and also to pair me in every way possible in aid of your efforts to gain admission for Hawaii and Alaska. Return not later than Monday.

Statement follows:

"The new Korean crisis makes statehood for Hawaii and Alaska important now as never before, in the interest of a strong American defense. In this crucial moment all lesser things must be forgotten and the immeasurable capacity of these two great and proven patriotic American communities must be made a part of the central core of our great Nation. Only as States can we really develop these two areas to the point where they will be the strongest possible bulwarks of our Nation. We must show the other peoples of the world that we make character, not color the criterion of quality in America. Hawaii's people have shown magnificent loyalty to the United States. I have seen in the hospitals of Japan and Korea many an Hawaiian soldier who bared himself to the enemy and has been wounded in defense of our cause."

CLAUDE PEPPER.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 331) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to read into the RECORD for the information of the Members of the Senate a portion of the caption of the bill (S. 2036), to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union. It is the companion bill on Alaska statehood, which was introduced in the Senate. It was introduced on June 10 (legislative day, June 2), 1949, by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], for himself, and on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. Graham, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the former Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Baldwin, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished acting majority leader, what are the plans for the proceedings after the Senator from Michigan has completed his remarks?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The RECORD has been made perfectly clear today by the objections which were made to various unanimous-consent agreements that there is nothing to be gained by a prolonged session, and when the Senator from Michigan has completed his remarks it will be my purpose, if I am here, to ask that the Senate recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Will it be tomorrow, or Monday?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It will be tomorrow.

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION—BOOK BY MAX LOWENTHAL

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to return at a later date to a more extended treatment of the subject, I should like to make a brief statement about a book released to the public on November 20. The book is entitled "The Federal Bureau of Investigation"; the author is a lawyer and former Government employee named Max Lowenthal; the publishers are the William Sloane Associates, Inc., of New York City. I need not further identify the book, the author, or the publishers. Every Member of Congress was presented with a copy by the publishers.

Mr. President, this book is evil, and it is symptomatic of an internal threat to our security. Never in our history has the United States been in a more critical position than it is today. The Communist menace threatens the entire world, and we are even now fighting for our lives in Asia. We cannot tell the day or moment when this fight for life may come even nearer. This menace operates not only abroad; it operates here at home also.

Mr. President, in the last extremity, when no man can hope to defend himself alone, the community closes ranks to preserve itself. Most of the time we take our Nation and society for granted, but every man knows in his heart that at the last we have to join together to save our lives. This has been so with all nations from the beginning of time, and that is why the greatest of all crimes is treason. The man who betrays his country to the enemy, betrays his neighbors, and his neighbors know it.

Mr. President, our position in the world is peculiar. The dynamic of our economy is supplied by private enterprise. Our Government is a representative republic, based upon a written Constitution. In that Constitution is a Bill of Rights, which contains the sacred promises of trial by jury, of protection of free speech and press and of religious establishments, the right of petition, and so on. The fathers who wrote this Constitution were not so simple-minded as not to know that the responsibility of maintaining these rights rested upon the citizens and their Government. It is the fact that intermittently through all our history these rights have had to be struggled and fought for; it has often required strenuous effort to maintain them. Yet, despite grievous lapses, we have managed by and large to keep the rights intact, and have had the envy of mankind.

Thirty-three years ago a band of extremely able and ruthless conspirators seized control of Russia, then in the throes of collapse, and set up the Soviet Union. From that hour Moscow became the capital of a world-wide conspiracy having, as its aim, the conquest of the world and the establishment of communism throughout the globe.

We all know that communism itself is imperialism, that it is going to estab-

lish itself in all parts of the world by force unless it is prevented by force from doing so. That applies to other countries, as well as to the United States.

In the prosecution of this conspiracy the Communists speedily discovered that the rights of freedom of speech and press, so long fought for in the west, could be utilized in pushing Communist designs. Thus, by degrees, every country discovered within its borders a conspiratorial group, looking to Moscow for direction, and obediently following the dictates of this foreign power.

On many occasions Communists use as a shield the Constitution of the United States, and I for one believe they have a right to do that under our law, but they also owe obedience to the law.

How to handle this problem presented difficulties which no government had ever faced before. The Congress was slow to grapple with the problem because of the dread in every man's heart that inadvertently some portion of the Bill of Rights would be jeopardized.

But all this while it was clear enough to everybody that whatever Congress might do in the way of legislation, the Communists must be watched and information of their activities gathered.

Last Friday we read in the press that the Communists said they must have mass action, that they could no longer abide by boards set up by Government, by Congress, or by the courts. That was said in connection with the 1950 security law. The task of watching the Communists developed, under the statutes, upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with the chief responsibility resting upon its director. Since 1924 the director has been Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who was appointed to the place by Attorney General Stone, later Chief Justice of the United States. Mr. Stone, when he made the appointment, was disturbed about expenses of the Bureau during the so-called Palmer raids in 1919 and 1920. He wanted the Bureau of Investigation overhauled, its method of personnel selection made more careful and severe, its morale heightened. Mr. Hoover was given the job of doing this, and has held the position ever since. He has done this while simultaneously carrying out the duties imposed upon him by the statutes.

In line of duty the FBI, among other things, has been watching the Communists for years. Of course, we all know that the FBI has no power to act upon the information which it gathers. It can only act upon the express orders of the Attorney General and the Department of Justice.

I have stated upon the floor of the Senate previously that in 22 cases the FBI was prevented from acting except upon the express orders of the Department of Justice, that is, a Cabinet officer of the President of the United States.

That Mr. Hoover is conscious of the peculiar responsibility resting upon him we know; he has discussed it in public many times. I recall his statement at the annual meeting of the International Association of Chiefs of Police in 1945. He then said:

I have said before, and I say again, that there is no place in our American way of life for a national police. Our first line of

defense in peace or war is the local police agency. It is on the scene and can strike at lawlessness at its source.

Now comes Mr. Lowenthal with his book about the FBI. It is manifestly the product of long and ingenious labor, with hundreds of citations and pieces of quoted matter, carefully and deceptively fitted together to form a tremendous indictment of the FBI. So lengthy, indeed, is the book and so elaborate its design that I shall not attempt at this point to analyze it. It would require a floor address of several hours and an equally lengthy list of citations. For the moment I wish only to point out the burden of the Lowenthal argument. By implication Mr. Lowenthal seeks to do two things:

First. To make Mr. Hoover responsible for the excesses of the Bureau before Mr. Hoover became the Director.

Second. To persuade people that the FBI is potentially a tyrannical secret police which would wreck our civil liberties and subject our citizens to the ruthless practices of the police state.

One of the best descriptions of the Lowenthal book I have seen is found in a review published in the Washington Post for November 26, 1950. The review is by Father Edwin Walsh of Georgetown University, a student of communism for 30 years. Says Father Walsh:

What the author has produced is a lawyer's indictment of the FBI in the style and mood of a prosecuting attorney . . . he selects his material with an eye to getting a conviction.

But the book is even more than that. It is the work of an obviously practiced slicker. Never does Mr. Lowenthal make a categorical statement which would leave his defenses open; he spreads his poison by implication and indirection. For a man who represents himself to be so concerned about the state of our civil liberties, who has such a passionate yearning for the FBI to be honest and above board, it is remarkable that he is willing to sign his name to an indictment so devious.

If what Mr. Lowenthal implies were true, the author would not be at large this moment. The FBI would hold him incommunicado in some secret place of incarceration. Mr. Lowenthal's publishers would be in a prison camp, and the G-men would right now be installed in Sloane Associates offices in New York, browbeating stenographers and applying thumbscrews to the editorial employees. None of these things are true. The book is on sale openly everywhere, the publishers are getting their money and, presumably, are paying Mr. Lowenthal his royalties.

What is true, however, is that Mr. Lowenthal has committed a devilish piece of sabotage, sabotage of the mind. While assailing the idea of thought control he is perverting thought itself. The book is not honest, it is not above board, but it is persuasive. The pseudo-liberal who has access to print and radio may very well be taken in by the book and help to spread the poison.

Since he retired twenty-odd years ago a comparatively wealthy man Mr. Lowenthal has had plenty of time to de-

vote to extracurricular activity such as his constant and ever-increasing tirades against the FBI. In the early 1940's he circulated a 75-page memorandum around the National Press Club urging writers to go after the FBI. Portions of this memorandum were used verbatim in the editorial columns of the New Masses, Daily Worker, the New Republic and other publications. In 1941 he wrote another memorandum entitled "Is the Department of Justice Sufficiently Competent in National Defense?" in which he attacked the Hobbs bill legalizing wire-tapping. The same year he produced another paper called "Shall America Have a Permanent Large Scale Political Spy System?" In this piece he attacked Mr. Hoover as a man attempting to undermine civil liberties through association with the military, and as the one person directly responsible for the Palmer Red raids in 1919 and 1920.

This book is advertised as an objective study. But that is something of the background of bias against which this book was written.

Mr. President, if we had had no experience with Communist infiltration, if we did not know from the Wadleigh confessions, the Marzani and the Coplon convictions, from the Hiss case, and numerous others how far the Communist infiltration of Government had gone, if we did not have the documentary evidence of subversion and sabotage now being printed in the daily press we might be less suspicious of this book.

But we do know about this infiltration. Our eyes are opened to the desperate character of the situation in which we find ourselves. We know of the clear and present danger in which we are.

One of the most successful tactics of the Communist technique has been to destroy character and to undermine institutions. And this book is designed to do both—to destroy the character of a fine administrator, Mr. Hoover, and the character of a well organized and just institution, guarding the freedom and liberties of our people, the FBI.

Two months ago, after labor covering a period of 5 years, Congress passed the McCarran Act. The first part of that act was originally known as the Mundt-Ferguson bill. When it was first presented to the House it was the Mundt-Nixon bill. It had been altered in the Senate, and therefore the change of names applying to it.

The purpose of the act is to give Government the means and the power to grapple more effectively with the Communist threat. Under this act the responsibilities of the FBI are greatly increased. Mr. Hoover's tasks are now more onerous than ever. Almost at the moment when these tasks are given him, the Lowenthal book appears. At bottom the book is evil, a monstrous libel, designed to blast the reputation of the man upon whom Congress has just laid new burdens. In all conscience, Congress cannot allow this libel to pass unchallenged. So long as our people remain free and our institutions remain strong books like this will be known for what they are and properly discounted by the American people.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Michigan and I are members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which deals with FBI appropriations. We have sat together on that subcommittee for several years. We have noticed how carefully the subcommittee and the full committee go into the requests for expenditures by the FBI. In the opinion of the Senator from Michigan would it not be impossible for the FBI to become a secret police, to become a Gestapo, while Members of Congress were on the job at all?

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree heartily with that suggestion. I think the Senator from Massachusetts will agree with the Senator from Michigan that on many occasions the Director of the FBI, Mr. Hoover, has said to the committee that the purpose of the FBI was not to ferret out matters that had no connection with Federal law; that the Bureau was a gatherer of facts and information so that proper prosecution could be had, but only in connection with matters involving Federal statutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not also true that the Members of Congress who have to be elected, would be the first recipients of any complaints by constituents if they felt that such a thing as a Gestapo were impending?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I agree. Not only the members of the Appropriations Committee, but every Member of Congress would be here and would be able to act, and it would be impossible for the FBI to function as a Gestapo, because the FBI, in its functioning, depends upon the appropriations made by Congress. The appropriations must be made every year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is equally true, is it not, that Mr. Hoover, when he presents his case, presents it in such a factual way that he has gained perhaps greater respect than any of the department heads who come before the Congress asking for appropriations?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say so; and I would say further that in practically every case his explanations have been such as to cause the committee, and later the Congress, to be willing to approve the appropriations he has requested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a final question; does not the Senator agree that, inasmuch as the burden is upon Congress, to appropriate the money, it is impossible for what Mr. Lowenthal suggests to become a reality?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe so. I have no fear, because I believe that Congress, being in control of the purse strings, will be able to cope with any situation. The matters which seem to have been used in this book to cause this insidious thinking about the FBI, an organization which is now so vital to our great country, have not been called to the attention of the Congress.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, December 1, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, November 30 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be majors

Benjamin H. Inloes, Jr., MC, [redacted]
Theodore Stalk, MC, [redacted]
Francis D. Threadgill, MC, [redacted]
Frederick W. Timmerman, MC, [redacted]

To be captains

Helen M. Abramowska, ANC, [redacted]
Gladys H. Anderson, ANC, [redacted]
Helen M. Arduser, WMSC, [redacted]
Thomas H. Baker, MC, [redacted]
Robert J. Barnett, MC, [redacted]
Ruth Barrett, ANC, [redacted]
Marion L. Benninger, ANC, [redacted]
Alice E. Berry, ANC, [redacted]
Elizabeth L. Breitung, ANC, [redacted]
Helen A. Chavez, ANC, [redacted]
Alice B. Clark, ANC, [redacted]
Edmund J. Colton, MC, [redacted]
Margaret J. Conley, ANC, [redacted]
Mary V. Cotterell, ANC, [redacted]
Helen D. Dalton, ANC, [redacted]
Florence M. DeWitt, ANC, [redacted]
Luella E. Dieckroeger, ANC, [redacted]
Catherine M. Dolemba, ANC, [redacted]
Anne Duga, ANC, [redacted]
Carl A. Fischer, MC, [redacted]
Lucille C. Fisher, ANC, [redacted]
Elizabeth L. Flavelle, ANC, [redacted]
Josephine A. G. Fries, ANC, [redacted]
Alice E. Garancio, ANC, [redacted]
Eleanor M. Garen, ANC, [redacted]
Delzena E. Garrard, ANC, [redacted]
Ramona A. Gilligan, ANC, [redacted]
Dorothy Goldsmith, ANC, [redacted]
Edna Hargrove, ANC, [redacted]
Juanita E. Haydel, ANC, [redacted]
Erdeal Haywood, ANC, [redacted]
Hazel V. Honeycutt, ANC, [redacted]
Florynce M. Houle, ANC, [redacted]
Lucy E. Jacobson, ANC, [redacted]
Edna L. Johnson, ANC, [redacted]
Evelyn L. Kelly, ANC, [redacted]
Harriet J. King, ANC, [redacted]
Dean C. Klevan, DC, [redacted]
Mary H. Kuhn, ANC, [redacted]
Theresa S. LaPlante, ANC, [redacted]
Georgia E. Lessley, ANC, [redacted]
Carolyn A. Leyko, ANC, [redacted]
William F. MacDonald, MC, [redacted]
Mary E. Madgett, WMSC, [redacted]
Bernadette M. J. Malette, ANC, [redacted]
Marian M. Matheson, ANC, [redacted]
G. Elizabeth Melton, ANC, [redacted]
Verine J. Montgomery, ANC, [redacted]
Mary Morehead, ANC, [redacted]
Laura M. Mosley, ANC, [redacted]
D. Marguerite Olson, ANC, [redacted]
Eva K. Ordway, ANC, [redacted]
Lucyle M. Pace, ANC, [redacted]
Margaret E. Peters, ANC, [redacted]
Eunice M. Phelps, ANC, [redacted]
Maeceille B. Pless, ANC, [redacted]

Lessie M. Reed, ANC, [redacted]
Samuel Rodriguez, MC, [redacted]
Rosa M. Russo, ANC, [redacted]
Juliana Sabat, ANC, [redacted]
Cecilia M. Sar, ANC, [redacted]
Estelle M. Skadorva, ANC, [redacted]
Connie Snape, ANC, [redacted]
Hazel I. Snowden, ANC, [redacted]
John J. Stifter III, DC, [redacted]
Eleanor M. Stevenson, ANC, [redacted]
Ralph Suriano, DC, [redacted]
Eleanor J. Swan, ANC, [redacted]
Alice C. Taylor, ANC, [redacted]
Dorothy A. Tessen, ANC, [redacted]
Nora M. Tobin, ANC, [redacted]
Lena A. Toole, ANC, [redacted]
Mildred L. Trimmer, ANC, [redacted]
Mildred S. Turner, ANC, [redacted]
Reba B. Welr, ANC, [redacted]
Maude D. Williams, ANC, [redacted]
Rosalie T. Wozny, ANC, [redacted]

To be first lieutenants

Alva H. Bandy, JAGC, [redacted]
Helen R. Barefoot, WMSC, [redacted]
Joe D. Bell, DC, [redacted]
Mary K. Berteling, WMSC, [redacted]
Germain P. Boyle, JAGC, [redacted]
William A. Bridenstine, VC, [redacted]
Mary L. Carroll, ANC, [redacted]
Warren C. Casey, JAGC, [redacted]
Mark T. Cenac, MC, [redacted]
Harold Collings, Jr., MC, [redacted]
Lois C. Eldson, ANC, [redacted]
Henry A. Fisher, Jr., JAGC, [redacted]
John R. Gibson, MC, [redacted]
Charles C. Grimm, JAGC, [redacted]
Armin E. Gutstein, MC, [redacted]
Alvera E. Hamlyn, WMSC, [redacted]
Dan Hightower, VC, [redacted]
Dovie R. House, ANC, [redacted]
Jane M. Irving, ANC, [redacted]
Emma C. Itgen, ANC, [redacted]
William M. Keeling, MC, [redacted]
Joseph B. Kelly, JAGC, [redacted]
John C. Kinney, JAGC, [redacted]
Milton B. Learner, JAGC, [redacted]
Bessie M. Leeton, ANC, [redacted]
John F. Ljunggren, MC, [redacted]
Clifford B. Lull, Jr., MC, [redacted]
Albert C. Malone, Jr., JAGC, [redacted]
Carl R. Nolte, Jr., JAGC, [redacted]
Gabriel Nossow, VC, [redacted]
Emma E. Ozuna, ANC, [redacted]
Thomas E. Perry, DC, [redacted]
Anne R. Piergallini, ANC, [redacted]
Gennady E. Platoff, MC, [redacted]
Virginia M. Porch, ANC, [redacted]
Mary R. Preston, WMSC, [redacted]
Franklin C. Reynier, MC, [redacted]
George E. Ritter, VC, [redacted]
William R. Schillhammer, Jr., MC, [redacted]
Grace L. Sears, ANC, [redacted]
Richard W. Snyder, JAGC, [redacted]
Willard F. Spiller, Jr., DC, [redacted]
Anastasia P. Urbanak, ANC, [redacted]
Colin O. Villines, JAGC, [redacted]
Melburn N. Washburn, JAGC, [redacted]
Jean A. Wolf, JAGC, [redacted]
Elizabeth V. Woodham, WMSC, [redacted]
Jeraldine York, ANC, [redacted]

To be second lieutenants

Miriam R. Burke, WAC, [redacted]
Dorothy C. Carson, WAC, [redacted]
Ellen deBeruff, WAC, [redacted]
Martha C. Eliker, WAC, [redacted]
Jean M. Fuller, WAC, [redacted]
Patricia A. Keegan, ANC, [redacted]
Barbara E. Knudten, WAC, [redacted]
Alice W. Leete, WAC, [redacted]
Howard C. Lelfheit, MSC, [redacted]
Catherine L. Levangle, ANC, [redacted]
Marshall A. Mason, Jr., MSC, [redacted]
Felice R. Morin, ANC, [redacted]
Mabelle A. Northey, ANC, [redacted]
Sally A. O'Mallan, ANC, [redacted]
Albert L. Paul, MSC, [redacted]
Joan H. Perry, WMSC, [redacted]
Vivian L. Piller, ANC, [redacted]
Janet M. Rasmussen, WAC, [redacted]
Virginia H. Wandelt, WAC, [redacted]

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Dale V. Alkire, [redacted]
Robert Arter, [redacted]
Joe Baker, Jr., [redacted]
John R. Baker, [redacted]
John W. Baker, [redacted]
Orville S. Beard, [redacted]
Henry C. Becker, Jr., [redacted]
Alexander H. Bernhard, [redacted]
William L. Black, [redacted]
Bill R. Blalock, [redacted]
Charles M. Bolen, Jr., [redacted]
Sam F. Bornhauser, [redacted]
Haynes Brinkley, Jr., [redacted]
James J. Brockmyer, [redacted]
Gerald C. Burch, [redacted]
Lex J. Byers, [redacted]
Mark C. Carrigan, [redacted]
Robert M. Carroll, [redacted]
Robert P. Carter, [redacted]
William V. Casey, [redacted]
John B. Cave, [redacted]
Herbert J. Childress, Jr., [redacted]
Hal S. Christensen, [redacted]
Niels G. Christensen, [redacted]
John W. Collins, [redacted]
Robert S. Collins, Jr., [redacted]
Donald R. Condrill, [redacted]
Archie E. Conn, Jr., [redacted]
Joseph E. Corr, Jr., [redacted]
Cecil M. Curles, [redacted]
Roland E. Curtis, [redacted]
Donald H. Dahlene, [redacted]
David N. Dalton, [redacted]
Glenn A. Davis, [redacted]
Oren E. DeHaven, [redacted]
Richard A. deRusha, [redacted]
Bernard J. Dolan, Jr., [redacted]
Ralph M. Dorsey, [redacted]
Harry A. Dragotta, [redacted]
Wellington J. Dunn, [redacted]
James E. Echols, Jr., [redacted]
James R. Ellingsworth, [redacted]
Hodges S. Escue, [redacted]
James J. Flaggert, Jr., [redacted]
John D. Florio, [redacted]
Raymond E. Forbes, [redacted]
Donald D. Gabe, [redacted]
Frank R. Garner III, [redacted]
William E. Garofalo, [redacted]
Charles T. Garrison, [redacted]
Paul J. Gentile, [redacted]
Rudolph F. L. Giglio, [redacted]
Dale R. Godsey, [redacted]
George A. Greetham, [redacted]
Bruce G. Grover, [redacted]
Alger E. Hageman, [redacted]
Roy A. Hagen, [redacted]
Charles A. Hagman, Jr., [redacted]
Wayne E. Hanselman, [redacted]
James C. Harper, [redacted]
Carroll D. Harrod, [redacted]
John N. Hassell, [redacted]
Donald J. Hassin, [redacted]
Donald J. Hennes, [redacted]
James M. Henry, Jr., [redacted]
Lee S. Henry, Jr., [redacted]
Lawson R. Hillman, [redacted]
Forest E. Hoff, [redacted]
Albert R. Hoffman, [redacted]
Alfred Holston, [redacted]
Lawrence B. Hooper, [redacted]
Edward A. Horrigan, Jr., [redacted]
John W. Houtz, [redacted]
John J. Huetter, [redacted]
David H. Hunter, [redacted]
Stanley J. Hussey, [redacted]
Donald E. Hutcherson, Jr., [redacted]
Joseph D. Hynes, [redacted]
William W. James, [redacted]
Norman G. Johnson, [redacted]
Raymond E. Johnson, [redacted]
Walter F. Johnston, [redacted]
Jesse L. Jordan, Jr., [redacted]
William P. Junk, Jr., [redacted]
Robert S. Kellar, [redacted]

Eugene Kelley, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Patrick J. Kenny, [REDACTED]
 John C. Kirsch, [REDACTED]
 Kenneth M. Kone, [REDACTED]
 Louis W. Kranyak, [REDACTED]
 Alfred M. Kubota, [REDACTED]
 Robert O. Lambert, [REDACTED]
 Wilson A. Landry, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Maurice C. Lane, [REDACTED]
 Jack B. Lang, [REDACTED]
 Harold H. Lee, [REDACTED]
 William B. Liles, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James R. Lukens, [REDACTED]
 Robert F. Lynd, [REDACTED]
 Filmore W. McAbee, [REDACTED]
 Glen R. McAfee, [REDACTED]
 Kernon M. McConkey, [REDACTED]
 James R. McCoy, [REDACTED]
 Jack E. McDonald, [REDACTED]
 John J. McDowell, [REDACTED]
 Edgar McGowan, [REDACTED]
 Samuel H. McKenty, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Eric L. McLendon, [REDACTED]
 Robert M. Madvig, [REDACTED]
 Harold M. Maness, [REDACTED]
 Martin A. Markley, [REDACTED]
 David S. Marshall, [REDACTED]
 James W. Martin, [REDACTED]
 Norman L. Martin, [REDACTED]
 William J. Martin, [REDACTED]
 Louis G. Mathern, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Allen J. Mauderly, [REDACTED]
 Eugene L. Melchior, [REDACTED]
 Walter P. Meyer, [REDACTED]
 Daniel S. Miller, [REDACTED]
 Richard C. Millard, [REDACTED]
 Paul H. Miller, [REDACTED]
 Russell J. Miller, [REDACTED]
 Richard F. Mitchell, [REDACTED]
 Robert E. Monroe, [REDACTED]
 Walter H. Moon, [REDACTED]
 Albert E. Moore, [REDACTED]
 Eulless B. Moore, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Gene D. Moore, [REDACTED]
 Howard M. Moore, [REDACTED]
 Harry W. Morse, [REDACTED]
 Johnson C. Moss, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Mario V. Motola, [REDACTED]
 Orbra G. Mullins, [REDACTED]
 David B. Mylchreest, [REDACTED]
 Joseph W. Negard, [REDACTED]
 Franklyn S. Nelson, [REDACTED]
 Robert E. Nelson, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wilbert J. Newsome, [REDACTED]
 William F. Nickel, [REDACTED]
 William E. Noble, [REDACTED]
 Charles G. Noice, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Tillman C. Oliver, [REDACTED]
 Harold H. Olsen, Jr., [REDACTED]
 John P. O'Shaughnessy, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Joseph F. Paradis, [REDACTED]
 Robert E. Parke, [REDACTED]
 Emory C. Parrish, [REDACTED]
 Richard R. Peabody, [REDACTED]
 William R. Phillips, [REDACTED]
 Stephen Popadich, [REDACTED]
 Robert H. Porter, [REDACTED]
 James V. Preult, [REDACTED]
 John G. Ransier, [REDACTED]
 John W. Rasmussen, [REDACTED]
 Chester E. Raun, [REDACTED]
 George Regas, [REDACTED]
 Robert B. Respass, [REDACTED]
 Clifford C. Reynolds, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Malcolm K. Rhine, [REDACTED]
 Walter T. Ride, Jr., [REDACTED]
 David L. Rooks, [REDACTED]
 Warren W. Rossman, [REDACTED]
 James I. Scott, [REDACTED]
 Harry A. Seese, [REDACTED]
 Donald W. Seibert, [REDACTED]
 Lewis S. Selby, [REDACTED]
 Robert W. Shidler, [REDACTED]
 Thomas A. Shuman, [REDACTED]
 William L. Simmons, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James F. Smith, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Vance O. Smith, [REDACTED]
 James E. Stacy, [REDACTED]
 Posie L. Starkey, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Comfort K. Starr, [REDACTED]
 Warren B. Steele, [REDACTED]
 William B. Steele, [REDACTED]

Chester R. Stelman, [REDACTED]
 William Stendebach, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Richard N. Stoddard, [REDACTED]
 Tunstall L. Strawhand III, [REDACTED]
 Stanley P. Swartz, [REDACTED]
 William E. Taylor, [REDACTED]
 James L. Teese, [REDACTED]
 William S. Thoma, [REDACTED]
 Charles M. Thomas, [REDACTED]
 William F. Thompson, [REDACTED]
 Frederick M. Townroe, [REDACTED]
 William H. Tucker, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Fernand R. Van Laethem, [REDACTED]
 Euell M. Vinson, [REDACTED]
 John R. Vosepka, [REDACTED]
 Fred M. Walker, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Herbert H. Walta, [REDACTED]
 William W. Wanamaker, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William P. Ward, [REDACTED]
 Wilburn C. Weaver, [REDACTED]
 Charles R. Westcott, [REDACTED]
 Nevin C. White, [REDACTED]
 Frank E. Wilkins, [REDACTED]
 LeRoy L. Willard, [REDACTED]
 Curtis T. Wilson, [REDACTED]
 William S. Wolf, [REDACTED]
 Walter G. Wolfe, [REDACTED]
 John F. Wood, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William W. Woodside, [REDACTED]
 Gustave M. Wueste, [REDACTED]
 Theodore Wyckoff, [REDACTED]

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Paul O. Boghossian, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Eugene G. Lawley, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Sam E. McGregor, [REDACTED]
 Malcolm J. Ruhl, [REDACTED]
 James W. Shields, [REDACTED]
 Joseph W. Vann, [REDACTED]

(NOTE.—These persons were given recess appointment on October 3, 1950, October 20, 1950, and October 27, 1950.)

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, subject to physical qualifications:

To be majors

Robert F. Bell, MC, [REDACTED]
 Carl G. Giesecke, MC, [REDACTED]

To be captains

William J. Amaral, DC, [REDACTED]
 Dagny V. J. Anderson, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Elsie Anderson, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Frances M. Avery, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Gertrude L. Beardsley, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Geneva N. Bowen, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Loralne J. Braasch, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Agnes A. Brigham, WMSC, [REDACTED]
 Catherine E. Brogan, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Areline F. Burkhead, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Monnie C. Butler, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Rose H. Cindric, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Ella M. Clark, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Joy B. Crain, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Isabelle R. Curran, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Lucile M. Dale, WMSC, [REDACTED]
 Miriam A. Delp, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Anna K. Dennis, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Dorothy M. Fehr, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Jeanne M. Gaillard, ANC, [REDACTED]
 M. Argenta Geist, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Anastasia E. Gianarakos, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Marie A. Gill, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Thelma B. Goodman, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Lillian M. Goodwin, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Willie M. Grissom, ANC, [REDACTED]

Mary T. Groh, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Ethel I. Hagler, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Virginia P. Hayenga, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Mary L. Hines, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Margaret A. Hollinger, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Emma F. Houston, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Eva D. Houston, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Mary F. Hyman, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Pearl E. Jamison, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Doris F. Jensen, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Isabel M. Kent, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Margaret A. Kraemer, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Jean M. Lang, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Thelma L. Lang, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Elva J. Lawton, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Evelyn E. Leen, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Jean M. Linke, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Stella Lipowski, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Johnnie E. Long, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Edythe M. Lund, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Dorothy McBride, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Leonard Maldonado, MC, [REDACTED]
 Mary A. Marsic, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Edith F. Matthias, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Hazel M. Maxwell, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Leona L. Montgomery, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Jean Moore, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Mary L. Moultrie, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Mabel L. Mullins, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Ellen F. Murray, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Ruby J. Norwood, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Edna K. Park, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Mildred C. Pearse, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Marguerite L. Peters, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Mildred D. Pfiaeging, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Ardes Porter, WMSC, [REDACTED]
 Helen E. Pugsley, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Ruth M. Retzer, ANC, [REDACTED]
 George A. Reynolds, MC, [REDACTED]
 Mary E. Ross, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Dante Salera, DC, [REDACTED]
 Elizabeth F. Sedor, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Loretta W. Sippy, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Helen K. Smull, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Lila D. Soto, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Winnie Steadman, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Blanche M. Stewart, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Tynne N. Tamminen, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Margaret M. Thayer, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Beatrice E. Tracey, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Doris R. Troy, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Maria E. Watkins, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Lloyd E. Williams, DC, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants

Kevin G. Barry, MC, [REDACTED]
 Edith E. Beardsley, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Raymond J. Congour, DC, [REDACTED]
 Robert M. Coyne, DC, [REDACTED]
 Agnes I. Fay, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Mary A. Folwell, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Margaret E. Graham, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Florian E. Herring, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Billy C. Hopkins, DC, [REDACTED]
 Lelia J. Jones, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Mildred O. McFarland, ANC, [REDACTED]
 George V. W. Pope, Jr., JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Harry Quint, Jr., DC, [REDACTED]
 Bertha V. Rathine, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Wayne G. Roberts, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Robert W. Sherwood, MC, [REDACTED]
 John W. Snodgrass, Jr., DC, [REDACTED]
 A. Muriel Stark, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Sidney J. Walker, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Herluf Wanggaard, DC, [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenants

Phyllis J. Genter, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Anne C. Jablunovsky, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Josephine J. Jankowski, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Patricia M. Schneider, ANC, [REDACTED]

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Francis G. Boehm, [REDACTED]
 Marion R. Carrigan, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Eugene H. Cathrall, [REDACTED]
 George V. Chandler, [REDACTED]

Earl R. Fore, [REDACTED]
 David C. Gregory, [REDACTED]
 John R. Kenyon, [REDACTED]
 Philip H. Mecom, Jr., [REDACTED]
 John D. Nix III, [REDACTED]
 John C. Ogilvie, [REDACTED]
 Joseph D. Spinelli, [REDACTED]
 Ray V. Spivey, [REDACTED]
 Francis G. Thomas, Jr., [REDACTED]

The following-named distinguished military student for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as a distinguished military graduate, and subject to physical qualification:

Raymond D. Henley, [REDACTED]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Bob Jones, Jr., president of the Bob Jones University, Greenville, S. C., offered the following prayer:

God of nations and of men, in this hour of crisis we intercede for our country and for these men who shape her laws. Make our leaders strong of stature to wear worthily the mantle of their responsibilities. Give them that zeal without which work is but drudgery and that capacity for work without which zeal is but hysteria.

May they have eyes that see truth, hearts that love truth, lips that speak truth, and courage to contend for truth, remembering that He who declared that truth shall make men free, said of Himself, "I am the truth."

All our wisdom is foolishness to Thee; all human strength, weakness before Thee. Grant this Congress, therefore, divine wisdom from above and make these United States a nation "Strong in the Lord and the power of His might."

To this end, forgive America her pride, her backslidings, her sins. Lay upon our people a burden of repentance and heart-searching. Pour out upon the length and breadth of our needy land showers of spiritual revival and may those showers fall even upon the hearts assembled here. We pray through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 27, 1950, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 364):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. HERBERT A. MEYER, late a Representative from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51-8.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation, which was read by the Clerk:

NOVEMBER 28, 1950.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have this day transmitted to the Governor of California my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Twelfth District of California, effective midnight November 30, 1950.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD NIXON.

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF MR. WOODROW W. JONES AS A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

NOVEMBER 29, 1950.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: A certificate of election in due form of law, showing the election of the Honorable WOODROW W. JONES as a Representative to the Eighty-first Congress from the Eleventh Congressional District of North Carolina, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Alfred L. Bulwinkle, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. WOODROW W. JONES appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

AID TO YUGOSLAVIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 723)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress enact legislation authorizing further United States assistance to meet the emergency created by the food shortage in Yugoslavia.

More than 2 years ago the Government of Yugoslavia broke its association with the Soviet Union and its satellites. This rift resulted primarily from the refusal of the Yugoslavs to agree to the dictation of the Kremlin in the affairs of Yugoslavia. The Yugoslavs are deter-

mined to maintain their independence of the Kremlin. They are maintaining the largest fighting force in Europe, outside of the Soviet Union.

The breach between Yugoslavia and the Kremlin and its satellites has steadily widened. The Kremlin is determined to wipe out this one successful example of a former satellite which has freed itself from Soviet control. Directly and through its satellites, the Kremlin is trying to destroy Yugoslav independence. Yugoslavia is being subjected to an economic blockade, to propaganda, subversion, military pressure, and harassing border raids.

Since the break between the Kremlin and Yugoslavia, it has been the policy of this Government to assist Yugoslavia to maintain its independence. The continued independence of Yugoslavia is of great importance to the security of the United States and its partners in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and to all nations associated with them in their common defense against the threat of Soviet aggression.

This past summer Yugoslavia suffered perhaps the worst drought in its history. There were severe crop failures, and the lack of feed and fodder led to the extensive slaughtering of livestock. As a result, Yugoslavia is threatened with famine this winter. This would provide fertile ground for the subversive activities of the Kremlin and would seriously undermine the capacity of the Yugoslav people to resist Soviet aggression.

On October 20, 1950, the Yugoslav Government formally requested United States assistance in averting the worst effects of the disastrous crop failure. This request came only after the Yugoslav Government had exhausted all means of meeting the situation by its own efforts.

Immediate action was necessary to meet the situation. Shipments had to be arranged at the earliest possible date. Otherwise, it would have been impossible to get food to the more remote areas of Yugoslavia before they were isolated by the heavy winter snows.

Accordingly, this Government has taken action to begin shipments under existing authority and with funds already available. The Economic Cooperation Administration has made arrangements for the shipment of flour from Italy and Germany directly to Yugoslavia. At the same time, with the concurrence of the North Atlantic Treaty countries, mutual defense assistance funds are being made available for procurement of food supplies equivalent to the immediate needs of the Yugoslav armed forces. In addition, the Export-Import Bank is permitting a portion of a previously negotiated Yugoslav loan to be used for the purchase and transport of foodstuffs, partly from American surplus stocks. Under present plans, the cost of this interim aid already under way will amount to about \$30,000,000. This is sufficient only to meet a portion of the total need.

Now that the Congress has reconvened, I believe it appropriate to request a special authorization to meet the balance of the essential food needs of the Yugoslav people until the next harvest. Action should be taken promptly. Shipments