

for consideration of H. R. 9932, a bill to amend and extend certain provisions of the First War Powers Act, 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 3229). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 888. Resolution for consideration of S. 3945, an act to amend sections 3052 and 3107 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the powers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; without amendment (Rept. No. 3230). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee of conference. H. R. 4803. A bill for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 3211). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2460. An act for the relief of George O. Drucker, Livia Drucker, and their minor daughter, Gloria Elizabeth Drucker; without amendment (Rept. 3212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2888. An act for the relief of Frances Ethel Beddington; without amendment (Rept. No. 3213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2981. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Merinet Forgnone; without amendment (Rept. No. 3214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3044. An act for the relief of Bernice Josephine Lazaga; without amendment (Rept. No. 3215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3125. An act for the relief of Dr. Lutfu Lahut Uzman; without amendment (Rept. No. 3216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3241. An act for the relief of George Brander Palohelmo and Eva Leonora Palohelmo; without amendment (Rept. No. 3217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3259. An act for the relief of Ethelyn Isobel Chenalloy; without amendment (Rept. No. 3218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3260. An act for the relief of Richard H. Bush; without amendment (Rept. No. 3219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3261. An act for the relief of Willard Sidmer Ruttan; without amendment (Rept. No. 3220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3378. An act for the relief of Armando Santini; without amendment (Rept. No. 3221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3554. An act for the relief of Jose Manzano Somera; without amendment (Rept. No. 3222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3699. An act for the relief of Linda Leo; without amendment (Rept. No. 3223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 108. Concur-

rent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 3224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 9934. A bill to exempt members of the Armed Forces from the tax on admissions when admission is free of charge; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 9935. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that veterans of World War II who died during the 5-year period immediately following their separation from the active military or naval services shall be deemed fully insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 9936. A bill to make available, free of cost, survival information under atomic attack; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. Res. 889. Resolution directing full, complete, and continuing study and investigation of the administration, execution, and enforcement of export policies and control regulations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 9937. A bill for the relief of the estates of William A. Miller and Harold P. Stites; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 9938. A bill for the relief of Dewey Esco Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 9939. A bill for the relief of Wera Fazio, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

The Senate met in executive session 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, who in times past, across yearning centuries, spoke to the fathers through the prophets and in the word made flesh hath spoken to us in that One whose name is the Prince of Peace, and upon whose shoulders the government of men must ultimately rest: We thank Thee that not on one wondrous night alone did a star of hope light the heavens, but that straight down the crowding years the starlit pathway leads, reminding our earth-filled eyes that the highest truth is born in lowly places, clad in humble garb. As the Christmas star rains its fire once more on an earth plowed with spite and hate, may we see in it a shining symbol that if we would find the truth and the life abundant we must

follow our starry ideals, no matter over what burning sands or to what lonely deserts they take our faltering feet. Following the gleam, bring us and all mankind, at last, to that glad day which all men of good will seek:

"When peace shall over all the earth
Its ancient splendor fling,
And the whole world send back the song
Which now the angels sing."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McKELLAR, and by unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, December 20, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolutions:

On December 20, 1950:

S. 2513. An act to give a short title to the act of July 1, 1898, commonly known as the Bankruptcy Act; and

S. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

On December 21, 1950:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 5051) for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Paul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9827) to provide revenue by imposing a corporate excess profits tax, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. WOODRUFF, and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9798. An act to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9893. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAPEHART was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until January 2, 1951.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KNOWLAND was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate, beginning at 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOEY was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today, to attend to public business.

AWARD OF CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR TO COL. JUSTICE MARION CHAMBERS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an account of the presentation of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded to Col. Justice Marion Chambers, United States Marine Corps Reserve, retired. The presentation took place at the White House. The President of the United States made the presentation to Colonel Chambers. The account of the presentation describes the heroic and outstanding conduct of Colonel Chambers for which the Medal of Honor was awarded to him. Colonel Chambers is one of the advisory staff experts of the Committee on Armed Services. In that capacity he has been invaluable to his country and to the committee. He is an outstanding and heroic officer, a great soldier, and a fine gentleman. I am proud to say that he is a resident of Rockville, Md. I ask that the account be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR AWARDED TO COL. JUSTICE MARION CHAMBERS, USMCR (RETIRED)

The President today bestowed the Nation's highest award, the Congressional Medal of Honor, on Col. Justice Marion Chambers, USMCR (retired), for exceptional gallantry which helped assure the victory at Iwo Jima. It was the two hundredth Medal of Honor for a marine; the eightieth for marine heroism in World War II.

Colonel Chambers, of 140 South Adams Street, Rockville, Md., has been staff adviser for the Senate Armed Services Committee for the past 4 years. He is a product of Washington's Fifth Battalion of Marine Reserves which has graduated numerous outstanding officers.

Presentation of the Medal of Honor was made at noon in the west wing of the White House. Invited were Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall; Secretary of the Navy Francis P. Matthews; Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations; Gen. C. B. Cates, Commandant of the Marine Corps; Lt. Col. R. H. Thomas, USMC, aide to the Commandant of the Marine Corps; Mrs. J. M. Chambers (wife); Patricia Chambers (daughter); John Chambers (son); J. M. Chambers (son); Peter and Paul Chambers (7-month-old twin sons); Mr. A. F. Chambers, Sr. (father); Mr. A. F. Chambers, Jr. (brother); Mr. and Mrs. Rodney Jarvis (sister and husband); Mr. and Mrs. Mead Baker (sister and husband); Mr. and Mrs. John Schmutzer (mother-in-law and father-in-law); Mr. and Mrs. Albert Schmutzer (brother-in-law and wife); Mr. Lawrence M. Rulison (major, USMCR); Mr. James G.

Headley (captain, USMCR); Mr. Henry Hubbard and Mr. James R. Miller (friends); Maj. Gen. Verne D. Budge (USA retired) (friend); and Mrs. J. F. Blakeney (friend).

Colonel Chambers had been recommended for the Medal of Honor on April 7, 1945, after he had been evacuated from Iwo Jima seriously wounded. He had received the Navy Cross, which honor was revoked upon the reexamination of the original recommendation, with additional evidence.

He commanded the Third Battalion, Twenty-fifth Marine Regiment, in the Iwo Jima landing on February 19, 1945. His sector was beneath high ground from which heavy enemy fire raked the whole landing beach.

"Capture of the high ground," read the recommendation, "was essential to the success of the D-day operations. It is an established fact that had it not been done, it would have constituted a most serious threat to the subsequent operations of the Fifth Marine Corps."

The Third Battalion lost more than half its officers and nearly one-half its enlisted strength on D-day. But by "fearless disregard for his own life"—and leading his depleted battalion "by example rather than command" Colonel Chambers won the key heights and anchored the right flank of the Marines' position.

On the fourth day, directing the Marines' first rocket barrage and exposed to the enemy's main line of resistance, Colonel Chambers fell under enemy machine-gun fire. His wounds were so serious that he was medically retired on January 1, 1946, and, because he was specially commended for performance of duty in combat, he was promoted to full colonel.

He was born at Huntington, W. Va., on February 2, 1908, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur F. Chambers. He went to school there and 3 years at Marshall College in Huntington. He attended George Washington University 2 years, then National University also in Washington where he obtained his law degree.

Colonel Chambers joined the Naval Reserve in 1928, served 2 years, then joined the Marine Corps Reserve as a private. He was commissioned in 1932 and continued his studies toward promotion. He was a major, attending summer camp, when the Fifth Battalion was called up in 1940. For his enthusiasm and energy in training his men they dubbed him "Jumping Joe."

Colonel Chambers received the Silver Star medal for getting out the wounded and directing the night defense of a battalion aid station on Tulagi, where he was a patient already seriously wounded. He commanded the Third Battalion, Twenty-fifth Marines in the Roi-Namur campaign. On Saipan he suffered blast concussion, but returned to lead his command there and on Tinian. He had trained his command so thoroughly and his leadership was so conspicuous that he was awarded the Legion of Merit.

The award today reads:

"The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to Col. Justice M. Chambers, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty as commanding officer of the Third Assault Battalion Landing Team, Twenty-fifth Marines, Fourth Marine Division, in action against enemy Japanese forces on Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands, from February 19 to 22, 1945. Under a furious barrage of enemy machine-gun and small-arms fire from the commanding cliffs on the right, Colonel Chambers, then lieutenant colonel, landed immediately after the initial assault waves of his battalion on D-day to find the momentum of the assault threatened by heavy casualties from withering Japanese

artillery, mortar, rocket, machine-gun, and rifle fire. Exposed to relentless hostile fire, he coolly reorganized his battle-weary men, inspiring them to heroic efforts by his own valor and leading them in an attack on the critical, impregnable high ground from which the enemy was pouring an increasing volume of fire directly onto troops ashore as well as amphibious craft in succeeding waves. Constantly in the front lines encouraging his men to push forward against the enemy's savage resistance, Colonel Chambers led the 8-hour battle to carry the flanking ridge top and reduce the enemy's fields of aimed fire, thus protecting the vital foothold gained. In constant defiance of hostile fire while reconnoitering the entire regimental combat team zone of action, he maintained contact with adjacent units and forwarded vital information to the regimental commander. His zealous fighting spirit undiminished despite terrific casualties and the loss of most of his key officers, he again reorganized his troops for renewed attack against the enemy's main line of resistance and was directing the fire of the rocket platoon when he fell, critically wounded. Evacuated under heavy Japanese fire, Colonel Chambers, by forceful leadership, courage, and fortitude in the face of staggering odds, was directly instrumental in insuring the success of subsequent operations of the Fifth Amphibious Corps on Iwo Jima, thereby sustaining and enhancing the finest traditions of the United States naval service."

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to state that the Senate is in executive session. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into the Senate will proceed to vote on the nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg at 12:30 o'clock. There is no agreement as to a division of the time. The Chair will recognize Senators who wish to address the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, Senators be permitted to make routine insertions in the RECORD, without debate.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 9832. A bill to remove marketing penalties on certain long staple cotton; without amendment (Rept. No. 2688).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2244. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of G. T. Elliott, Inc., and M. F. Quinn (Rept. No. 2689):

S. 4000. A bill for the relief of Ernestine Bacon Jacobs (Rept. No. 2690);

S. 4003. A bill for the relief of Ertogroul Osman and Mehmed Fahreddin (Rept. No. 2691);

S. 4205. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans. (Rept. No. 2692);

H. R. 8152. A bill for the relief of Guy Thomas and others (Rept. No. 2693); and

H. R. 8585. A bill for the relief of Athina Mary Onassis (Rept. No. 2694).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 3749. A bill for the relief of Carroll L. Vickers, authorized certifying officer, Federal Works Agency (Rept. No. 2695); and

H. R. 7019. A bill for the relief of Aenny Blank (Rept. No. 2696).

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

S. Res. 378. Resolution to provide for a national call to prayer on Sunday, December 24, 1950; without amendment.

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

H. R. 2513. A bill to amend subdivisions d and e of section 58 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 2697).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 9802. A bill to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2698).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 21, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

EMMA W. WILSON

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 363, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, will the distinguished Senator explain the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution was submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and relates to the death of an employee in his office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 363) submitted by Mr. BUTLER on November 28, 1950, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Emma W. Wilson, sister of Evelyn Walker, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ELECTION OF MEMBER OF SENATE TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 379) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing, vice Mr. WITHERS, of Kentucky.

RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I now report four resolutions, the purpose of which is to grant investigating committees extensions of time until January 31, 1951, within which to make reports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first resolution.

INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION OF AGRICULTURAL CROPS

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 361) extending the authority for an investigation with respect to the protection of agricultural crops, reported with an additional amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I am not sure that all Members of the Senate heard the explanation by the distinguished chairman of the committee. But I understand this is the first of four or five resolutions, which tide the committees over until the Eighty-second Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The Committee on Rules and Administration determined that the committees in question should all be treated alike in fixing the termination date of January 31, 1951. By that time, the committees will have been able to take care of their offices, and, if the authorizations are renewed in the next Congress—and the new Congress can do as it pleases about that—that will give 1 month in which the committees may operate until a decision is made with respect to the authorizations in the new Congress. I am sure the Senator would like to have me say that each and every one of these resolutions has the termination date January 31, 1951.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was unanimously agreed to by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution, as reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration? There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 361), which had previously been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "until", to strike out "February 28" and insert "February 15."

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, in line 7, after the word "until", to strike out "February 15", as proposed to be amended, and insert "January 31."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 36, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to April 11, 1949, and Senate Resolution 198, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 1, 1950 (providing for an investigation with respect to the production of agricultural crops), is hereby continued until January 31, 1951.

INVESTIGATION OF FIELD OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 367, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 367) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to August 15, 1949 (providing for a study and investigation of the entire field of labor-management relations), is hereby continued through January 31, 1951.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF FUEL RESERVES

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 374, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, in line 6, after the word "through", to strike out "January 3, 1953" and insert "January 31, 1951."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 239, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to August 15, 1950 (providing for a study and investigation of the fuel reserves and to formulate a fuel policy of the United States), is hereby continued through January 31, 1951.

INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 375, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 375) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the first section of Senate Resolution 93, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to June 22, 1949, increasing the limitation of expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services, is amended by striking out "December 31, 1950," and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1951."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 370, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 370) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of the hearings conducted before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on S. 3936, Eighty-first Congress, on the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

PAY OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS OF SENATOR LEAHY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 380) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the administrative and clerical assistants in the office of Senator EDWARD L. LEAHY, appointed by him and borne on the payroll of the Senate when displaced by his elected successor, shall be continued on such payroll at their respective salaries until the end of the Eighty-first Congress, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

DAISY ADENA SMITH AND HOMER S. SMITH

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 372, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It relates to the death of an employee in the office of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 372) was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Daisy Adena Smith and Homer S. Smith, parents of Isabel M. Smith, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 366, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution was submitted by the Senator from Mississippi at the request of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. It relates to a continuance of surveillance of the infiltration of Communists into the United States. There was some question raised in committee as to the text of the resolution, which we can consider when it is looked into again in January, in that it specifies certain statutes to be examined, whereas the committee has broad authority to do that anyway, but inasmuch as the extension is only until the 31st of January, and can be reviewed by the committee, we decided to put the resolution into this shape.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, on page 4, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$10,000"; in line 6, after the word "committee", to insert "on or before January 31, 1951"; and after line 6, to strike out:

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.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 366) as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

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 organizations 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 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 \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee on or before January 31, 1951.

The preamble was agreed to, 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.

INVESTIGATION OF EXPORT POLICIES AND CONTROL REGULATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 365, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was on page 2, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

And insert:

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 there-

of, 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 \$2,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, on or before January 31, 1951.

So as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full, complete, and continuing study and investigation of the administration, execution, and enforcement by Government departments and agencies of the export policies and control regulations of the United States.

Such study and investigation shall include, but shall not be limited to, a continuing surveillance of the effectiveness of measures and efforts instituted by Government agencies to prevent the shipment or transshipment of exported materials to countries unfriendly to the United States or lack of such measures or efforts. The committee is also directed to ascertain to what extent, if any, American carriers have been and are utilized in such transportation.

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 \$2,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee on or before January 31, 1951.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that is all.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. IVES submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 4268) to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McMAHON and Mr. BRIDGES each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to Senate bill 4268, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 9798. An act to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 9893. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. EDWARD L. LEAHY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, December 28, 1950, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Edward L. Leahy, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge for the district of Rhode Island, vice Hon. John Patrick Hartigan, elevated. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. JOHN PATRICK HARTIGAN TO BE CIRCUIT JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, December 28, 1950, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. John Patrick Hartigan, of Rhode Island, to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit,

vice Hon. John C. Mahoney, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN TO THE GRAND CENTRAL RAILROAD BRANCH, YMCA

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by him at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York, November 20, 1950, at the diamond jubilee dinner of the Grand Central Railroad Branch, YMCA, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address by him at Harrisburg, Pa., November 14, 1950, before the annual convention of the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN TO NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OF CHILDREN'S COURT JUDGES

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by Francis Cardinal Spellman at a dinner of the New York State Association of Children's Court Judges, in New York City, on December 1, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

IN THE MATTER OF FRIENDSHIP—EXCERPT FROM ADDRESS BY THE LATE SENATOR HARRY B. HAWES

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an excerpt from a memorial address entitled "In the Matter of Friendship," delivered by the late Senator Harry B. Hawes, of Missouri, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNIST AGGRESSION—LETTER TO THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. NEELY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter addressed to the New York Herald Tribune by Gen. Donald B. Adams, and others, on the subject of Communist aggression, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHEROKEE INDIAN WINS PLEA TO REJOIN MARINES

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a newspaper article relating to a plea of a Cherokee Indian to be permitted to rejoin his Marine outfit, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GREED FOR WEALTH—STATEMENT BY J. K. WELLS

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement entitled "The Greed for Wealth," by J. K. Wells, of Oklahoma City, Okla., which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO THE LATE BEN J. SALLOWS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a eulogy of Ben J. Sallows, of Alliance, Nebr., in an editorial from the Alliance Daily Times-Herald of December 18, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

A SOLDIER'S PRAYER—BY LT. WILLIAM REAVIS ROBERTS

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a soldier's prayer, written by Lt. William Reavis Roberts, who was killed in line of duty in a plane crash March 2, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

POSITIVE APPROACH TO FOREIGN POLICY: SUMMARY OF SENATE ADDRESS—RELEASE FROM SENATOR MALONE'S OFFICE

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release from his office entitled "Positive Approach to Foreign Policy: Summary of Senate Address," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE REAL PURPOSE BEHIND ATTLEE'S VISIT—RELEASE FROM SENATOR MALONE'S OFFICE

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release from his office entitled "The Real Purpose Behind Attlee's Visit," which appears in the Appendix.]

DESTRUCTION OF THE NATION'S ECONOMIC STRUCTURE—RELEASE FROM SENATOR MALONE'S OFFICE

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release from his office entitled "Destruction of the Nation's Economic Structure," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GRAY REPORT EXTENDS CRACKPOT SOCIALIST PROGRAMS—RELEASE FROM SENATOR MALONE'S OFFICE

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release from his office entitled "The Gray Report Extends Crackpot Socialist Programs," which appears in the Appendix.]

STATE DEPARTMENT ADVANCING CAUSE OF COMMUNISM—RELEASE BY SENATOR MALONE'S OFFICE

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release from his office entitled "State Department Advancing Cause of Communism," which appears in the Appendix.]

THIS ADMINISTRATION GREATEST HOARDER OF ALL TIME—RELEASE FROM OFFICE OF SENATOR MALONE

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release from his office entitled "This Administration Greatest Hoarder of All Time," which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE \$48,000,000,000 FOR DEFENSE—RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF SENATOR MALONE

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release from his office entitled "What Happened to the \$48,000,000,000 for Defense," which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMAND FOR THE REMOVAL OF DEAN ACHESON—RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF SENATOR MALONE

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release from his office entitled "Demand for Removal of Dean Acheson," which appears in the Appendix.]

IN DEFENSE OF STATES' RIGHTS—RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF SENATOR MALONE

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release from his office on the subject In Defense of States' Rights, which appears in the Appendix.]

IN DEFENSE OF INSTALLMENT BUYING—RELEASE FROM SENATOR MALONE'S OFFICE

[Mr. MALONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a release from his office on the subject, Defense of Installment Buying, which appears in the Appendix.]

SEAFARING UNIONS CALL FOR IMMEDIATE MOBILIZATION OF MARITIME INDUSTRY TO MEET ANY EMERGENCY—STATEMENT BY JOSEPH CURRAN

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the seafaring unions, over the signature of Joseph Curran, chairman of the CIO Maritime Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

REASONS FOR THE IMMEDIATE CONSTRUCTION OF FAST CARGO AND PASSENGER SHIPS—MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum, written by himself, setting forth reasons why the Government should authorize the immediate construction of fast cargo ships and passenger ships, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESENT AND PRE-WORLD WAR II STATUS OF AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE—QUARTERLY REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE FOR AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a quarterly report of the Joint Committee for the American Merchant Marine, which appears in the Appendix.]

ISSUES IN THE CONNECTICUT ELECTION—LETTER FROM DR. PAUL ROSAHN

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Paul Rosahn, of New Britain, Conn., regarding issues in the recent election in Connecticut, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SENATE ON TRIAL—ARTICLE BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Senate on Trial," written by Senator HUMPHREY, reprinted from the American Political Science Review, which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter, dated December 1950, written by Mike Jenney, general manager, Pioneer Service Co., Inc., with reference to the military and economic problems confronting the Pacific Northwest, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARE WE WORTHY OF OUR HERITAGE?—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by George E. Stringfellow, vice president, Edison Industries, and imperial captain of the guard of the Shrine of North America, before the Masons of the Bell Laboratories, in Jersey City, Friday, October 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry

nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Lt. Col. William R. Shuler, Corps of Engineers, to serve as member of the California Debris Commission, vice Brig. Gen. Walter D. Luplow.

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

Frank J. Parker, of New York, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York, vice J. Vincent Keogh, resigned.

ADDRESS BY HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, former President Herbert Hoover made an address on "Our National Policies in This Crisis," over the Mutual Broadcasting System last night.

The counsel and admonitions of the only living former President command the attention of our people, because his is a voice of experience in the highest public office in the land.

As we, who are Members of the Congress, weigh the tremendous responsibility that is ours in this crisis, our minds are open for the light to guide our actions.

The observations of Mr. Hoover, therefore, are of immediate interest for thoughtful consideration.

I ask unanimous consent for insertion of former President Hoover's radio address of last night in the body of the RECORD.

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

I have received hundreds of requests that I appraise the present situation and give my conclusions as to our national policies.

I speak with a deep sense of responsibility. And I speak tonight under the anxieties of every American for the Nation's sons who are fighting and dying on a mission of peace and the honor of our country.

No appraisal of the world situation can be final in an unstable world. However, to find our national path we must constantly reexamine where we have arrived and at times revise our direction.

I do not propose to traverse the disastrous road by which we reached this point.

THE GLOBAL MILITARY SITUATION

We may first survey the global military situation. There is today only one center of aggression on the earth. That is the Communist-controlled Asian-European land mass of 800,000,000 people. They have probably over 300 trained and equipped combat divisions with over 30,000 tanks, 10,000 tactical planes, and further large reserves they can put in action in 90 days. But they are not a great sea power. Their long range air power is limited. These congeries of over 30 different races will some day go to pieces. But in the meantime they are cannon fodder.

Facing this menace on the eastern front there are about 100,000,000 non-Communist island peoples in Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and Korea. Aside from Korea, which I discuss later, they have probably 12 effective combat divisions with practically no tanks, air, or navy.

Facing this land mass on the South are the Indies and the Middle East of about 600,000,000 non-Communist peoples. There are about 150,000,000 non-Communist peoples in north Africa and Latin America. Except Turkey and Formosa, these 850,000,000 people have little military force which they would not or could spare. But they could contribute vital economic and moral strength.

Facing this menace on the continental European front there are about 160,000,000 non-Communist people who, excluding Spain, have less than 20 combat divisions now available, few tanks and little air or naval force. But their will to defend themselves is feeble and their disunities are manifest.

Of importance in military weight at this moment there is the British Commonwealth of 150,000,000 people, with probably 30 combat divisions under arms, a superior navy, considerable air force and a few tanks.

And there are 150,000,000 people in the United States preparing 3,500,000 men into a gigantic air force and navy, with about 30 equipped combat divisions.

SOME MILITARY CONCLUSIONS

If we weigh these military forces as they stand today we must arrive at certain basic conclusions.

(a) We must face the fact that to commit the sparse ground forces of the non-Communist nations into a land war against this Communist land mass would be a war without victory, a war without a successful political terminal. Any attempt to make war on the Communist mass by land invasion, through the quicksands of China, India, of Western Europe is sheer folly. That would be the graveyard of millions of American boys and would end in the exhaustion of this Gibraltar of western civilization.

Even were Western Europe armed far beyond any contemplated program, we could never reach Moscow. The Germans failed with a magnificent army of 240 combat divisions and with powerful air and tank forces.

(b) Equally, we Americans alone with sea and air power can so control the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans that there can be no possible invasion of the Western Hemisphere by Communist armies. They can no more reach Washington in force than we can reach Moscow.

(c) In this military connection we must realize the fact that the atomic bomb is a far less dominant weapon than it was once thought to be.

(d) It is obvious that the United Nations have been defeated in Korea by the aggression of Communist China. There are no adequate forces in the world to repel them.

Even if we sacrifice more American boys to hold a bridgehead, we know we shall not succeed at the present time in the mission given to us by the 50 members of the United Nations.

OUR ECONOMIC STRENGTH

We may explore the American situation still further. The 150,000,000 American people are already economically strained by Government expenditures. It must not be forgotten that we are carrying huge burdens from previous wars, including obligations to veterans and \$260,000,000,000 of bond and currency issues from those wars. In the fiscal year 1952 Federal and local expenditures are likely to exceed \$90,000,000,000. That is more than our total savings. We must finance huge deficits by further Government issues. Inflation is already moving, but we might with stern measures avoid the economic disintegration of such a load for a very few years. If we continued long on this road, the one center of resistance in the world will collapse in economic disaster.

THE DIPLOMATIC FRONT

We may appraise the diplomatic front. Our great hope was in the United Nations.

We have witnessed the sabotage of its primary purpose of preserving peace. It has been down to last week a forum for continuous smear on our honor, our ideals, and our purposes.

It did stiffen up against raw aggression last July in Korea. But in its call for that military action America had to furnish over 90 percent of the foreign forces and suffer over 90 percent of their dead and injured. That effort now comes at least to a measurable military defeat by the aggression of Communist hordes.

Whether or not the United Nations is to have a moral defeat and suffer the collapse of its whole moral stature now depends on whether it has the courage to—

(a) Declare Communist China an aggressor.

(b) Refuse admission of this aggressor to its membership.

(c) Demand that each member of the United Nations cease to furnish or transport supplies of any kind to Communist China that can aid in their military operations. Such a course honestly carried out by the non-Communist nations is not economic sanctions nor does it require military actions. But it would constitute a great pressure for rectitude.

(d) For once, pass a resolution condemning the infamous lies about the United States.

Any course short of this is appeasement.

WHAT SHOULD OUR POLICIES BE?

And now I come to where we should go from here.

Two months ago I suggested a tentative alternate policy for the United States. It received a favorable reception from the large majority of our press.

Since then the crisis in the world has become even more acute. It is clear that the United Nations are defeated in Korea. It is also clear that other non-Communist nations did not or could not substantially respond to the UN call for arms to Korea. It is clear the UN cannot mobilize substantial military forces. It is clear continental Europe has not in the 3 years of our aid developed that unity of purpose and that will power necessary for its own defense. It is clear that our British friends are flirting with appeasement of Communist China. It is clear that the United Nations is in a fog of debate and indecision on whether to appease or not to appease.

In expansion of my proposals of 2 months ago, I now propose certain principles and action.

First. The foundation of our national policies must be to preserve for the world this Western Hemisphere Gibraltar of western civilization.

Second. We can, without any measure of doubt, with our own air and naval forces, hold the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with one frontier on Britain (if she wishes to cooperate), the other on Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines. We can hold open the sea lanes for our supplies. I devoutly hope a maximum of cooperation can be established between the British Commonwealth and ourselves.

Third. To do this we should arm our air and naval forces to the teeth. We have little need for large armies unless we are going to Europe or China. We should give Japan her independence and aid her in arms to defend herself. We should stiffen the defenses of our Pacific frontier in Formosa and the Philippines. We can protect this island chain by our sea and air power.

Fourth. We could, after initial outlays for more air and Navy equipment, greatly reduce our expenditures, balance our budget, and free ourselves from the dangers of inflation and economic degeneration.

Fifth. If we toll and sacrifice as the President has asked, we can continue aid to the hungry of the world. Out of our productiv-

ity, we can give aid to other nations which they have already displayed spirit and strength in defense against communism. We have the stern duty to work and sacrifice to do it.

Sixth. We should have none of appeasement. Morally there is no appeasement of communism. Appeasement contains more dangers than Dunkerque. We want no more Tehrans and Yaltas. We can retrieve a battle, but we cannot retrieve an appeasement. We are grateful that President Truman has denounced such a course.

Seventh. We are not blind to the need to preserve western civilization on the Continent of Europe or to our cultural and religious ties to it. But the prime obligation of defense of western continental Europe rests upon the nations of Europe. The test is whether they have the spiritual force, the will, and acceptance of unity among them by their own volition. America cannot create their spiritual forces; we cannot buy them with money.

You can search all the history of mankind and there is no parallel to the effort and sacrifice we have made to elevate their spirit and to achieve their unity. To this date it has failed. Their minds are confused with fears and disunities. They exclude Spain, although she has the will and means to fight. They huddle with Germany, although she is their frontier. They vacillate in the belief that they are in little danger and the hope to avoid again being a theater of war. And Karl Marx has added to their confusions. They still suffer from battle shock. Their highly organized Communist parties are a menace we must not ignore.

In both World War I and World War II (including West Germany) they placed more than 250 trained and equipped combat divisions in the field within 60 days with strong air and naval forces. They have more manpower and more productive capacity today than in either one of those wars. To warrant our further aid they should show they have spiritual strength and unity to avail themselves of their own resources. But it must be far more than pacts, conferences, paper promises, and declarations. Today it must express itself in organized and equipped combat divisions of such huge numbers as would erect a sure dam against the Red flood. And that before we land another man or another dollar on their shores. Otherwise we shall be inviting another Korea. That would be a calamity to Europe as well as to us.

Our policy in this quarter of the world should be confined to a period of watchful waiting.

NATIONAL UNITY

There is a proper urge in all Americans for unity in troubled times. But unless unity is based on right principles and right action it is a vain and dangerous thing.

Honest difference of views and honest debate are not disunity. They are the vital process of policy making among freemen.

A right, a specific, an open foreign policy must be formulated which gives confidence in our own security before we can get behind it.

CONCLUSIONS

American eyes should now be opened to these hordes in Asia.

These policies I have suggested would be no isolationism. Indeed, they are the opposite. They would avoid rash involvement of our military forces in hopeless campaigns. They do not relieve us of working to our utmost. They would preserve a stronghold of Christian civilization in the world against any peradventure.

With the policies I have outlined, even without Europe, Americans have no reason for hysteria or loss of confidence in our security or our future. And in American security rests the future security of all mankind.

It would be an uneasy peace but we would carry it on with these policies indefinitely even if the Communists should attack our lines on the seas.

We can hope that in time the millions of other non-Communist peoples of the world will rise to their dangers.

We can hope that sometimes the evils of communism and the disintegration of their racial controls will bring their own disintegration. It is a remote consolation, but twice before in world history Asiatic hordes have swept over a large part of the world and their racial dissensions dissolved their empires.

Our people have braved difficult and distressing situations in these three centuries we have been on this continent. We have faced our troubles without fear and we have not failed.

We shall not fail in this, even if we have to stand alone. But we need to realize the whole truth and gird ourselves for troubled times. The truth is ugly. We face it with prayer and courage.

Mr. KEM subsequently said: Mr. President, I am glad the minority leader has placed in the body of the RECORD the address delivered by former President Herbert Hoover last evening on our national policies in this crisis. I hope every Member of the United States Senate will read and ponder these words that come from the heart of this great American.

In view of what has been said in the Senate recently—and well said—about the importance of national unity, I invite the particular attention of my colleagues to this paragraph of President Hoover's thought-provoking address:

There is a proper urge in all Americans for unity in troubled times. But unless unity is based on right principles and right action it is a vain and dangerous thing.

Honest difference of views and honest debate are not disunity. They are the vital process of policy making among free men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I have just made may be placed in the RECORD after the speech delivered by former President Hoover appears in the RECORD.

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

RAILROAD TO ALASKA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter I have written to Gen. George C. Marshall relating to the construction of a railroad through Canada to Alaska.

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

DECEMBER 19, 1950.

HON. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: For some time I have been deeply interested in getting action started on the proposal to construct a through railroad to Alaska connecting with the existing American-Canadian Railroad systems and the Alaska Railroad.

Over a year ago Public Law 391, the Magnuson-Butler-Jackson bill was passed authorizing the President to carry on negotiations with Canada looking toward a survey and ultimate construction of this railroad. As I understand it, one meeting was held with Canadian representatives, but I do not believe much progress was made and apparently the project is not moving along at all. Military events in Korea have revealed

once again what a dangerous position we are in in the Pacific area, where Alaska is a key outpost. I cannot help but think what a terrible risk we are taking by having no dependable land transportation link with Alaska. At present the bulk of our military supplies to the Territory must go by boat, but our shipping to and from Alaska is almost completely controlled by Harry Bridges through the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

For several years I have devoted considerable time to a study of the activities of Bridges and his union, both in Hawaii and Alaska. In the event of a major conflict, I am absolutely convinced that Bridges would not hesitate to call repeated strikes and engage in similar maneuvers for the deliberate purpose of stopping shipments of military necessities and sabotaging our defense effort. Under such circumstances I believe we might desperately want a rail link with Alaska.

Since the negotiations with Canada do not seem to be making much progress I am writing to ask if the Department of Defense might not at this time wish to get behind the project a little more strongly than in the past and develop a definite proposal for congressional consideration during the coming session of Congress. I understand that the Department is now engaged in reviewing the entire defense picture with a view to determining what changes in its program are necessary in the light of recent developments. During the course of that consideration I hope that the proposed Alaska rail link may be advanced to a high priority level.

Your views on this proposal in the light of the current situation will be very deeply appreciated.

Yours very sincerely,
HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator, Nebraska.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1951

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the executive session, and after returning to legislative session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9920) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia whether, if the request of the Senator from Tennessee is granted, the Senator from Georgia will ask that the supplemental appropriation bill be temporarily laid aside so that the Senate may consider the so-called military public works bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not had an opportunity to discuss the subject with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I intend to discuss it with him as soon as it is possible to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to making the supplemental appropriations bill the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the supplemental appropriation bill will be taken up at the conclusion of the executive session.

NOMINATION OF ANNA M. ROSENBERG

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, speaking on the nomination of Mrs. Anna M.

Rosenberg, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, I wish to say that I endorse the nomination unqualifiedly. I have known Mrs. Rosenberg for about 10 years, and during that period of time I had the pleasure of serving with her on the New York State War Council. I became acquainted with her great capacity to handle big problems and to handle human beings. I know of no person in this country who is better qualified to undertake problems dealing with personnel and manpower than is Mrs. Rosenberg. I feel certain that she will meet with great success in her new assignment. I want to make that statement publicly at this time and to wish her well in her big undertaking and great responsibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] in behalf of Mrs. Rosenberg's confirmation. The Senator from Washington, as I believe is generally known, is ill and is unable to be present. He is a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and he has requested me to place his statement in the RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. CAIN's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAIN

Had the appointment been mine to make I would not have selected to be Assistant Secretary of Defense an individual who was (a) foreign born, (b) a woman, and (c) a member of a minority group. I would have searched for a person against whom prejudice and suspicion would not so easily run.

The selection, however, was not for me to make. As a member of the Armed Services Committee and of the Senate it became my responsibility to examine the nominee's capacity, knowledge, and loyalty. I undertook this task in all seriousness, because from the moment the appointment was announced I was keenly conscious of how controversial the nominee's background made her, and I was disposed to support no person for the vital post of Assistant Secretary of Defense handling manpower who was not proven to be possessed of unusual abilities and the highest devotion to my country.

That Mrs. Rosenberg is an authority on manpower problems, and is a person of large capacity was established before the committee by several score of witnesses who are recognized as being outstanding authorities on the question of competence. If Mrs. Rosenberg does not know her business, or if she is a mental dud, she has completely fooled many of the best brains in this country over a period of years. From the hundreds who wrote or called the committee concerning Mrs. Rosenberg's knowledge and ability not a single one, so far as I recall, offered a negative criticism in these fields. It is important in voting for Mrs. Rosenberg to believe that she is among the foremost in manpower management. I do so believe.

Allegations were made to the committee that Mrs. Rosenberg had been associated some years ago with un-American activities, and was or had been a member of Communist-front organizations. The committee was determined to get at the truth involved in these highly serious charges. Every American ought to read every word of the committee hearings. Should an American after reading these hearings conclude that Mrs. Rosenberg is a disloyal person that reader will be in disagreement with each of the 13 committee members, each of whom would strenuously fight against confirming

anyone, for any post, whose loyalty was in doubt. The committee voted unanimously for Mrs. Rosenberg because it became convinced that her loyalty to the United States and its free institutions was not in doubt. If Mrs. Rosenberg is disloyal, then 13 committee members, both Democrats and Republicans, are disloyal and very stupid.

The committee hearings caused me some anxiety and deep concern but not because of Mrs. Rosenberg. Among the chief witnesses were some who sought to inflict deep injury to Mrs. Rosenberg, and further divide the Nation by giving false testimony under oath. Others promiscuously accused Mrs. Rosenberg of disloyalty without offering a scrap of supporting evidence. One or more told the committee they had never seen and did not know Mrs. Rosenberg, yet I know that they tried to influence, and were partly successful, prominent commentators and columnists to tell the country that Mrs. Rosenberg was subversive in every way. These witnesses called themselves men, but they were cowardly, dishonest, and traitorous in their conduct and testimony before the committee. I have urged the committee to seek to prefer perjury charges against these individuals. I hope it does and that those referred to will be fined and imprisoned. This result would be good for the Senate committee, Mrs. Rosenberg and the Nation.

I do not know that Mrs. Rosenberg will make a success of her job, but I feel keenly that she is qualified to try. The Secretary of Defense selected her and believes her to be qualified. Noted industrialists in all sections of the land certify that Mrs. Rosenberg knows as much about the problems of manpower as anyone. All of these men and the Armed Services Committee state publicly that Mrs. Rosenberg is a loyal and patriotic American. What more should a person have to be entitled to confirmation?

I believe that the Senate ought to confirm Mrs. Rosenberg, but more than that is required. Much of Mrs. Rosenberg's effectiveness has clearly been destroyed. Unfounded and unsupported charges against her have been accepted by many Americans as being true. The Senate ought to do all it can to restore Mrs. Rosenberg's effectiveness. The committee hearings ought to be made public, and Senators ought through statements to tell everybody what Mrs. Rosenberg is not, as well as what she is. Her success is of importance to every American. She must not be permitted to be ineffective or to fail because people generally have not been told who she really is and what she can really accomplish for the good of us all. Committee members are the ones most qualified to talk of these things.

On the assumption that Mrs. Rosenberg is to be confirmed by the Senate I would conclude that there is something striking and promising about the appointment. It means to me that, if my country finds it necessary fully to mobilize, we shall go about that task in a full way. Aside from the fundamental question of loyalty we shall only be concerned with what a person can do, and no longer concerned with who is this person and where does he or she come from. Mrs. Rosenberg is some of those things which in the past have not qualified a person for authority and influence in a man's world. If she gets away with her monumental undertaking it will mean that others of like backgrounds will be given a chance to serve America.

For us to conquer the deep seated trouble of the present, for us to have a real chance to live tomorrow, it will be imperative for every American to stand by and offer his abilities. It will be just an imperative that these abilities be made use of without regard to race, or place of birth, or sex. Mrs. Rosenberg's appointment is actually an experiment. For the good of the Nation I pray that it works.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that last evening I voted against confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wilson. Because there may not be a yea-and-nay vote today on the nomination of Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, of New York, I want the RECORD to show that if there were a yea-and-nay vote I would vote against her nomination.

I wish the RECORD further to show that if there were a yea-and-nay vote on the nomination of Stephen Spingarn, of New York, I would also vote against his nomination.

I call attention to the fact that if the nomination of Mr. Spingarn is confirmed, the Federal Trade Commission will have honored five members from the State of New York. I further call the attention of the Senate to the fact that for 61 years no person has been appointed from the State of North Dakota to any single policy-making group, as the head of any Department, as a member of the Cabinet, as an Ambassador, or as a consul.

IMPORTANCE OF FULL REPORT ON MEETING OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT NATIONS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, our Secretary of State has just returned from a meeting with appropriate representatives of the North Atlantic Pact nations. His remarks to the press; upon his arrival home, were that the meeting was a success and that the cause of peace has been advanced.

It is to be hoped that an adequate disclosure on this meeting will be forthcoming to the Senate within a reasonable time. We must know the extent of any commitments made in behalf of the United States, and we must have an opportunity to weigh those commitments in the manner prescribed by law. While we fully appreciate the security requirements which govern such disclosure, we must be in a position to protect the public interest in these most critical times. Confidence of the public can be earned only by guaranteeing the representation of its interests in policies the fulfillment of which must be borne by the public.

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN J. SPINGARN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last night I spoke in support of the nomination of Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg. I should like now to say a few words about the nomination of Mr. Stephen J. Spingarn to be a member of the Federal Trade Commission. I have known Mr. Spingarn officially through contacts I had with him in his position as general legislative assistant to the President. I understand that he has a record of 16 years of devoted public service. He is what we call a career man. As such, his nomination seems to me to be a most happy and satisfactory one.

I have read the record of Mr. Spingarn's testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. That testimony impressed me as being that of a man who is highly knowledgeable, alert, and extremely well informed on the broad economic problems that will

face him as a member of the Federal Trade Commission. At the same time his mind is open on several of the most controversial and complex problems now before the Federal Trade Commission. He showed a grasp of these problems without any prejudice regarding their solution. I can think of no better approach for a new member of this Commission.

A nominee for a high post should certainly not be judged on the basis of his family connections. But I cannot refrain from stating that I have known Mr. Spingarn's family for four generations. The name is an eminently honorable one in the annals of my State—honored not only for integrity of character and civic leadership but also for many contributions to the public good and for unselfish devotion to the cause of human betterment.

From what I know of Mr. Spingarn he is a young man in the tradition of his family. I can give him no finer tribute. I know that the Senate will confirm this nomination.

I wish to be recorded not only in support but also in praise of the President's action in making this designation.

CONGRESSIONAL IMMUNITY

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, last August before the adjournment of Congress I introduced two measures in the Senate. They were appropriately referred, but no action was taken upon them. I do not like to see the Eighty-first Congress adjourn without expressing myself with reference to those two measures. They deal with the immunity enjoyed by Members of Congress.

Article 1, section 6, of our Constitution, gives to Members of Congress the privilege to make defamatory, smearing statements, and to practice demagoguery with complete immunity from laws applied to all other citizens of our country.

This unusual special privilege was placed in the Constitution by the founding fathers with apparently little or no discussion or debate, it having been lifted almost in identical form from the English law:

For any speech or debate in either House they shall not be questioned in any other place.

We must remember that the Constitutional convention was only shortly removed from English rule. The Members of the convention were cognizant of and alert to the inherent danger which lies in control of legislative bodies by the executive, then known as the King. So our doctrine of legislative immunity from arrest for any cause, except treason, felony, or breach of the peace and from questioning in any other place for speeches and debates in either House was promulgated in England as a necessary protection, not from the people represented in the Parliament, but from the executive crown. The Parliament in session must be allowed to criticize the King without fear of retaliation in the form of arrest or civil suits. If not, the democratic processes in England would fail. Therefore, it was plainly and definitely the intention of the Parliament to seek protection not from their constituents, but from the King.

This doctrine was embodied completely in the Constitution of the United States and in the constitutions of our several States, and there it remains today. In a long list of court cases growing out of abuse of this privilege, immunity from arrest is well established by a series of decisions, all of which are clear and concise with reference to immunity enjoyed. Unfortunately many recent decisions have expanded the coverage of this immunity to other government administrative and quasi judicial personnel. The courts have ruled that a Cabinet officer acting within the scope of his duty may issue public statements derogatory to the character of individual citizens with absolute immunity.

Most Members of Congress, and certainly all of our constituents, would be surprised, amazed, and appalled if they knew and fully realized the extent to which this doctrine of privilege and immunity can be applied without equivalent precautions against abuse. Surely it was the intention of the framers of our Constitution that immunity should apply to words spoken in the Halls of Congress, but, as construed by our courts, immunity is applicable to speeches which are never made or uttered before the Congress but which can be written or adopted by Members of Congress as extensions of imaginary remarks and broadcast throughout the country in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The doctrine of immunity has been applied to committee reports and to testimony embraced in committee hearings.

During the days of the constitutional convention the power of the press was feeble as compared with the power of the press of today. Other means of dissemination of news was nonexistent, while today we have the great national and world-wide circulation of magazines, radio, and television. So, when I, as a Member of Congress, either knowingly or without intent to smear and injure, make an official statement derogatory to any person, the tactic pays off in three ways. First, it makes of me, as a Member of Congress, a man to be feared; second, it discredits my opponents, and in the third place it gives to me publicity, which in some cases may be my paramount objective. Words spoken by Members of Congress, and especially on the floor of the United States Senate, carry great weight and are still, I think, accepted by the people as statements of truth from authoritative sources. They are universally accepted as facts. Therefore, so long as our Constitution carries this clause, Members in either body of this or any other Congress may make unfounded and unsubstantiated charges against named individuals, and every American citizen is in acute danger of losing his constitutional right to defend himself.

The Congress, in each and every law passed, has a fundamental purpose, namely, protection of some right or privilege of one, some, or all citizens. Surely the protection of the guaranteed rights of the citizens under the Constitution is the primary function of this body.

If situations should confront us when we of the Congress are no longer able to control our own Members by the rules of

society, justice, and fair play, then we must take drastic steps to control them, steps which will take away our right to immunity, and by doing so reestablish the right of fair trial and opportunity of defense on the part of the individual citizen.

The irony of the situation lies in the fact that we, of the Congress, who are elected for the prime purpose of protecting our constituents, while allowing to remain in the Constitution that provision which gives us the privilege to attack our constituents and seek cover under the cloak of immunity, at the same time retain rules of the Senate which make it impossible to attack each other, thus affording ourselves protection we will not grant to the people.

So I repeat, the right of each and every American citizen of self defense may be violated by Members of Congress who are elected to defend these very rights.

Newspapers carry banner headlines of our accusations, radios blare them, accusations, whether true or false, are constantly battered into the minds of the people.

But what of the accused? His voice is the voice of one crying in the wilderness, a voice unable to make himself heard because of constitutional immunity, because of article 1, section 6, of the Constitution.

I repeat, this was not the intention of the founding fathers. Their intention was to keep the legislator on the job, and to protect him from harassment of civil suit. They unquestionably did not intend to aid and abet him in the violation of democratic rights of the citizens which had been established only after centuries of struggle.

This problem of immunity, of freedom from questioning, must be solved. Therefore I have offered in the Senate a joint resolution to repeal that part of section 6 of article I of the Constitution which reads:

And for any speech or debate in either House they shall not be questioned in any other place.

This joint resolution may be considered by some Members of Congress to be harsh. They will question the advisability of lifting this congressional shield, and thereby making Members of the Congress legally responsible and legally reliable for their words and actions. To my way of thinking, however, the time has arrived when the American citizen wishes no longer to tolerate such high-handed, irresponsible actions, and no longer to permit himself to be deprived by congressional action of his reputation, of his position, of his home, and have his family injured without the right to defend himself. We have placed the citizens of this country in the position of not being informed of the nature and cause of the accusation, of not being confronted by the witnesses against them, of not being able to obtain witnesses in their favor, and of not being able to have the assistance of counsel for their defense.

All too long Congress, if not in law in actuality, has placed Mr. John Q. Citizen, our constituent, if you please, Mr. President in double jeopardy. He is tried in

committee and subcommittee, in the newspapers and on the radio. Then if an iota of evidence is found upon which a legal action may be based he is again tried in a court of law.

In event my colleagues do not see the wisdom of removing this special privilege which we enjoy, and pursuing further the possibility, should we continue to be immune, of devising some method which will not require citizens of the United States to suffer by our deeds without a remedy, I have introduced legislation which will parallel the development of Government liability to suit upon contracts and for torts. Originally the Government could not be sued upon any grounds whatsoever—"The king could do no wrong." Later it was recognized that this was unjust, and Government by an act of Congress, has consented to be sued upon contracts.

The extension of governmental liabilities is based upon the sound ground that where the conduct of a governmental business involves a loss to a citizen, such as when the driver of a Government motor vehicle inexcusably wrecks a citizen's car, the loss should be borne as a cost of Government, and therefore the injury or loss is borne as a cost of Government so that the whole people, not the individual damaged, bear the cost.

The application of this doctrine to congressional immunity is clear. It is something which has been suggested recently by two members of the New York bar, both graduates of the University of Cornell and the Yale Law School. Thus the remedy would be for Congress to pass an act permitting a party so injured to sue the United States Government for defamatory statements for which, if it were not for congressional immunity, he could obtain redress by law.

The great advantage of such an act would be the financial reparation made to the individual libeled. An unjust charge, for example, of communistic leanings, can cause a person great financial harm—perhaps the total loss of job and job opportunities. The problem of extending damages resulting from congressional libel is the same as in all other libel cases.

A sum of money, however, can never completely compensate a person for a lost reputation, but the very fact of winning a judgment would help to restore his reputation. A citizen asking employment after being libeled by a Member of Congress could show a prospective employer the judgment vindicating him. While the newspapers and radio commentators would never play up the story of his being cleared by 12 good men, nevertheless it would be a news item within the community where the plaintiff lived, and the embarrassment of being proved wrong might supply the restraint now lacking for those very few who willfully promulgate libel.

The time to correct this unfair, unjust favor and privilege given to Members of Congress is long past due. Suggestions I have made will never compensate for the injuries suffered by all too many good citizens down through the years, but will prevent recurrence of

such unhappy, unnecessary, and cruel situations.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. HUNT. I decline to yield at the moment. I have practically concluded my statement.

Mr. President, I intend to reintroduce the two measures immediately after the Eighty-second Congress convenes. I expect at that time to press for action on one of the measures.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee desires to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question. There remains 1 minute before the time set for the vote.

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Wyoming upon the work he has done on this very important matter, and I desire to associate myself with the general purpose he has in mind. The proposal of the Senator should be given careful and immediate consideration. Maintaining the prestige of Congress as well as fair treatment to the individual citizen requires legislation of this kind.

I wish to ask the Senator a question. If a plan such as the one here presented were adopted, would it to some extent, at least, have alleviated a great deal of the hard work the Senate Armed Services Committee has had to do in ferreting out and finally bringing to light the facts in regard to the improper and unjustified charges which were made against Mrs. Rosenberg? And let me say that I think Mrs. Rosenberg a most capable woman; I know she will make a splendid Assistant Secretary of Defense, and I regret exceedingly that she has had to go through such a dreadful humiliation which was inspired by evil design. Would not the Senator's proposal at least make such a smear more unlikely?

Mr. HUNT. I should like to say to the Senator from Tennessee that the hearings before the Armed Services Committee upon the Anna M. Rosenberg nomination primarily prompted me to deliver these remarks today, although, as I have said, they are long overdue and should have been made long ago.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—NOMINATION OF ANNA M. ROSENBERG

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time has expired; and the Senate is to vote now on the nomination of Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes to make an explanation of the report made by the Armed Services Committee respecting the pending nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to postponing for 2 minutes the time for voting on the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on December 19, on behalf of the Armed Services

Committee, the Senator from Virginia made a unanimous report from the committee, recommending confirmation of the nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg to be Assistant Secretary of Defense. This is the second time the Committee on Armed Services has unanimously recommended the confirmation of this nomination.

I have been a Member of the Senate for 18 years. I have never participated in an investigation of charges made against a nominee whose nomination was before the Senate that was conducted with greater diligence or more searchingly than was this investigation of the charges made against Anna M. Rosenberg. Not only did the committee hear every witness who desired to be heard, but we even investigated rumors, by subpoenaing those who were supposed to have made statements critical of Mrs. Rosenberg. Twenty-five hours were consumed in the hearings, and 1,053 pages of testimony were taken.

The result was that the committee has unanimously reported to the Senate that there is not one scintilla of evidence to support the charge that Mrs. Rosenberg at any time was sympathetic to communism or was a Communist.

Mr. President, as chairman of a subcommittee, I wish to state that the President of the United States permitted the subcommittee, composed of myself, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], to inspect the files of the FBI. Not a single criticism of Mrs. Rosenberg's loyalty to the country was contained in those files. To the contrary, there was much commendation.

Mr. President, the suggestion of nomination was made personally to the President by Secretary of Defense Marshall, as is shown in the report. There are in the files and in the hearings letters from General Eisenhower, Secretary Stuart Symington, Mr. Baruch, James F. Byrnes, Colonel Hobby, Robert P. Patterson, General Smith, and many others, testifying as to Mrs. Rosenberg's loyalty and efficiency.

I wish to read the concluding portion of the committee report, comprising the committee's findings and recommendation:

COMMITTEE FINDINGS

After a thorough and meticulous investigation of all the charges made, it is the unanimous opinion of the members of the Armed Services Committee that evidence has not been submitted to support the charges against the nominee. Furthermore, it is the unanimous opinion of the committee that the nominee is qualified to fill the position to which she has been appointed.

RECOMMENDATION

It is the unanimous recommendation of all members of the Armed Services Committee that the Senate confirm the nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire report be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (Ex. Rept. No. 16) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg to be Assistant Secretary of

Defense, a position to which she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, having considered the same, submit the following report to accompany said nomination reported to the Senate on November 30, 1950.

It is unusual for committees of the Senate in submitting recommendations with respect to Presidential nominations for confirmation to file a written report with the Senate. However, because of unusual circumstances surrounding the Armed Services Committee's consideration of the nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, and the grave charges made against the nominee, the committee at the conclusion of the recent hearings in the case voted to file a report with the Senate.

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION FOR CONFIRMATION

The nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, a position to which she was appointed during the recent recess of the Congress, was referred to the Armed Services Committee on November 27, 1950. On November 29, Mrs. Rosenberg was requested to appear before the committee. She testified under oath relative to her qualifications for the position to which she was appointed, her business connections, alleged membership in disloyal and subversive groups, and other pertinent information. At the conclusion of this hearing the nine members of the committee present voted unanimously to recommend her confirmation to the Senate. A printed record of the testimony of this hearing has been made available for Members of the Senate and general distribution.

CHARGES AGAINST NOMINEE

Shortly thereafter some members of the committee received oral and written statements to the effect that named witnesses could be produced who would swear that Mrs. Rosenberg had been a member of a Communist-front organization, was considered to be a member of the Communist Party, and had assisted in placing Communists in high Government positions.

COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

The committee met on December 5 to consider these grave charges against the nominee. Subpoenas were issued for those persons who were purported to have knowledge of these allegations. The committee held six sessions, each of 3- to 4-hour duration, to hear all witnesses who might have knowledge of any disloyal activities of the nominee. The record of these hearings consists of 1,053 pages of transcribed testimony. The attendance of the committee members at these hearings was excellent, and at no time during the presentation of evidence were there less than seven members present.

One witness, Ralph De Sola, testified that he, of his own knowledge, knew Anna M. Rosenberg to be a member of the John Reed Club in either 1934 or 1935, a known Communist-front organization, while he was also a member. He stated that he saw her at four or five meetings of the club and was introduced and talked to her on one occasion. De Sola stated that he recognized the nominee from pictures and from personal observation to be the same person that he met at a meeting of the John Reed Club in 1935. The person named by De Sola as introducing him to Mrs. Rosenberg did not only fail to corroborate De Sola's testimony but stated that he had never attended a meeting of the John Reed Club and did not know the nominee. Others named by De Sola as prominent in the John Reed Club at that time likewise had no knowledge of Mrs. Rosenberg's membership or attendance at meetings of the club. De Sola further testified that he had in 1937 turned over to an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation named George Starr information concerning Mrs. Rosenberg's membership in the John Reed Club and other Communist activities.

in which she has participated. George Starr in testifying before the committee recalled talking with De Sola but did not recall any mention of Anna M. Rosenberg. He further stated that had De Sola transmitted to him information relative to Anna M. Rosenberg's connection with Communist activities, such information would have been transmitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for inclusion in the Rosenberg file.

At the request of the committee, and by direction of the President, the complete FBI files on Anna M. Rosenberg were inspected by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, consisting of Senators BYRD, HUNT, and CAIN. Each subcommittee member indicated that after a thorough reading of the file there was nothing therein to substantiate De Sola's statement or to indicate in any way that Mrs. Rosenberg was a disloyal person.

Other charges of disloyalty to her country brought to the attention of the committee have all been thoroughly investigated with the conclusion that there is no evidence to support the charges.

The transcribed testimony of the witnesses before the committee relative to the nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg has been printed and made available for distribution.

As of December 19, after the completion of hearings, the committee was advised by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that their agents have located an Anna Rosenberg who was associated with the John Reed Club in New York City in the early 1930's. This woman, whose maiden name was Anna Rosenberg, admits to the FBI agents that she was associated with the John Reed Club in New York City from shortly after its founding until 1934, when she moved to California, and that she knew of no other Anna Rosenberg who was associated with the John Reed Club.

QUALIFICATIONS OF THE NOMINEE

Practically the entire working part of Mrs. Rosenberg's life has been spent in personnel, labor-relations, and manpower work. Until her appointment as Assistant Secretary of Defense she was engaged in this type of business in New York, having several responsible and well-known clients. She has also served the Government on many important boards and commissions.

Mrs. Rosenberg was personal representative of President Roosevelt in 1944 and of President Truman in 1945 to study military manpower problems in the European theater. From 1942 to 1945 she was secretary of the President's Labor Victory Board. Further, she was a member of the Advisory Board of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion from 1944 to 1947. She was a member of the Manpower Consulting Committee of the Army and Navy Munitions Board. She was a member of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training and allied matters connected with national defense. During the war Governor Lehman appointed her a member of the New York State War Council and Governor Dewey continued her appointment.

Until recently Mrs. Rosenberg was a member of the Committee on Mobilization Policy of the National Security Resources Board and a special manpower consultant to the Chairman of that Board, Mr. W. Stuart Symington.

At the time of the original hearing on the nomination of Mrs. Rosenberg, General Marshall sent the following telegram to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee:

"Lovett informs me your committee asked him the circumstances surrounding Mrs. Rosenberg's appointment as Assistant Secretary of Defense. I want you to know that I personally thought of her and selected her for the position without suggestion, or recommendation, or consultation from anyone. I advised no one, other than Lovett

and Mrs. Rosenberg, of my selection until I talked to the President on election day.

"G. C. MARSHALL,
"Secretary of Defense."

Since the appointment was made the committee has received messages of unqualified support of the nominee from General Eisenhower, Secretary Stuart Symington, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, Hon. James F. Byrnes, Col. Oveta Culp Hobby, Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Gen. Bedell Smith, and numerous others. The committee received over 1,000 messages for and against the nominee. It is significant to note that all the messages indicating personal knowledge of Mrs. Rosenberg and her work voice approval of the nomination.

COMMITTEE FINDINGS

After a thorough and meticulous investigation of all the charges made it is the unanimous opinion of the members of the Armed Services Committee that evidence has not been submitted to support the charges against the nominee. Furthermore, it is the unanimous opinion of the committee that the nominee is qualified to fill the position to which she has been appointed.

RECOMMENDATION

It is the unanimous recommendation of all members of the Armed Services Committee that the Senate confirm the nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense?

MR. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert at this point in the RECORD a statement in regard to Mrs. Rosenberg.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The statement submitted by Mr. BENTON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENTON

Mr. President, it would not be fitting for me to permit Mrs. Rosenberg's name to come before the Senate for confirmation without speaking briefly. I have known her more intimately and have seen her far more frequently than has any other Member of Congress.

In the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, she has been through what she calls an "ordeal." I shall not now try to draw any moral for the Senate from these hearings. There are many Members of the Senate far better qualified to do this. I hope they will do it. What we can learn applied to future hearings, I leave to my seniors to suggest. But I may say that I very much like one suggestion reported in the press: That public hearings of charges against the character of a nominee for office be given a preliminary screening by the committee staff, or in some other fashion, before they are thrown into the front page headlines and put under the klieg lights.

Mrs. Rosenberg is, of course, far better able to withstand false charges and vilification than are most appointees. The press and radio know her well. She has as large a group of influential and powerful friends as any private citizen in the United States.

I first met her in 1940. I was introduced to her by the chairman of one of our great corporations. He introduced her with the amazing statement, "Here is one of the half dozen most influential people of the United States." I thought I knew the country pretty well. It was my business. Yet I had never heard of her. Her alleged influence came out of the confidence she enjoyed of President Roosevelt, as well as Governor

Lehman, Mayor LaGuardia, and many others of our great leaders with whom she worked intimately—and daily. Indeed, Mr. David Rockefeller, at the completion of his term as secretary to Mayor LaGuardia, told me that there was nobody in his judgment in whom the mayor had such implicit confidence.

Many who did not know Mrs. Rosenberg—at that time felt that her influence and her so-called power rested wholly upon these personal relationships. The fact that this is not true has now again been attested to by her choice by General Marshall—as it has previously by her selection on many key boards—and further by her amazing record of achievement in her own private business since the termination of the war.

I first worked with Mrs. Rosenberg in 1940 when we both served as consultants and advisors to Mr. Nelson Rockefeller. Five years later when he resigned as Assistant Secretary of State, he personally told me that without her guidance and counsel he could not have hoped to establish his great record in the field of Inter-American Affairs. Mrs. Rosenberg's firm in New York not only serves Mr. Nelson Rockefeller and other members of the Rockefeller family as clients, but serves Col. John Hay Whitney, the great firm of Lazard Freres, R. H. Macy & Co., and many other of America's great enterprises. I am proud of my own connections with her, which are numerous.

Now, what is the extraordinary quality about this immigrant girl—this girl born in Budapest who migrated to this country at the age 13 or 14—what is the extraordinary quality that makes her so influential year in and year out, and makes her list of clients the finest and most envied in the entire field of public and personal relations.

I once compared her to Mr. Jesse Jones, who for more than a decade so brilliantly served his country in post after post here in Washington. I worked closely with Secretary of Commerce Jones throughout the war years after he appointed me vice chairman of the original board of trustees of the Committee for Economic Development. Mr. Jones personally selected and approved the 45 or 50 original appointments to the group which established the Committee for Economic Development, a group that expanded into some seventy thousand by the end of the war. Mr. Clarence Francis, Chairman of the Board of General Foods, once told me that Jesse Jones was the finest judge of men he had ever seen. Mr. Jones' great administrative gifts grew, I came to believe, from what I shall call his intimate touch with reality. He had an uncanny talent for going to the real heart of a problem. He knew what people wanted. He knew what was actually in their minds regardless of what they said. He knew where the dangers and risks lay. He knew how to use incentives and rewards.

This keen sense of reality is the distinguishing quality which Mrs. Rosenberg's rich clients are willing to pay heavily to get. Mr. Jones has used his talent for himself, and for his country. Mrs. Rosenberg has used hers for her friends and clients and for her country which she loves with an unrivalled passion.

I once said of Mrs. Rosenberg that "She has a genius for candor." But candor is not one of the gods' real gifts—unless it is keyed to a keen and unwavering sense of reality.

I do not say that Mrs. Rosenberg is the most remarkable woman that I have ever known. I have known remarkable women who shall be nameless on the floor of the Senate—and elsewhere.

But I say unequivocally that Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg is the most extraordinary human being that I have ever known and that her gifts are unique.

Mr. President, these gifts are today greatly needed by the American people here in our Government in Washington. General Marshall is to be congratulated on bringing them

to the service of the people. General Marshall's great prestige makes it difficult for his subordinates to talk up to him. I worked under him for almost a year as Assistant Secretary of State and later served under him, while he was still Secretary of State, as chairman of two United States delegations at international conferences. General Marshall is an avid listener; he is a skilled questioner; but it is not easy for his subordinates, against his great experience and background, to hammer their way into his office and to deliver themselves in a few minutes of opinions and experiences which may have taken months to form. This must be even more true in the Department of Defense where General Marshall served for more than 40 years and where he has forgotten much more than most of his subordinates will ever learn. It is not easy for any executive to find subordinates who can and will speak up, and I ask the Senate to imagine General Marshall's problems in the Pentagon.

General Marshall's appointment of Mrs. Rosenberg shows his talent as an executive. He of course knows that her experience embracing labor management relations and manpower problems, over the past 17 years, is unrivalled by any man or woman anywhere. But he also senses his own need for fearless talk, for outside criticism, for candid and courageous appraisal all of this he will get from Mrs. Rosenberg. He knows she is better qualified for this role—not merely than anyone he can get—but than anybody, anywhere. Indeed, I know that she would never have accepted this appointment had she not herself seen this great need of the general's and properly appraised her own capacity to contribute to it.

This is not the first offer of high post that Mrs. Rosenberg has had in Washington. She has turned down higher. It is only due to the great crisis we face that she accepted this appointment at such personal sacrifice.

Mr. President, as with so many things—which turn out unexpectedly—I believe that this ordeal to which Mrs. Rosenberg has been subjected will prove to be a good thing for the country and a good thing for her and for General Marshall. There is, in these hearings, the operation of what I like to call the law of the opposite effect. This is one of my favorite laws and we see it operating all around us. These hearings were designed to besmirch Mrs. Rosenberg. Their effect is just the opposite. What the hearings have done is to bring to the attention of every single member of the Senate, and to the country as a whole, the remarkable record and background of our new Assistant Secretary of Defense, and her extraordinary qualifications for the job. The hearings have forced each and everyone of us to the realization that we have an extraordinary figure in the Defense Department fully capable to discharge the great responsibilities which are hers. Now that the Senate knows the background of this amazing woman, she will not lack defenders when the attacks mount around her. In her job she will be forced to do unpopular things. Yes, here is a dirty assignment. When she boldly makes the tough decisions, we of the Senate will not have to ask: "Who is this Mrs. Rosenberg?" We shall know, and through knowing, we shall have confidence in the action taken. The country will know. And the country will have confidence.

Indeed, Mr. President, a day or two ago I jestingly asked Mrs. Rosenberg whether she had personally planned these hearings. I told her that I had always known that she was smart but I had never thought that anybody could be smart enough to come to Washington with a plan by which Representative RANKIN and Mr. Gerald K. Smith combined their forces in an attack upon him.

Mr. President, I congratulate the Committee on Armed Services on the patience and thoroughness with which it has conducted these unpleasant hearings. I congratulate

the committee on the unanimity of its findings. In particular, I congratulate Senator CAIN for his sympathy and support—and I urge upon the Senate the immediate and unanimous approval of this recommendation from the committee on which we are now to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next nomination on the Executive Calendar is that of Stephen J. Spingarn, of New York. The nomination will be read by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen J. Spingarn, of New York, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to his nomination? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that now that these nominations have been confirmed, the Senate has returned to the consideration of legislative business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Executive Calendar has not been concluded.

The next nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Gibson, of Michigan, to be a member of the Displaced Persons Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY, AIR FORCE, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Inasmuch as there has been some consideration of taking an adjournment this week, the Chair suggests that consideration be given to notifying the President of the confirmations of nominations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, while the Senate is in executive session, I report favorably, with a unanimous report from the Committee on Armed Services, sundry nominations in the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps, extending from the grade of admiral or general down through the grade of lieutenant. The committee's report is unanimous on the part of both the Democratic and the Republican members of the committee.

Inasmuch as the printing bill in this case would amount to several hundred dollars, I suggest that there is precedent for considering the nominations at this time. No objections have been raised to them. I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask the distinguished Senator from California whether included among the appointments are any of civilians, or are all the appointments in the military or armed services?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There are no civilian appointments; all of them are in the armed services, the military.

Mr. WHERRY. All of them are routine, are they?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; and they are unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, without the necessity of having them printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations heretofore approved by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified in these cases.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous consent agreement entered into earlier today House bill 9920 is the unfinished business.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9920) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in regard to the bill, so that the Senate will know what has been done by the Appropriations Committee.

The committee very largely accepted the House version of the bill, with the addition of two items. One is the stockpiling item, involving an amount of \$1,800,000,000. The other is the atomic-energy item. The two items together constitute a difference, as compared with the amount carried in the House version of the bill, of a little more than \$2,000,000,000.

That is all I wish to say.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the Senate Appropriations Committee be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the practice which has long been in existence, the committee amendments are to be read and considered first.

MILITARY AND NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, from the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the bill H. R. 9893 and I submit a report (No. 2687) thereon. I desire to make a very brief statement.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is this the military construction bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is.

Mr. WHERRY. In order that we may be able to plan our program here, may I ask the Senator whether he intends to ask that the appropriation bill be temporarily laid aside and this measure be considered now?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do. I now state very briefly the reasons why I shall do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the second supplemental appropriations bill, which is now the pending business, there are contained a large number of items of appropriations for construction of certain public works which the Department of Defense says are essential to the defense of the United States. The bill passed the House and has been reported by the Senate Committee without having followed the customary method of authorizing these works by express statute. In other words, we have the cart before the horse. In an effort to get the horse before the cart, the Senate Committee on Armed Services this morning reported unanimously, and without amendment, the bill which passed the House on yesterday, giving statutory authorization for the construction of these works. The bill, in round figures, authorizes \$1,600,000,000 worth of construction. There are contained in the appropriation bill appropriations for approximately \$1,500,000 of that amount. In other words, more than 90 percent of the authorization is already contained in the appropriation bill which the Senator from Tennessee has made the unfinished business.

In the interest of regular parliamentary procedure, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 9893.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to the request—I am wondering whether the distinguished Senator would merely make another observation as to how passing this bill before the appropriation bill is passed may facilitate the entire procedure.

Mr. RUSSELL. It will certainly remove any doubt whatever as to the authority of the Department of Defense to proceed with these very necessary defense projects.

Mr. WHERRY. And that is the purpose of putting the authorization bill ahead of the appropriation bill, is it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and also to maintain the regular procedure which has always obtained, in that authorizations are generally enacted by the Congress before appropriations are made to carry out an authorization that does not exist.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask the Senator this question: The Senator is a member of both the Committee on Ap-

propriations and the Committee on Armed Services. Is it not a fact that if we pass the appropriation bill, we shall be appropriating a large sum of money, the authorization for some of which are carried in the bill of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. As I stated, more than 90 percent of the authorization is carried in the appropriation bill.

Mr. WHERRY. So that they should really go together, but the authorization should come ahead of the appropriation, and that is the sole purpose. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the only purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection at all to the immediate consideration of the bill, and I thank the Senator from Georgia for his observations. Of course, we can argue the merits of the authorization, but in view of the fact that we are already appropriating, as the Senator from Georgia said, for 90 percent of the authorization, we may as well get the authorization in first.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that what the Senator from Georgia is trying to do is to insure that each one of the projects shall go before the respective committees for authorization?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a fact. Otherwise, the bill might be subject to a point of order. It would not be subject to a point of order in this case, because the House has already approved. But it certainly would be in the direction of orderly procedure to do what has been suggested.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the Senator is correct as to the problem as he has outlined it. I think the Senator from Georgia will agree with me that appropriating money without having the proper standing committee of the Senate being given an opportunity to study, pass on, and authorize or disapprove the various projects included is bad procedure. I think the Senator from Georgia agrees with that, and he is taking the only recourse which he can take consistently with getting us back again on the right track.

I should like to say further that so far as the Defense Establishment is concerned, I think, not only in the committee but on the floor of the Senate, the Defense Department and every other department wants to have due notice that in the future they shall proceed in an orderly way, and that the proper legislative committees of the Senate have a full opportunity to hear the evidence and study such a complex and substantial bill as is this one, without coming in for appropriations.

Mr. RUSSELL. Every standing committee of the Senate is very jealous of its powers, and properly so, to consider proposed legislation before appropriations are made.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether he thinks it advisable to take steps to change the law, which has been changed piecemeal, in war emergencies, so that the Defense Department cannot undertake this procedure in the future.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly want to exercise every possible precaution to protect the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. That committee is composed of Senators who have been working intimately with the question of national defense, and I think every step should be taken to see that the Defense Establishment in the future does apprise the Senate Committee on Armed Services of plans and intentions in advance of going to the Committee on Appropriations. I say that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and as one who is very proud of his membership on that committee. It is a procedure which has been followed throughout the course of the history of our country.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, as I understand the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, primarily the point he has in mind is that by allowing the appropriation bill to be acted upon before action is taken on the authorization bill we do not thereby establish a precedent which might be dangerous not only during wartime but also in peacetime.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. I wish to say that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] cooperated wholeheartedly with me in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator will discuss fully the appropriations, as I understand this bill is being reported without amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. So that the authorizations are the exact amounts approved by the House; is that a fact?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand the authorization was \$1,650,000,000. The reason why I am asking these questions is that there is no report accompanying the bill. Possibly the Senator had intended to give us all that information.

Mr. RUSSELL. The correct figure is \$1,658,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that in the supplemental appropriation bill the House approved an appropriation of \$1,430,000,000 of the authorization. What I should like to have the distinguished Senator point out is that no doubt the House bill was strictly for military construction projects which were absolutely necessary, and I should like to have an explanation, if the Senator can give it, of the projects.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I cannot give the information down to the last dollar and cent, but I will say that most of the difference is in the completion of the projects which are started under the appropriations contained in the bill which is the unfinished business before the Senate. One of the reasons given by the Defense Establishment for not requesting the entire \$1,658,000,000 was that they knew there would be another appropriation bill which would cover the difference between the \$1,430,000,000 appropriated and the \$1,658,000,000 authorized.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not had time to examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning. Does the Senator know why the committee appropriated \$1,430,000,000, and did not appropriate more? Was it because it was not asked for at that time?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate will permit, the Chair desires to congratulate the Senate on its good attendance, but the Chair hopes it will not be denied the right to congratulate the Senate on its good order. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in the absence of a report accompanying the bill, if the Senator from Georgia can give us the information I have suggested, I should appreciate it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, that question would more properly arise on the consideration of the appropriation bill which appropriates the funds. But it is my understanding that the Defense Establishment did not ask for the money, because it did not feel it could be authorized or contracted for or expended before there would be another appropriation bill. The Committee on Appropriations, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar], has allowed in the bill every dollar which the Defense Establishment sought for military purposes. The Senator from Nebraska, being one of the ranking members of that committee, knows that to be the fact. There may be differences as to our foreign policy, but we have been united as one man in responding to every request of the Defense Establishment to provide for the men of America who are being summoned to the colors in this perilous period.

Mr. WHERRY. So, if the House committee considered the bill at the time the Senate considered it, there probably would not be the difference between what was appropriated and what the authorization asked for.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the difference would still be there. Very frequently Congress will authorize a great deal more than is requested in an appropriation bill because of the length of time covered by a contract.

Mr. WHERRY. Then there is no dispute in the findings of the Senate committee and the House committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have reported the House bill without amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the entire authorization for military construction?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is all for military construction.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My memory is not sufficiently clear, but I think that every project in the authorization bill has been started. There are three or four items which, as the Senator from Georgia has stated, are not appropriated for in full because the Military Establishment did not request the amount in full; but every item has been started.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has stated the matter, as I understand it.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, at the beginning of his remarks the Senator said something about public works projects to be authorized. Now he mentions only military projects.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I used the term "public works," instead of "military public works," it was certainly an oversight on my part, because the bill refers only to military projects.

Mr. WATKINS. As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I do not remember that the committee received any communications with relation to such projects.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assure the Senator that the Committee on Armed Services is not in any way infringing upon the prerogatives of the Committee on Public Works. These are strictly military projects which come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WATKINS. I am not at all complaining of any infringement on the prerogatives of the Committee on Public Works. If there were any public-works projects involved, I merely wanted to get straight in my mind what they were. I am satisfied with the explanation of the Senator. I may have misunderstood his remarks with respect to public works.

Mr. RUSSELL. If I did not use the term "military public works" it was an omission on my part, because all the projects involved are military projects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 2687) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9893), to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to provide the authorization for the construction of facilities

required by the Department of Defense and to authorize the appropriation of funds to carry out this construction at locations within and outside the continental limits of the United States. A major portion of the funds required for the construction authorized in this bill, is contained in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1951 (H. R. 9920).

DISCUSSION OF THE BILL

On December 13, 1950, the President submitted to the Congress recommendations for the additional appropriation of funds for the Department of Defense totaling \$16,844,247,000. Included in this amount is approximately \$1,500,000,000 for new construction for the military services and for which this bill will provide the major part of the authorization.

The following paragraph is quoted from a letter from the Secretary of Defense to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee dated December 19, 1950:

"You have inquired as to the emergent nature of the projects contained in the justifications submitted by the three military departments in support of S. 4257. The public-works construction which the Department of Defense seeks by S. 4257 is urgently needed at this time. The projects embraced by that bill are needed now in order to broaden the mobilization base of the Armed Forces so that they will be prepared readily to meet the requirements of any mobilization that may be dictated by the international situation. That international situation has already led to the proclamation by the President of the United States of the existence of a national emergency. Time is of the essence with respect to those projects. Accordingly, it is extremely important for this Department to secure at the earliest possible time authority for the construction of those projects."

The Army second supplemental construction program, titles I and IA of the bill, totals \$390,896,900 for authorization. The program was assembled and based on the following principles:

(a) Current strategic requirements will be satisfied to the extent required at this time.

(b) Permanent facilities programmed will not exceed permanent requirements for forces in being on June 30, 1950.

(c) The total of new permanent and existing temporary and permanent facilities at an installation will not exceed emergency requirements.

(d) All existing mobilization-type facilities will be continued in use throughout the emergency and are not to be replaced with permanent construction.

The application of these principles has resulted in a program required by the expanded Army and which consists essentially of permanent construction. It accomplishes two main objectives: First and primarily, provision of long lead time construction items to improve our mobilization base; and, secondarily, provision of an additional increment of our permanent peacetime requirements, by proper location and selection of the facilities to be constructed.

Of the authorization being requested, \$299,300,000 is for construction in the continental United States; \$91,600,000 is for construction overseas and in Alaska.

The overseas portion consists of: \$28,100,000 to continue the program for the deployment of the peacetime forces in Alaska, and to provide logistical supporting facilities there; \$57,200,000 for vital facilities in other overseas areas; \$4,400,000 for temporary construction in Japan; \$900,000 for troop housing in Hawaii; \$1,000,000 for the advance design of overseas projects.

The sum of \$299,300,000 for the continental United States will provide for the following major categories of facilities: \$50,000,000 for facilities for antiaircraft defense of the United States; \$37,600,000 for facilities to

speed up the research and development program; \$37,300,000 for training facilities, including anti-aircraft and guided-missile training, as well as specialized training in other fields; \$3,800,000 for communications facilities; \$13,100,000 for housing of 6,455 troops; \$92,300,000 for increased warehouses and equipment maintenance shops, including \$29,100,000 for a new signal depot in the east; \$26,200,000 for a new finance administration center; \$27,500,000 for certain classified activities, including the Armed Forces special-weapons project; \$8,500,000 for certain industrial and port facilities and the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology; \$3,000,000 for advance design.

This authorization includes 42 sets of family quarters at isolated stations in the continental United States for which funding is not planned at this time. Also included is authorization for 635 sets of quarters in Alaska for which appropriations are being sought in the second supplemental appropriations bill.

The second supplemental program was developed prior to the conditions that now exist in Korea. It, therefore, represents planning which may require some changes dependent on decisions that may be reached on national and international levels. For example, this program accents research and development and improvement of the Army logistic system. Only \$13,100,000 is provided for troop housing in the United States. New plans may require a change in this emphasis. For that reason, the Army has asked for a degree of flexibility in the authorization act which is not normally accorded to peacetime programs. It needs the facilities provided for in this program, regardless of any changes in plans; however, new plans may bring into top urgency items not presently so considered.

A total of \$319,750,000 is being sought in the second supplemental appropriations bill to support total authorizations of \$390,896,900 contained in titles I and IA of this bill, H. R. 9893. It is anticipated that the total appropriation will be obligated during fiscal year 1951.

The Navy's request for authorization for public works in the 1951 second supplemental amounts to \$381,655,310, of which \$327,548,610 is for continental facilities and planning, and \$54,106,700 is for overseas facilities and planning.

The Navy's public works proposal is based on requirements due to the situation in the Far East, the increase in forces afloat, the build-up of our two Marine Corps divisions to full strength, and certain emergency repairs. Projects presented for appropriations are of a deficiency nature, and can be placed under contract before the end of fiscal year 1951.

Requested funds will be applied to the following:

- (a) Improvement of fleet-support activities in the western and central Pacific.
- (b) Augmentation of the Marine Corps shore establishment.
- (c) Airfield runways and facilities to provide safe operation for jet and long-range naval aircraft and for tactical and gunnery training.
- (d) Expansion of communications facilities.
- (e) Conversion of certain ordnance facilities in order to produce new and improved explosives.
- (f) Construction of additional aviation gasoline and jet fuel bulk storage to bring up our reserve storage.
- (g) Emergency repairs to certain naval shipyard installations.

Title II authorizes a total of 122 family quarters, all to be located at Inyokern, Calif., at a total cost of \$2,017,880. The justification is as follows:

(a) The naval ordnance test station, Inyokern, is one of the important Bureau of Ordnance research stations and is the most important one engaged in research in the

field of guided missiles. Lack of proper housing accommodations is the primary factor which most seriously affects the ability of the station to carry out its mission. Very little effective work can be obtained from employees, whose term of employment is from 6 to 8 months. Many new employees report on the station, spend a month or so getting cleared for secret material and being indoctrinated into their jobs, then fruitlessly wait on the housing list for 3 or 4 months, becoming more dissatisfied with barracks-type life all the time. They finally terminate after 6 or 8 months of employment when they find that it will be several years before they can expect to better their housing accommodations. This situation has been aggravated by the present emergency since some of those employees without any housing for their families or with housing which is inadequate, now feel that they had better seek employment elsewhere where conditions are better before they find themselves frozen in their jobs and unable to leave Inyokern.

The total Navy authorization of \$381,655,310 has been funded to the extent of \$303,378,000 in the second supplemental appropriation bill. It is anticipated that the entire sum will be obligated during fiscal year 1951.

The Air Force request for authorization in title III totals \$885,604,000, of which \$451,467,000 is in continental United States and \$367,150,000 is outside continental United States.

A large percentage of Air Force facilities are of mobilization and "far paper" (theater of operations) types of construction. In the last 5 years the facilities problem has been aggravated by the accelerating magnitude of demands imposed by new aircraft developments. Subsequent to World War II, public works have been limited.

To meet the facilities requirement generated by the scheduled limit activations and by the Air Force development plan, it is necessary that a vast Air Force construction program be embarked on at the earliest possible moment.

Stemming from the previously mentioned schedule of unit activations and operational requirements, a detailed study was undertaken to evolve a base-utilization program. In such a study as this the factors of force composition and time phasing become paramount. In arriving at the finalized base-utilization program certain basic concepts were employed. They are:

- (a) Maximum use of existing facilities currently under Air Force jurisdiction.
- (b) Maximum expansion of existing Air Force installations.
- (c) Maximum use and expansion of all other facilities available.

In developing this construction program the Air Force has used certain standards of construction, as follows:

(a) Air Force permanent 25-year-life construction: This type of permanent construction will conform to normal competitive commercial standards, providing an economical life of approximately 25 years with normal maintenance. This permanent construction will be used at all bases of the 48-wing plan (July 1, 1950) and for facilities for the associated squadron fighter interceptor deployment bases.

(b) Air Force semipermanent 10-year-life construction: This type of construction will be built on on-grade slabs or masonry or concrete piers, with standard framing of floors and roof trusses. For the sake of economy, a prefabricated wood shell or frame or similar light construction with an economical life of approximately 10 years will be used. If these structures must later be continued in use, they can be made to compare favorably with Air Force permanent construction by adding standard weatherproof siding and roofing, finished floors, and completing interior sealing and trim. This semi-permanent construction will be used at all

bases other than those at which permanent construction will be employed.

(c) Air Force temporary 5-year-life construction: This is the World War II temporary "theater of operations" type construction with inadequate interior living and working conditions and without standard heating plants or sanitary facilities incorporated in the building. This program does not envision this type of construction. It will be resorted to only in the event of full mobilization or for strictly theater-of-operations construction.

Of the \$885,604,000 authorization scheduled for acquisition and construction about \$463,200,000 (or 52 percent) is allocated to facilities directly in support of Air Force operations. A further \$133,800,000 is for training facilities within the United States.

For depots and logistical facilities the Air Force has scheduled \$90,100,000, largely within the United States.

For communications facilities and navigational aids some \$35,000,000 is programmed of which more than three-fourths is in the overseas areas.

The sum of \$22,800,000 is devoted to priority research, development, and test facilities; \$20,400,000 for classified facilities, and \$53,400,000 for other construction, of which \$22,550,000 is for continental United States and \$30,828,000 is for overseas.

In addition, the bill includes \$67,000,000 additional authorization for an expansion of our land-based aircraft control and warning system.

Facilities to support Air Force operations are critically essential. These shortages are largely in the categories of airfield pavements, fuel-storage facilities, operational and aircraft-maintenance structures.

In this program there is scheduled \$95,700,000 for airfield pavements, \$82,300,000 for fuel storage and dispensing facilities, \$182,900,000 for operational facilities (includes tactical air-control facilities) and plant for aircraft maintenance. Troop housing has been allocated \$169,300,000, about 75 percent of which is within the United States. The only Air Force family housing in this bill is in the overseas areas, mainly in Alaska. For base support facilities, including utilities and grounds improvements, \$141,900,000 has been scheduled.

Under prevailing conditions, it is readily understandable that situations may arise which will necessitate immediate construction which cannot await normal legislative action without seriously impairing our defense efforts. For that reason the committee has approved a general authorization for "and other construction"—\$22,500,000 in continental United States, and \$30,828,000 outside continental United States. However, the committee has imposed two restrictions: (1) The authorization shall not be construed as authorizing a separate Air Force Academy; (2) the Air Force will fully advise the committee before proceeding with any projects under the authorization.

The total Air Force authorization of \$835,604,000 has been funded to the extent of \$807,000,000 in the second supplemental appropriations bill.

The proposed legislation has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense, as is evidenced by the letter of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, which is hereby made a part of this report.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., December 12, 1950.
Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program

for 1950 and it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

Purpose of the legislation: This proposal would authorize the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to construct public works urgently needed by the Department of Defense at this time. That need will become increasingly acute under the expanding military program dictated by the current international situation. It is contemplated that all of the projects covered by this authorization bill will be financed in whole or in part during fiscal year 1951 and funds so to finance those projects are being sought for inclusion in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1950.

Legislative references: The last major public works bill for the Department of Defense is Public Law 564 of the Eighty-first Congress, approved June 17, 1950.

Cost and budget data: The total amount of authorization included in this proposal is \$1,658,719,610, of which \$390,896,900 (including \$7,500,000 for the Armed Forces special-weapons project) is for the Department of the Army, \$381,428,710 is for the Department of the Navy, and \$886,394,000 is for the Department of the Air Force.

Sincerely yours,

MARX LEVA.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9920) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—Legislative branch," at the top of page 2, to insert:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUND

For an additional amount for Building," \$21,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce," on page 3, after line 18, to insert:

ACCESS ROADS (ACT OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1950)

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, including \$2,000,000 for payments of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authorization granted by said section, to remain available until expended, \$10,000,000, of which \$2,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the unexpended balance of funds heretofore appropriated for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 4, to insert:

Senate Restaurants: For replacement of equipment, Senate Restaurant, Capitol Building, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Security Agency," on page 8, after line 7, to insert:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Grants for hospital construction: For an additional amount for construction grants

under part C, title VI, of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, \$75,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter V—Department of the Interior," on page 9, after line 2, to strike out:

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825e), as applied to the southeastern power area, including purchase (not to exceed five) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$1,850,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VI—Independent offices—Atomic Energy Commission," on page 9, line 19, after the word "amount", to strike out "\$840,000,000" and insert "\$1,080,000,000"; and in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "two hundred and fifty" and insert "five hundred and fifty."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, with reference to the Atomic Energy Commission, I should like to ask for some explanation as to why the Commission needs 550 passenger vehicles.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. LANGER. On page 9, in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission, why is it necessary to provide 550 automobiles?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Wyoming had charge of that phase of the bill. I ask that he be permitted to answer the question of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to explain the reason for the amendment. The Atomic Energy Commission presented persuasive evidence of the fact that busses are needed and used to transport workers from their homes to the various plants at which they work. The use of busses is a timesaver and money saver. The use of passenger vehicles is required in order to make certain in the construction of new projects—and new projects are to be constructed—that management officials will reach speedily the various parts of the projects. The committee was quite convinced that this increase was essential as a money saver. I should like to call attention to the fact that the budget estimate had placed no limitation upon the number of cars to be furnished, but the committee placed a limitation of 550, after having very thoroughly examined the witnesses of the Atomic Energy Commission.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. I notice that the House passed the bill with a limitation of 250 cars, and the Senate committee changed the limitation to 550.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; we added 300 cars because we were convinced by the testimony that the cars were essential to expedite the construction work and to save the time of the men going back and forth to the various projects.

Mr. LANGER. There is nothing in the bill which would prevent the Commission from purchasing 550 Cadillacs; is there?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is a general law which provides explicitly that no passenger vehicle may be bought which costs more than \$1,400.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 10, to insert:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

For an additional amount for carrying out the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946 (50 U. S. C. 98), \$1,834,911,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 10, after line 6, to insert:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$3,250,000; and the limitation imposed by section 103 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amount available for travel expenses under this head, is increased from "\$260,000" to "\$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Selective Service System—Salaries and expenses," on page 11, line 8, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$10,787,899" and insert "\$11,000,000"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "of which not exceeding \$250,000 shall be available for equipment, and not exceeding \$35,000 for travel expenses of special boards", and in line 13, after the word "replacement", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That both of the limitations under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, on the amounts available for travel expenses are hereby repealed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tennessee Valley Authority," on page 12, line 2, after the word "amount", to strike out "\$64,500,000" and insert "\$67,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 2, to insert:

CHAPTER VIII

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of revenues of the District of Columbia)

Office of Civil Defense

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1951, for "Office of Civil Defense," \$337,500; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall be available for personal services without reference to the civil-service and classification laws.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer on page 16. Is there an understanding that the committee amendments shall be considered first?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Committee amendments are to be disposed of first.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 28, after line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading on page 28, line 12, after the word "Chapter," to strike out "VIII" and insert "IX."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments," on page 28, line 21, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 244, and", and in line 22, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$5,274,034" and insert "\$6,983,938."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading on page 29, line 11, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "IX" and insert "X."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions," on page 29, line 13, to change the section number from "901" to "1001."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 4, to change the section number from "902" to "1002."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 11, to change the section number from "903" to "1003."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes consideration of committee amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk and ask that they be stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask for the adoption of two more amendments which I am authorized to present to the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations and as to which I have given notice?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Tennessee for that purpose?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I send the first amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

PAYMENT OF SUMS DUE DECEASED CONGRESSIONAL PERSONNEL

(a) Section 49 of the Revised Statutes is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 49. When any person dies while serving as a Member of or Delegate to Congress, as Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, as an officer or employee of either the Senate or House of Representatives, or as an employee or a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, the appropriate disbursing officer of the Senate or House of Representatives shall pay to the widow or widower of such person, or, if there is no widow or widower, to the next of kin or heirs at law of such person, any unpaid balance of salary or other sums due such person at the time of his death."

(b) Section 50 of the Revised Statutes is repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer another amendment on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations. Its pres-

entation was unanimously directed by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, before the heading entitled "Chapter III," it is proposed to insert the following:

**MARITIME ACTIVITIES
SHIP CONSTRUCTION**

The first proviso in the paragraph under the head "United States Maritime Commission, ship construction" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1950" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1951".

Appropriations and contract authority made available to the United States Maritime Commission for ship construction in the fiscal years 1950 and 1951, and in addition thereto \$224,000,000 in contract authority, the totals of which, including not to exceed \$500,000 which may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses" for necessary administrative costs without regard to limitations thereon in said appropriations, and including not to exceed \$15,000,000 for the construction, activation, acquisition, and expansion of plant or facilities, on land whether owned by the Government or otherwise owned, shall be available, without regard to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 with respect to essential trade routes, for construction of such additional dry-cargo vessels as the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the President, shall find necessary for national security: *Provided*, That such additional vessels shall not be subject to the first proviso under the head "New ship construction" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, or the last proviso under the head "Ship construction" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1951.

For the payment of obligations incurred on or after July 1, 1946, including obligations authorized herein, for ship construction, reconditioning and betterments, pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and to the authority granted under the head "United States Maritime Commission" in the several appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, and 1951, the unexpended balance of funds heretofore appropriated for the liquidation of such obligations may be consolidated and may, in total, be available for the liquidation of such obligations.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Limitation under the head "Salaries and expenses," United States Maritime Commission, in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1951, are amended as follows: "Maintenance of shipyard facilities" is increased from "\$452,000" to "\$483,000," and "Maintenance and operation of terminals" is decreased from "\$765,000" to "\$734,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, after line 2, under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority," following the word "expended", it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That purchases and contracts for supplies or services may be made by the Authority during the fiscal year 1951 without regard to any provisions of law relating to advertising or competitive bidding."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I offer the

amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, after line 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

CHAPTER IX—FOREIGN AID

Whenever he determines that such action is essential, the President may from time to time utilize, for the effective carrying out of the purposes of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 (title II of Public Law 535, 81st Cong.), not to exceed in the aggregate 5 percent of the funds made available for the fiscal year 1951 for the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the point where the 5-percent ECA amendment was agreed to a statement and two letters from the ECA Administrator be printed in the RECORD.

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

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1950.
Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: You inquired as to the general purposes for which we requested a right to transfer 5 percent of our appropriated funds from title I to title II.

As a result of developments since the passage of this year's appropriations bill less money is needed for economic aid to Europe and more is needed for economic aid in the Far East between now and June 30, 1951. In view of this we feel it desirable that the right be given to transfer up to 5 percent from the European to the far eastern title. This would make available a possible total of \$125,900,000 in the general area of China.

This authority is sought for these immediate reasons: to increase by \$15,000,000 the amount of aid to Formosa, to provide \$15,000,000 to inaugurate a program in the Philippines, and to reimburse the sum of \$4,500,000 used to purchase grain sorghums in the United States to relieve a threat of famine in India. In addition, it seems prudent to provide authority in case further transfers prove necessary in the critical area of Far East and Southeast Asia where urgent action may be required at any time. Any transfer of funds which ECA proposes would also, of course, require the approval of the Budget Bureau and the President.

The only one of the above programs which has not already been in operation for some months is the Philippine program where we propose to use up to \$15,000,000 between now and June 30, 1951, to the extent that projects are submitted by the Philippine Government which warrant ECA approval. The fund would not be used, however, unless the Philippine Government took the necessary steps for social and fiscal reform which were accepted in general terms by the president of the Philippines in an agreement signed on November 14, 1950. I am attaching a press release which outlines the major points in that agreement, which basically were that if appropriate reforms were undertaken by the Philippine Government the President of the United States would propose a substantial program of economic aid to the United States Congress. This program would be designed to extend over a

period of years. ECA does not propose to take any other action on the major program other than the \$15,000,000 proposed above until the whole plan has been presented to the Congress for appropriate legislation.

However, since the Government of the Philippines is moving rapidly toward the initiation of those reforms, ECA and the State Department, with the approval of the President of the United States, feel that we should initiate some of the projects at once so as to develop further the enthusiasm and support of the Philippine Government and people.

With this financial and moral support from the United States I believe that we can establish promptly an effective aid program which will make possible a major improvement in the whole Philippine situation.

Thanks for the opportunity of commenting on these plans.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Administrator.

P. S.—You will, of course, recall that the China Area Aid Act of 1950 prohibits the use of these funds in Communist-dominated areas.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF AUTHORIZATION TO
TRANSFER FUNDS APPROPRIATED UNDER TITLE
I FOR THE EUROPEAN AREA TO TITLE
II OF THE GENERAL AREA OF CHINA OF PUBLIC
LAW 535

As conditions have developed since the appropriation bill was passed, the demands on the funds for Europe will be less in proportion to the demands on the available funds for the general area of China. It is, therefore, felt desirable that flexibility be provided by authorizing the President to transfer up to 5 percent between the two titles of Public Law 535. This proposed flexibility is the same as the Congress provided for the mutual defense assistance program.

It is not intended to use that amount for any new purposes but simply to have funds available which can be used to meet emergencies in the critical Far East area if necessity requires. I am informed that the Economic Cooperation Administration contemplates only the following additional expenditures: \$15,000,000 for the Philippines; \$15,000,000 for Formosa, and \$4,500,000 to replace funds diverted from Burma, Indochina, Indonesia, and Thailand for the purchase of grain to relieve famine conditions in India. These and any other additional expenditures would, of course, require the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the President.

The only one of the above programs that is new is the one for the Philippines and these funds would not be used unless the Philippine Government took the steps toward necessary social and fiscal reform which were accepted by the President of the Philippines in an agreement signed with Mr. Foster as the representative of President Truman on November 14, 1950. I have been assured that the major program would not be undertaken until the whole plan has been presented to the Congress and approved. The Government of the Philippines, however, is moving rapidly toward the initiation of these reforms and it is felt that the United States should take advantage of that impetus and initiate some of the projects at once.

The need for additional funds for Formosa is urgent due to increased heavy burdens and unless additional funds can quickly be made available, the economy of Formosa will be seriously jeopardized. These requirements for the Philippines and for Formosa cannot be met by reduction of the scheduled programs for Burma, Indochina, Indonesia, and Thailand without severe risk to the achievements of the objectives of the United States in the whole area. Of course none of these funds can be used in a Communist-dominated area.

DECEMBER 16, 1950.

HON. KENNETH D. MCKELLAR,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: The Economic Cooperation Administration is now operating in Formosa and Southeast Asia under the authorization of title II of Public Law 535 with funds left over from earlier appropriations for the China-aid program. It is requested that authorization be given the President to transfer up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated under title I to title II of Public Law 535 in order to permit the programs now scheduled to be maintained for the rest of the fiscal year and to provide flexibility to meet contingencies in this strategic and critical area of the world.

About \$98,000,000 remained from earlier appropriations for the China-aid program and the Congress earmarked \$40,000,000 for the Formosa program, \$8,000,000 for humanitarian relief in China and \$6,000,000 for Chinese students and teachers in the United States. It was assumed, however, for planning purposes that it would not be feasible to provide relief in China and that the \$8,000,000 tentatively earmarked for this purpose would be available for the general area. Fifty-two million dollars were therefore considered to be available for Burma, Indochina, Indonesia, and Thailand, although even this amount was somewhat less than recommended by the Griffin mission which surveyed the needs of these countries during this past spring.

The need for additional funds during this fiscal year for programs which are now scheduled arises primarily because of necessary expenditures which were not anticipated at the time of the original estimates. The President, because of the famine conditions in India, allocated \$4,500,000 to purchase grain for that country. Thirty million dollars will also be required to carry out the economic program recently initiated in the Philippines and to maintain the Formosa program which has been changed as a result of the improved military situation of the island from a relief and rehabilitation program operating on a month-to-month basis to one designed to enable Formosa to achieve self-sufficiency within a few years. These additional expenditures cannot be met by reducing the scheduled programs in the other countries without severe risk to the achievement of our objectives in this area. Costs, moreover, have increased substantially since the original estimates were formulated.

As of this date, about \$52,000,000 of the \$92,000,000 available have been obligated. A good part of the period since the Congress authorized use of these funds in the general area of China, however, had to be utilized in organizing the missions, in negotiating the required bilateral agreements, and in screening the preliminary programs. The program in Burma, Indochina, Indonesia, and Thailand have, therefore, only been in full operation for approximately 2 months, and the amended program for Formosa for about the same length of time. At the rate of obligation which has now been reached and which is required to maintain the momentum of the program, available funds will be exhausted during the third quarter of this fiscal year, even if emergencies do not arise which would require expenditure of more funds than now scheduled. It is considered, moreover, that funds must be available to meet emergency situations.

We, of course, hope that expenditures can be held to the \$36,000,000 additional required for the programs now scheduled. The position of the United States in this troubled area should not, however, be risked on the certainty of being able to do so. Authorization is, therefore, requested to transfer up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated for the European area so that funds will be available to meet emergencies as well as to maintain the present programs. For example, it has been apparent in recent weeks that mili-

tary burdens are weighing heavily on the Formosan economy and considerably more than the amount now estimated may be needed to prevent economic and financial collapse and to preserve the real progress already achieved. The situation in Indochina is critical and the building up of indigenous military forces may impose financial burdens which will require additional economic support. Harvests are again bad in India, and it may again be necessary to help finance increased grain imports if famine conditions are to be avoided. Such examples can be multiplied, but we consider that it is clear that in these days common prudence requires that ample funds be on hand to be used if emergencies do arise.

Authorization to transfer economic-aid funds between areas is required for the same reasons that led the Congress to include such authorization in the MDAP legislation—to enable the United States to move quickly and effectively to meet emergencies threatening our over-all struggle against the forces of the Kremlin. We do not know in advance just where the pressure against the free world is going to build up or in what area it may be wise for the United States to use its economic strength in the general effort to combat Communist pressure. We do know that with resources that can be rapidly mobilized the United States stands a better chance of counteracting the strains and holding the line against the forces of subversion and aggression.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Administrator.

PROPOSED LANGUAGE

Whenever he determines that such action is essential, the President may from time to time utilize, for the effective carrying out of the purposes of the China Area Aid Act of 1950 (title II of Public Law 535, 81st Cong.), not to exceed in the aggregate 5 percent of the funds made available for the fiscal year 1951 for the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), as amended.

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

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I connection with the maritime activities amendment which was adopted a moment ago, providing an additional \$224,000,000, could the Maritime Commission buy the two ships which were discussed the other day, the *Mariposa* and the *Monterey*?

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

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say that it was not in contemplation of the committee or of the evidence which was presented to us that that should be done. This appropriation is designed to enable the Maritime Commission to build new ships which are required by the Defense Establishment.

Mr. LANGER. The amendment specifically exempts the Commission from any necessity for buying new ships. It does not provide that these are to be new ships.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment has to do with new ship construction, as is disclosed by the following provision:

The first proviso in the paragraph under the head "United States Maritime Commission, ship construction" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1951, is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1951", and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1951."

Appropriations and contract authority made available to the United States Maritime Commission for ship construction in the fiscal years 1950 and 1951, and in addition thereto \$224,000,000 in contract authority—

Mr. LANGER. Let me invite the Senator's attention—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. Please permit me to answer.

The appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951 which Congress passed last year, and which are referred to, did not contain provisions authorizing the acquisition of the ships referred to, and there was under consideration upon the floor the other day a special bill dealing with that question, which was not passed. I feel quite confident that there is nothing in this amendment which changes the situation with respect to the two vessels to which reference has been made.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I call attention to the proviso at the end of the second paragraph of the amendment, reading as follows:

Provided, That such additional vessels shall not be subject to the first proviso under the head, "New ship construction" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, or the last proviso under the head, "Ship construction" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1951.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Those provisos were provisos of limitation, by which only a certain number of new vessels could be built. That is all that has been eliminated.

Mr. LANGER. What the Senator from North Dakota wants to know is this: Must this \$224,000,000 be spent for new ships?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Or can the Commission buy old hulks?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. This is for new ships.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that by changing the language which is a part of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, the Maritime Commission is permitted to use, up to July 1, 1951, certain funds which were appropriated for the construction of passenger ships? That language has been changed so that freight-carrying ships may be constructed, ships which will have a speed of 20 knots, draw 30 feet, and hold a certain number of tons.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. New ships.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. New ships; and those new ships are to cost \$7,000,000 apiece. By putting in the \$224,000,000 in addition to the language change with respect to the \$126,000,000, we permit the Maritime Commission to build 50 new ships. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct. Will the Senator not agree with me that it is not the intention of the committee, and there is nothing in this language to authorize the purchase of any old ships?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It certainly is not the intention of the committee. Ab-

solutely not. Other ships would have to be purchased by the Navy Department from military funds, entirely apart from this appropriation. That is the committee's intention.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. Is it not true, in furtherance of the statement of the Senator from Wyoming, that Admiral Cochran of the Maritime Commission and others have urged this measure as essential, so as to provide ships in addition to those which are presently available, and that the entire urge is for new construction to supplement existing facilities?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Maryland is quite correct. I think I am at liberty to say that a request is now pending before the Bureau of the Budget for additional sums for the construction of additional ships. This request will be presented in the new budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. At all events, I will say to the Senate that the committee allowed what was asked, because we thought it was a time of danger, and that new ships ought to be made available. After hearing the testimony of the various witnesses we allowed this item to go in.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield in order that I may insert in the Record a statement in support of the committee's position on this question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

There are few, if any, requirements which have greater merit and call for more immediate action than the upbuilding of our merchant marine.

Despite the costly lessons of World Wars I and II, our Nation has failed to give proper recognition to the important part to be played in an emergency by the merchant marine. Despite the experience of the past, many people considered the laid-up fleet as available for any use when necessity arose.

Some of us saw the inherent dangers in this policy and gave warning that we would be caught unprepared if we did not take forthright and adequate steps to remedy the situation. I might add at this juncture that about a year ago I introduced the long-range shipping bill which, if promptly enacted, would have gone far to remedy the present unfortunate situation.

In the Korean crisis America learned to its sorrow that only a small portion of the laid-up fleet was of the type that could be placed into immediate service in order to answer the need of the hour. It is a matter of great regret to note that we did not have enough troop ships and fast cargo ships ready for the emergency. It was necessary to charter foreign ships and it would have been even more disastrous had we been faced by a foe which had readily available submarines and air forces to repel the Inchon landing.

There is imperative need for ships which can move American troops expeditiously. There is immediate need for fast cargo ships that can continue to help the armed services by transporting ammunition and supplies. The inexcusable neglect evidenced toward the maritime industry has resulted in a deplorable condition with regard to available shipbuilding personnel in the United States. Unless remedial action is taken, and taken promptly, in connection with efforts to mo-

bilize the country's resources against Communist aggression, it would be folly to expect anything but a complete break-down of American shipping and ship construction in the event of the long-dreaded all-out attack by Communist forces.

Recollection of the great number of ships constructed during World War II confuses many of our people, who apparently feel that these laid-up ships could be put back into service at a moment's notice, and would be entirely satisfactory for naval auxiliary and Army transport use. As anyone familiar with the situation knows full well, however, there is quite a time lag between the withdrawal of these vessels from the laid-up fleet and the date of their reentry into service. Much more important, however, is the fact that, by and large, they are not fast enough to keep up with the speedy naval forces of today or to avoid the improved enemy submarines that will be encountered in any future naval engagement.

What is urgently and vitally needed is a continuing program of ship construction which will prevent "block obsolescence", that will permit recruitment and maintenance of a minimum core of experienced shipbuilders, and that will keep the United States at least somewhat abreast at all times of its peacetime and wartime maritime needs.

American private enterprise can be depended upon to do its part in ship construction if only the Nation will give it the opportunity. World War II demonstrated better than anything in history how successfully the maritime industry can respond in an emergency if it is given the sign to go ahead.

Those of us who took active part in the lengthy committee hearings over the 5-week period earlier this year have long since been convinced of the crying need for a strong American merchant marine. This great industry can be of inestimable value during the national emergency, now declared by the President. In past crises patriotic merchant seamen have done their full share in protection of the interests of the United States. Backing them will be ship construction and ship repair organizations who are experienced and able and deserve our support. No finer group of patriotic citizens can be found in America than the key officials, the workers and seamen who together represent a merchant marine of which our Nation can well be proud.

DECEMBER 19, 1950.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge administration support for long-range shipping bills in Congress, S. 2786 and H. R. 5346. The maritime industry has not had the attention it warrants as part of the national-defense organization. The objections previously put forward by the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget are now entirely overshadowed by the current emergency.

Respectfully yours,

GEO. H. FRENCH,
President, the Maryland Drydock Co.

BALTIMORE ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
Baltimore, Md., December 18, 1950.
Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

The Baltimore Association of Commerce, representing 2,300 business and industrial organizations of this community, earnestly requests your vigorous support of the long-range shipping legislation now pending before Congress after receiving approval of the appropriate committees of both Houses.

A strong United States-flag merchant fleet is a fundamental need in this period of national crisis both as a defense measure and for the preservation of our economy. As a center of world shipping and ship construction and repair with experienced personnel

whose skills must be preserved for this emergency, Baltimore is particularly concerned. We view the situation, however, primarily as a national issue of the gravest significance.

G. H. POWDER,
Executive Vice President.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD at this point of some explanatory material?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, did not I have the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair begs the Senator's pardon. The Senator from New Hampshire had the floor, and yielded to the Senator from Tennessee for the purpose of offering some amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the action taken by the Senate in enacting the authorization for military public works, I ask that the bill be amended, on page 14, line 14, after the words "Military construction, Army," by inserting "including construction as authorized by law."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that amendment will be made.

Mr. RUSSELL. I offer the same amendment on page 18, line 22, after the word "new", the language to be inserted being "including construction as authorized by law."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask that my two amendments be stated. The amendments are offered on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 24, after the word "therefor", it is proposed to insert: "Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this head shall be used for such purposes in any territory of Korea under Communist control."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, Members of the Senate will find this item on page 16, under the heading "Civilian Relief in Korea." During the hearings I questioned Secretary Marshall and Secretary Lovett about this problem. Let me read this brief quotation:

AMOUNT FOR RELIEF IN KOREA

Senator BRIDGES. I wondered in this bill about the item for \$100,000,000 for relief of various kinds in Korea. Considering the current situation there, I should think it would be pretty difficult to apply that now, would it not?

Secretary LOVETT. Yes; I think it would, Senator BRIDGES. General McGruder has the details on that. That was responsive to a request in the Department to estimate the needs on the assumption of course at that time that the pacification of North Korea was in motion. The South Korean portion of it is, of course, in the lap of the gods.

Senator BRIDGES. I notice in the North Korean item, a lot of it is for rebuilding municipal distribution systems in North Korea. I am just wondering whether or not that is at least a necessary thing in this appropriation. We would have to know what the sit-

uation was certainly before we rush into this to appropriate for North Korea rehabilitation when it may never be in our hands.

Secretary LOVETT. That will be one of the last items, I am sure, that is justified, Senator BRIDGES, and of course it would depend on the circumstances then.

Senator BRIDGES. Certainly, but I am not sure that psychologically it would be the thing for us to do, to throw \$100,000,000 into this to help rehabilitate the Communists in North Korea at this particular time. I think you people will want to center on other things, as I would. I would be enthusiastic about a situation developing, perhaps, of rebuilding some of South Korea, but there would have to be quite a lot of salesmanship done on me to spend a lot of money rebuilding North Korea.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on behalf of himself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] on page 16, after line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I offer another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 21, after the word "transportation," it is proposed to strike out "\$100,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000."

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a good deal of question has been raised by Members of the Senate respecting the progress of the Department of Defense in awarding contracts, how those contracts are awarded, whether by bid, whether by negotiated contracts, and whether or not the rising scale of prices has interfered with the ability of the contractor or the subcontractor to deliver. There is a colloquy in the hearings beginning at the middle of page 26 and continuing to page 31, in which the Senator from New Hampshire submits a series of questions and is joined in them by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and other Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the questions and answers to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Chairman, in order to expedite things here, I would like to ask a series of questions, and then allow the Defense Department to answer them in writing at the next meeting on Monday, and

that would expedite the thing here, if you will.

1. I would like the approximate figure as to the number of defense contracts awarded up to date.

2. Whether the contracts have been awarded on bid or negotiated basis?

3. If there have been any negotiated contracts, in general, what have they been for?

4. If contracts have been awarded on a bid basis, have there been cases where the successful bidder was unable to assume his obligations in the contract through failure to produce the product? There are a good many rumors on that, in the Subcommittee in the Armed Services.

Then, 5. How many successful bidders have had to ask for more funds subsequent to the date of the contract due to circumstances which they consider beyond their control?

Senator HILL. Would you say "And what were those circumstances"?

Senator BRIDGES. Yes.

6. If from the answers to the above it is obvious that certain contracts are not being fulfilled according to their original obligations, we would like a report made to the committee which would include the following:

The total contracts awarded on the bid basis, on negotiated basis. Contracts awarded on the bid basis subsequently canceled by the Department of Defense, and for what reason canceled. Contracts awarded on the bid basis for which no deliveries have been made by contracting firm or industry, and for what reason. A number of contracts awarded on the bid basis where contracting firm or industry came back for an increase in funds for completion, and for what purpose.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I interrupt at that point to ask a question subordinate to that? How many contracts contain escalator price clauses?

Senator BRIDGES. That is very good. And what is the policy on subcontracts? In other words, various people of your Department with or without your knowledge are making different statements about subcontracts, and sometimes it is said that the Defense Department has complete jurisdiction over them, and some others say, "Well, now, that is a thing over which we have no jurisdiction and that comes wholly under the contracting firm for the top contract."

I think if the clerk will submit those, and they can be answered in writing, that will save a lot of time here.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Let us add another question: What has been the experience of the Defense Department with respect to increasing prices during the past 6 months?

Senator ELLENDER. May I submit another question, following Senator BRIDGES? I would like to know this: I have been informed that on several occasions bids have been submitted by various contractors, all of whom have qualified, but yet when the time comes to give the bid out, there is a feeling that in many cases the low bidder is not accepted, although he is qualified, but is given to one that has had experience in World War II. Now, I would like to know what the policy is going to be in the future, if the Defense Department is going to invite bidders and give it not to those who have the lowest bid, but to those who have had the experience in the past. It strikes me that it ought to be given to the lowest bidder.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The lowest responsible bidder.

Mr. LOVETT. In Senator BRIDGES' first question, you used the word "obligated" or "contracted"?

Senator BRIDGES. I referred to the number that have been awarded, that is, you can subdivide them under those that have been contracted, actually contracts awarded, or that there are partial steps in so doing.

Mr. LOVETT. I find we frequently cause confusion unintentionally by following the budget description of "obligations" which requires the full contract, whereas all of the services operate really on the basis of commitment when letters are sent out and engineering production starts before the contract is fully completed—the basic agreements having been reached. So if Senator BRIDGES will permit, we will deal with it on the basis of committing funds, and then contracted in addition, so as to give you the full picture. Otherwise it would be misleading.

Senator BRIDGES. There has been called to my attention where I said contracts awarded on a bid basis on which no delivery is made; I mean by that where, for some reason, they have reneged, where you have awarded it in good faith, but where the company has not lived up to the delivery on the contract.

Mr. LOVETT. That is understood.

(The information requested is as follows:)

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT ACTIVITY JULY 1 THROUGH OCTOBER 30, 1950"

"1. Question. Number of Department of Defense contracts awarded and/or committed since July 1. Money value represented by such contracts.

"Answer. During the first 4 months of fiscal year 1951, the Department of Defense placed approximately 500,000 purchase actions. Since this figure includes local purchases (purchases under \$1,000), which type of purchase accounts for the great bulk of all governmental purchase transactions, it is probably more significant that there has been committed and obligated from all procurement funds and project authorizations during the period approximately \$8,100,000,000. It must be borne in mind that included in the latter sum are commitments to Government-owned manufacturing arsenals and plants. Accordingly, the industrial impact of these commitments has not been fully realized by the award of all contracts thereunder.

"2. Question. Which part of 1 above was negotiated and which part advertised in number of transactions and amount of money?

"Answer. Although our statistical effort is not entirely current for the first 4 months of fiscal year 1951, the best estimate available is that approximately 50,000 transactions were advertised, representing a value of \$900,000,000, and 450,000 transactions were negotiated, representing a money value of over \$7,000,000,000. Here, again, it must be borne in mind that the negotiated figure includes local purchases which, during fiscal year 1950, represented 75 percent of the total number of negotiated transactions and 3 percent of the value of the negotiated transactions.

"3. Question. In general terms, what items are being negotiated?

"Answer. Generally speaking, the military departments have been negotiating for the following types of items: (a) Those that are highly technical; (b) those for which but one source exist; (c) those which are urgently needed in support of military operations; and (d) those that are in extremely short supply. Included are such items as tanks and military-type vehicles, large and complicated electronic items, aircraft, missiles, aircraft maintenance and overhaul services, airline transportation services, steel, aluminum and aviation gasoline, and the like.

"The Secretary of Defense approved today, December 18, 1950, a policy designed to broaden the industrial base of our procurement programs. This policy requires that contracts be spread across industry as widely as possible. In accomplishing this purpose wider use of negotiation will be required. Formal advertising will continue to be used, but not when its use will adversely affect either the speed-up of the procurement process or the broadening of the industrial

base. The declaration by the President of a state of national emergency permits the Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force to authorize negotiation pursuant to the authority of section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947. Copy of the policy approved today is set forth below, showing the 10 points to which the military departments are to pay particular attention in placement of contracts.

"4. Question. Under advertising—

"(a) What is the experience with respect to default by contractors?

"Answer. Defaults in advertised Department of Defense procurements have always been negligible in number. There has been no marked upswing in the number of defaults since July 1, 1950. However, it should be noted that in general it is still too early for default actions to occur with respect to advertised contracts related to the Korean action. The reason for this is that, in general terms, awards made during August 1950 specify delivery dates of from 2 to 6 months. The Department foresees, however, an increase of defaults for the reason of contractor's inability to perform.

"(b) Have the contracts been canceled? If so, for what reason?

"Answer. There have been the usual number of 'terminations for the convenience of the Government.' In addition, there have been cases of termination for default which, upon investigation, are found to have been justified under the provisions of the contract. In these instances the cases are converted and terminated 'for convenience of the Government' and not by 'default.' Where the justification does not exist it is necessary that the excess costs, if any, of the default be held against the defaulting contractor's account. Appeals are permitted in the instances where differences of opinion are not resolved between the contractor and the contracting officer.

"(c) Have upward revisions in prices been requested? For what reason?

"Answer. Yes. Upward revisions in prices have been requested in order to prevent serious loss to contractors due to continuous and serious price increases. In those instances in which the contract did not specifically provide for the price redetermination or escalation, the requests were refused, since there is no legal basis for adjusting prices upward without legal consideration.

"(d) Are awards made to the lowest bidder? Under what circumstances does production experience in World War II result in an award to other than the lowest bidder?

"Answer. Yes; awards are made to the lowest responsible bidder, price and other factors considered. Prior to receiving the award of a military contract, a bidder must show evidence of his financial and technical qualifi-

cations to perform. Previous successful production experience, including that of World War II, is one indication of such qualification. However, award is never made solely because of World War II production experience to other than the lowest responsible bidder.

"5. Question. In general terms, have contractors requested upward revisions in prices without consideration or under price redetermination or escalation provisions contained in the contract? Upon what basis have the revisions been requested?

"Answer. In situations in which the contracts do not contain price redetermination or escalation clauses, contract modifications have been requested on the basis of serious financial loss due to the unforeseen price increases. Since no legal consideration passes to the Government, relief cannot and has not been granted. In situations in which price redetermination or escalation clauses are included in the contracts, upward price revisions have been allowed in accordance with the terms of the particular contract.

"6. Question. In general terms, how many contracts contain provisions for price escalation?

"Answer. Very few. Every effort is made to purchase military requirements on a fixed-price basis. Price escalation and price redetermination is authorized only when there are unknown pricing factors which will become evident as production under the contract progresses and, by including the clauses, contingency charges will be minimized. It should be noted that there is considerable pressure for price redetermination and escalation provisions in procurements now under consideration. If economic conditions continue as at present, it can be expected that further pressure for such escalation will be exerted.

"7. Question. In general terms, what is Department of Defense experience in price increases in the last 6 months?

"Answer. The Department of Defense has undertaken, within each of the military departments, a continuing study of price levels. Price comparisons for end products purchased by the military departments are difficult to make because of the constant evolution and development of the product, and our price studies indicate that price increases have varied considerably by types of products. We have also even found that there have been price decreases resulting from greater volume production. Both the Air Force and the Navy have indicated a general experience of an over-all price rise of approximately 10 percent occurring over the period in question. Price studies of the Army made by each of the technical services of representative items procured by the technical services show:

Technical services	Items	Average price increases, percent
Signal Corps	Radio set and field wire	9.7
Corps of Engineers	Lumber and miscellaneous construction equipment	18.3
Quartermaster	Cotton and wool cloth, wool (foreign and domestic), leather and shoes	30.5
Transportation Corps	Railroad cars and cargo pallets	12.8
Ordnance Corps	Metals, chemicals, etc.	30.8
Medical Services	Miscellaneous medicines, chemicals, and medical devices	34

"8. Question. What is the current Department of Defense policy in regard to subcontract management?

"Answer. One of the principal services the Government obtains from industry under a contract is contractor management which includes, among other things, subcontract management. Although the Military Departments promote the widest possible subcontracting by the prime contractor and particularly small business, and reserve the right to approve the more significant subcontracts, they do not intervene in any way nor direct the contractual relationship be-

tween the prime contractor and his subcontractors.

"BROADENING OF POLICY RELATIVE TO THE INDUSTRIAL BASE OF PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS"

"The President has declared a national emergency. The issuance of this declaration permits the Secretaries of the Military Departments to authorize the negotiation of purchases and contracts pursuant to the authority contained in section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947. The Munitions Board recommended, and I approved, the following statement of policy.

"The Military Departments have already received instructions to accelerate procurement actions in connection with second supplemental 1951 funds. It is essential in complying with these instructions that contracts be spread across industry as widely as possible in order to broaden the industrial base of our procurement program. Broadening the base will require wider use of negotiation. Formal advertising will continue to be used in appropriate cases, but not when such use will adversely affect the acceleration of procurement or the broadening of the industrial base contemplated by this directive.

"The Military Departments should pay particular attention to—

"(a) The greatest possible integration of current procurement contracts with the industrial mobilization program and the accepted schedules of production.

"(b) The equitable distribution of procurement contracts among the maximum number of competent suppliers. The concentration of contracts with a few leader suppliers is to be avoided unless the necessity therefor is clear.

"(c) The utilization of existing open industrial capacity to the maximum. Expansion of facilities should not be authorized when open capacity can be found. Whenever time permits, and in order to broaden the mobilization base, additional contractors should be utilized in lieu of multishift or overtime operation.

"(d) The fullest possible use of small-business concerns.

"(e) The utilization in negotiation of competition and multiple awards, whenever possible.

"(f) The aggressive encouragement or requirement of subcontracting by prime contractors.

"(g) The provision of maximum incentive to the producer for the reduction of his costs.

"(h) The placement of contracts with a view to economies in the use of transportation facilities.

"(i) The availability of manpower in distressed employment areas or in areas of manpower shortages.

"(j) The reservation of special skills and abilities for the more difficult production tasks.

"To the extent necessary, departmental procurement procedures and practices should be modified to conform to the foregoing. Particular attention should be paid to the caliber of personnel engaged in the negotiation of contracts."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer as an amendment a new section, which I ask to have inserted at the proper place in the bill, and which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the bill it is proposed to insert:

Sec. —. In order to stimulate production of strategic minerals and metals from small deposits located in the United States, the RFC is authorized and directed, pursuant to regulations duly promulgated in that regard, and provided a claim has been filed or is filed within 6 months immediately following the date of the enactment of this act, to pay to a producer of strategic or critical minerals or metals, an amount equal to the uncovered costs, including capital expenditures, not, however, in excess of \$100,000,000 to any one producer, incurred during the period between September 8, 1939, and August 14, 1945, in a good faith effort to furnish or arrange to furnish any of said materials or metals for use in the prosecution of the war, whether contracted for in writing or in response to any oral, written, or published request, solici-

tation, appeal, or offer to purchase from a contracting agency defined in the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, Seventy-eighth Congress, Public Law 395. A claim otherwise allowable under the provisions of this act shall not be barred by reason of (1) prior rejection under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, Public Law 395, Seventy-eighth Congress, or (2) the lapse of a corporate charter, where the claim is filed by a surviving stockholder.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is evidently legislation. We have had no hearings on the subject at all. We do not know whether it is good legislation or bad legislation. I am instructed by the committee to enter a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to call attention to the fact that if we are going to produce some of the scarce critical metals which are essential in the war, it is necessary that the action proposed by the amendment be taken. In World War II a great number of small mining operators, as a result of being requested, or acting upon the statements made by the procurement agencies of the Government, undertook to develop some scarce metals and minerals. When the war ended they had not been able to cover the costs of their operations. The amendment seeks to bring about that just action, that just compensation for these mine operators. If we are going to expect them again to undertake development of mines producing scarce minerals we must treat them with fairness and prevent them from incurring great expense for which they would not be compensated. It seems to me it is an amendment which is necessary in order to encourage the small mine operators to go to work on mines that contain metals and minerals of a kind which are essential to war production.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I will say in reply that we do not know with what the amendment deals. It has not been recommended to us. There is no budget estimate for it. There has been no testimony taken about it. The only thing we know is that at the last moment the Senator from Montana offers the amendment. It may be a very good thing, but the Senator will have to offer it at the next session of Congress. It cannot go into this bill. I make the point of order against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his point of order until the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has spoken?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to take only several minutes of the Senate's time today on the subject of governmental red tape as it pertains to this country's acute shortage of war metals and minerals.

The Congress enacted into law on September 8, 1950, the Defense Production Act of 1950 with the express purpose of facilitating the production of goods and services necessary for national security.

Section 302 of the act gave the President authority to make provision for loans for the exploration, development and mining of strategic and critical metals and minerals. Section 303 of the act gave the President authority to make provision for the encouragement of exploration, development, and mining of critical and strategic minerals and metals.

I believe I can say without successful contradiction that it was the intent of Congress through the act to secure minerals and metals as speedily as possible to build up our depleted reserves. I believe it was the further intent of Congress that the administering agencies designated should have the same thought in mind.

However, the Congress did not reckon with the red-tape experts in its timetable of implementing national security.

More than 2 months after enactment of the Defense Production Act, these red-tape experts in the National Security Resources Board were still hard at work trying to formulate a questionnaire under which an applicant might file for Government loans under terms of the act.

Three months after passage of the act these application forms were finally completed. In fact, they were so complete that an outstanding mining engineer with 25 years of experience told me he could not fill out one of the application form monstrosities if his life depended upon it.

This application form is a masterpiece of "red tape intellect." Each form has 12 pages of searching questions whose answers would no more indicate the production potential of a mine than it would predict a probable date for armageddon. Whether a one-man mining company wants to borrow \$5,000 to sink a mine shaft or a big corporation wants \$100,000,000 to build an H-bomb plant, the same questions must be answered.

Each questionnaire must be submitted in quadruplicate. An item overlooked by the "red tape experts" was that the paper on which the forms were printed is so heavy that a squad of typewriters cannot make a carbon impression on a duplicate copy, let alone on the triplicate or quadruplicate copies. Perhaps, a miner's jackhammer would be more appropriate.

Let me point to a part of the text of this application form. There are 18 basic questions, with 26 subheadings, plus a comprehensive financial statement, a comparative statement of income and expenses, and a comparative statement of condition of the applicant.

A mining company would be eligible to secure a loan application only if its metal or mineral were on the essential list. Strangely enough, this questionnaire asks the applicant to set forth the existent shortages of the metal or mineral, either regionally or nationally, presumably, the true shortage of a metal such as copper, lead, or zinc, is top-secret information known only to the munitions board, the joint chiefs of staff, and the National Security Resources Board itself.

The form asks the miner to go one step further and do a "crystal gazing

act" by predicting to the National Security Resources Board what the future shortage of the metal or mineral might be. Again, such predictions can come only from the munitions board, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the National Security Resources Board.

The applicant must also provide his "blank check" to the Federal Government, by agreeing to "reimburse any agency upon demand for any expenses incurred in connection with or arising out of this application or any loan made pursuant hereto."

Meanwhile, the mining men of the West, who are asking for a chance to dig out minerals vital to any war effort, are plagued with this "comedy of errors."

The National Security Resources Board time and again vetoed suggestions of the Defense Minerals Administration, staffed by some dollar-a-year leaders in the mining industry, that an application form or at least some of the questions have a relevance to the mining industry. Instead, four economists from the National Security Resources Board were allowed to dictate their "red tape whims" to a mining industry trying with every means at its command to build up our mineral reserves.

The Defense Minerals Administration, charged with marshaling our mineral and metal potential, rebelled to no avail against the "red tape dictates." Instead, today, the miner must fill out the 12-page National Security Resources Board form, plus a 10-question Defense Minerals Administration statement of facts. The latter deals with the practical aspects of mining, such as the extent of deposits, assay reports, production records, and production facilities.

One miner has written to me that in dealing with this "red tape," he will probably have to use more lead in writing out the practically endless forms than he will be able to dig out of the ground for some time to come.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall finish my statement in a moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I simply wish to make a comment regarding the Senator's speech.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well, I am glad to have the Senator from Wyoming do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy, indeed, that the Senator from Nevada has made this statement for the RECORD. The facts, as he relates them, are correct, as they have been found by members of the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I should like to have the Senator know that the committee will endeavor to induce the authorities who have prepared this amazing questionnaire to see a little light of reason and draw up an application form which a mining engineer can understand and can fill out.

I thank the Senator very much for his statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Wyoming for his contribution. Let me say that it

should not be necessary for a mining engineer to fill out the form, because the practical miner who tramps the hills and finds the ledges and knows what a ledge or a lode or a vein is, is usually able to give comprehensive advice as to what he has found. Technical matters—such as, for instance, assays and the like—may follow thereafter.

Mr. President, I am protesting this "red tape monstrosity" to Chairman Stuart Symington, of the National Security Resources Board, in the hope that a more sensible approach may be taken to a critical problem.

I bring this commentary to the attention of the Senate in the further hope that we may be able to point out to the administrative agencies that total war, if it comes, might be lost in a maze of red tape. Such a total war can only be won with planes, tanks, and guns.

This Nation must have minerals and metals—not on paper application forms, but in fighting equipment in the hands of our soldiers, sailors, and airmen.

I thank the Senate for its attention.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in regard to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I make the point of order that it proposes the addition of legislation to an appropriation bill. I am very sorry to have to make the point of order. I do so upon instructions of the committee.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that the clerks at the desk be authorized to correct chapter and section numbers in the bill to correspond with the amendments which have been made.

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

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I merely wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. He has clearly shown the need for a revision of the questionnaires he has discussed. Not only must that be done, but we must adopt some kind of a fair and decent attitude toward the small mine operators if we are going to get them to undertake to develop the scarce and strategic minerals which are essential to the defense preparations of our country.

In the last war, many hundreds of the small mine owners went to work because they felt it was their patriotic duty to undertake to open up deposits which they thought would be promising and would furnish the Government with the necessary metals and minerals for the prosecution of the war.

That is the reason why I offered my amendment today. I am sorry that it is going to be made the subject of a point of order. I hope that at some proper time we may be able to have this matter taken care of.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Our committee will be glad to hear the Senator at any time.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has made a point of order that the amendment of the Senator from Mon-

tana proposes the addition of legislation to an appropriation bill.

The amendment is clearly legislation proposed to an appropriation bill; therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have the third reading of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 9920) was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CORDON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the appropriation for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement I have prepared, having reference especially to the Coast Guard.

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

As chairman of the subcommittee for the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriations bill, I feel it is an opportune time to advise the Senate of the splendid work being done in these trying days by the personnel of the Treasury Department, especially by the military and civilian personnel attached to the Coast Guard Service. As Senators know, this service has been in long existence, and has many varied and complex functions, the most recent being the important port security program which was authorized by the so-called Magnuson Act of August 8, 1950 (Public Law 679). To implement this program there is included in the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1951 \$14,700,000 for operating expenses, and \$7,900,000 for acquisition, construction, and improvements.

The bill also carries \$3,900,000 additional funds for allowances for dependents of enlisted members of the Coast Guard, as provided by the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (Public Law 771). The regular bill for 1951 carried under these two heads the respective sums of \$136,000,000 and \$17,000,000, thus making the total requirements for 1951, \$154,600,000 for operating expenses and \$24,900,000 for acquisition, construction, and improvements for the Coast Guard Service.

For the most part these fund requirements are essential to our national defense. They represent without doubt the minimum needs of the Coast Guard at this time. Additional military personnel and essential matériel are being procured at an accelerated rate.

It is to be remembered that members of the Coast Guard perform essential and distinguished service both in time of peace as

well as in time of war; however, in time of war the Coast Guard operates as a service in the Navy. Therefore, it is of paramount importance to the country that the Coast Guard be maintained in a high state of military readiness, and only through the sufficiency of funds and the continued good work of the Coast Guard personnel can this be accomplished.

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to call attention to the fact that the appropriation bill which has just been passed carries a total sum for the Department of Defense of \$16,845,181,000—an extraordinary sum of money.

In this connection, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the part of the report of the committee, beginning on page 3 and ending on page 4, entitled "Increasing Prices and National Defense Procurement." I ask unanimous consent that these 2 pages of the report, chapter 7, which deal with national defense, covered in chapter 7, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

INCREASING PRICES AND NATIONAL DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

The committee has been profoundly disturbed by continuously increasing prices of commodities affecting national defense and feels that it is the responsibility of the Department of Defense to leave nothing undone to translate into orders at the earliest possible time, the appropriations which are made in this bill. The committee requested of the Department of Defense specific information with respect to the variations in price for military matériel and equipment since immediately before the outbreak of the Korean War. This report filed with the committee by the Office of the Secretary of Defense when analyzed carries the startling information that inflation has cut the value of the dollars of the sums appropriated for defense since pre-Korea by approximately \$3,000,000,000.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense reports of the committee that "these price rises are becoming increasingly widespread despite efforts to reduce costs wherever feasible by simplification of specifications and substitution of materials." Again the Office of the Secretary of Defense reports, with respect to the purchase of aviation gasoline; not only that prices have increased by some 3 to 14.6 percent but that "part of the aviation gasoline supplies are being derived from marginal productions . . . that are not economical under normal conditions" with the result that "premiums of varying amounts are being paid for the supply increments furnished from marginal sources reaching from 5 to 45 percent."

It is the opinion of the committee that time is of the essence in the placing and delivery of orders for all defense materials and equipment for which appropriations are here made. The committee will watch carefully and anxiously to see how clearly the Department will accelerate its procurement of vital materials. It demands action by the Department; it hopes the Department will show results.

The committee is aware of the problems involved in putting into effect wage and price controls but believes that the sooner a termination of this problem is concluded, the quicker the monster of inflation may be defeated.

A review of the basic raw materials which go into the production of military commodities clearly shows the impossibility of separating prices on civilian production from prices on military production.

It has come to the committee's attention that quantities of strategic materials have been sold by our friends to Russia and China. It is to be hoped that the free nations allied with us will take steps to at once stop such transactions.

Specific examples of this startling upward trend of prices for military procurement may be set up as follows:

BASIC RAW MATERIALS

Eleven basic raw materials used by the military show an average increase in price from April 1950 to December 1950 of 72.3 percent. Ten of these eleven items had price increases between September and December ranging from 1.2 to 40 percent.

PRICE INCREASES ON SELECTED MAJOR ITEMS

Aviation gasoline purchased through normal channels increased 3-3.2 percent on the Gulf coast and 13-14 percent on the west coast. Prices of supplies obtained from marginal sources are from 5 to 45 percent higher.

Increases in some other important items are as follows:

	Over-all percent increase, April to October-November 1950	Percent increase occurring between August-September and October-November
Army:		
Tires, 7.50 by 20	38.3	14.7
Bailey bridge	37.0	
Trousers, cotton, khaki	30.8	12.6
Boots, service, combat	42.4	
Cloth, wool, serge, 16-ounce	39.8	10.3
Navy:		
Rope, wire, 3/16-inch	100.0	
Mattresses	65.4	65.4
Sheets	50.7	50.7
Shell, smoke	55.8	
Air Force:		
Height finder, AN/TPS-10D	38.9	14.3
Parachutes:		
T-7A, parachute assembly with service canopy	51.7	
100-foot cargo chute	39.8	

In April 1950 the Army paid \$23.99 for a 7.50 by 20 tire. In December 1950 that same tire cost the Army \$33.18—and nearly \$4 of the increase has occurred in the last 2 months.

In April 1950 the Army paid \$37,796 for a Bailey bridge. That same bridge now costs the Army \$51,792.

In April 1950 it cost the Army 74 cents to cut, make, and trim a soldier's cotton khaki trousers. To perform those same operations in December 1950 costs the Army 97 cents. Nearly half of the increase in the cost of these operations has occurred since September 1950.

In April 1950 the Army paid 57.5 cents for a soldier's wool socks. By December 1950 those same socks cost 68.1, 5 cents of the increase occurring since September.

In April 1950 combat boots cost the Army \$5.72 a pair. Those same boots in December cost \$8.15 a pair.

In April 1950 the Navy paid 11.9 cents a foot for 3/16-inch wire rope. In December 1950 the price is exactly double, or 23.8 cents.

In August 1950 the Navy paid \$8 for mattresses. Those same mattresses cost \$13.23 in December.

In August 1950 the Navy paid \$1.50 for sheets. Those same sheets cost \$2.26 in December.

In April 1950 an Air Force flying jacket cost \$16.50. This same jacket in December cost the Air Force \$25.

In April 1950 a parachute assembly with service canopy cost the Air Force \$198.30. To get this same assembly in December cost \$300.77.

In April 1950 the Air Force could buy a 100-foot cargo parachute for \$1,287. In December 1950 they must pay \$1,798.66.

RELIEF OF NEW YORK QUININE & CHEMICAL WORKS, INC., ET AL.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, by arrangement with the majority and minority leaders, I at this time move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order 1596, the bill (H. R. 4653) for the relief of the New York Quinine & Chemical Works, Inc., and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4653) for the relief of New York Quinine & Chemical Works, Inc.; Merck & Co., Inc.; and Mallinckrodt Chemical Works.

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum. I do so in order that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] may be present before action is taken on this request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to make that suggestion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in order to expedite the work of the Senate, let me say that the Senator who is interested in this particular piece of proposed legislation is now on the floor, and unless there is some reason for continuing with the quorum call, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

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

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4653.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I wish to discuss this bill.

This is a private claim bill which involves the payment of \$139,000.

Because of the substantial amount involved, the bill was referred by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to a subcommittee, composed of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

A public hearing was held on the bill. The bill remained before the subcommittee for some months following the hearing, and was reported favorably to the full committee on May 17.

This is a somewhat complicated matter, but I shall attempt to state it as simply as possible.

This claim arises out of wartime transactions for the purchase of opium from Turkey. The three claimant companies, who are chemists and drug wholesalers, were the ultimate receivers and distributors of the opium. The original

purchase from Turkey was made for the account of the Defense Supplies Corporation by one of the three claimant companies, under an arrangement worked out at the request of the Government. The purpose of this arrangement was to stockpile opium, which was then in short supply, and to make the stockpile available for distribution in the United States, through regular channels.

It is a trade practice of long standing to buy and sell opium on the basis of the morphine content. That is, an initial price is agreed upon on the basis of an assumed morphine content, by percentage; and when the opium is delivered, it is sampled and tested, and the price is then adjusted, up or down, depending on whether the morphine content is higher or lower than the assumed percentage.

In the purchase of this particular opium, this trade practice was recognized in the exchange of correspondence and cablegrams between this country and Turkey. Subsequently, when the opium was parceled out in smaller lots to the three claimant companies, this trade practice was not in terms incorporated in the letters of acceptance which constituted informal contracts for the purchase of the opium by the claimant companies.

The Defense Supplies Corporation paid the Turkish suppliers for the opium; and subsequently, the American companies who are claimants here paid the Defense Supplies Corporation for the opium which they received. The Defense Supplies Corporation made a profit on the deal in excess of \$300,000.

The opium was below standard in the sense that it had a lower morphine content than the assumed percentage. Therefore, the Defense Supplies Corporation was entitled to a refund from the Turkish suppliers. The Department of State attempted, over a long period, to secure this refund, but was unsuccessful in doing so. Then the American company which had handled the original negotiations with Turkey offered to attempt to secure the refund, and by the device of deducting the amount of the refund from the billings to it, by the same Turkish suppliers, of other opium subsequently purchased, was successful in collecting the entire amount. Then, assuming that in accordance with the usual trade practice, this refund would be passed on to the companies which received and distributed the opium, a proposal in this regard was submitted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, successor to the Defense Supplies Corporation. The RFC took the position that from the purely legal standpoint, since the contract with the American companies did not contain any specific provision for adjustment of the price in proportion to the morphine content of the opium, and did contain a provision that the opium was being accepted "as is," the amount of the refund could not be passed on to the claimant companies. The RFC did agree that the money should be retained by the company which had collected it, until a determination of the matter; and representatives of the

RFC testified that they felt these claimants had an equitable case, and did not oppose enactment of this legislation.

Boiled down, the situation is this: Through the efforts of one of these claimants, the Government has recovered a refund which, in accordance with trade policies, should be passed on to the ultimate purchaser and distributor of the opium in each case. This sum is in excess of a profit of over \$300,000 which the Government already has made on the deal. For the Government to get this money, it would constitute a windfall. If the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through the State Department, had itself successfully recovered this refund, under the accepted trade practice, there would be a moral obligation to pass it on to the claimants here; though it is admitted that it is extremely doubtful whether there would be any basis for legal enforcement of this equitable claim.

Under all the circumstances, it was felt by a majority of the committee that the bill should be approved.

The bill has been passed by the House of Representatives and has come from the House to the Senate. I submit the matter to the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, first of all I wish to commend the able Senator from Nevada for his very enlightening statement of the equities involved in the pending bill. I, too, wish to join in strongly urging that H. R. 4653 be passed by the Senate. Since I have previously presented my views on the bill, and since the distinguished Senator from Nevada has also made a full explanation of it, I shall not take the time of the Senate to repeat the arguments which have heretofore been made.

I refer my colleagues to pages 11971 and 11972 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 8, 1950, for a concise statement of the views of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and to page 14695 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 13, 1950, for a detailed and convincing statement made by the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

In fairness to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] who, as we all know, is out of the country on official business, I think I should say that he objected to the bill when it came up on calendar call. Because of the objections of the Senator from Michigan, I have reexamined the bill very carefully, and I am absolutely convinced that this is a clear case in which considerations of equity completely outweigh strictly legal technicalities which, in themselves, are certainly arguable.

In the light of all the circumstances, the three companies named in the bill should certainly not be forced to turn over to the Government the amount of \$139,293.55, which was collected from the Turkish opium monopoly because of a morphine deficiency in the opium the companies bought from the Government. The United States Government has already made a substantial and unexpected profit on its opium stockpiling program, and every consideration of equity supports the retention of the amount provided in the bill by the com-

panies named. I know that if my distinguished senior colleague were on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, he would join in urging that the bill be passed at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4653) for the relief of the New York Quinine & Chemical Works, Inc.; Merck & Co., Inc.; and Mallinckrodt Chemical Works?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FEDERAL CIVIL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2678, the bill (S. 4268) to authorize a Federal civil-defense program, and for other purposes.

Before we begin to debate the measure I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I desire to reserve my right to object to consideration of the bill until I can ask the Senator from Illinois a few questions with respect to it.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be very glad to listen to any inquiry with respect to it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Has the Senator from Illinois discussed the subject with the minority leader?

Mr. LUCAS. On yesterday I advised the Senate that we would take up the civil-defense bill before we concluded with the business of the present session of Congress.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I agree that the bill should be considered. I am not raising any question with respect to that point. However, there was some discussion yesterday about the desire of a number of Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle to have time to look at certain provisions of the bill. I do not know whether they have had such opportunity.

Mr. WHERRY. I was not present when the distinguished majority leader made his request. I wonder if he would object to having a quorum call. I believe some Senators who are interested in the bill desire to offer amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader stated that he would suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I understand that the request of the Senator from Illinois has not been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill is pending.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be suspended.

Mr. MORSE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon objects. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have discussed the matter with the able Senator from Oregon, and I again ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now withdraw the request, which is pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois withdraws the request which is pending before the Senate, which is that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the civilian defense bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as there was a colloquy between the majority leader and the minority leader relative to the request he is withdrawing, I was wondering whether the majority leader would not state the reason for withdrawing the request at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to do that. It is my understanding that a tentative agreement was made between members of the Armed Services Committee that certain amendments should be offered to the civilian-defense bill, and that the bill would not be taken up until tomorrow. Under those conditions, of course, I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In other words, it is the intention of the majority leader to move for the consideration of the bill tomorrow, is it?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. The moment we finish with the other matters which may be pending in the Senate this afternoon, I shall make a motion to take up the civilian defense bill, and in view of the understanding between the members of the committee, of course, we will consider the bill tomorrow. I hope we may debate it this afternoon, with the understanding that the vote on the bill will be taken tomorrow, if that is satisfactory to the Members of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. It is perfectly agreeable. That will give every Senator an opportunity to offer an amendment if he desires to do so, but the votes will come tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has been recognized.

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF TITLE II OF THE FIRST WAR POWERS ACT, 1941

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 2680, Senate bill 4266.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2466) to amend and extend title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments with an amendment, on page 2, line 3, after the word "designate" to strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "but in no event beyond June 30, 1952," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 538) is hereby amended by striking out the words "the prosecution of the war effort" and the words "the prosecution of the war", appearing in such section, and inserting in lieu of each stricken provision the words "the national defense."

Sec. 2. Title II of such act, as amended, shall remain in force during the national emergency proclaimed by the President December 16, 1950, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate, but in no event beyond June 30, 1952.

Sec. 3. Nothing in this act shall prejudice anything heretofore done under the said title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, or the continuance in force of any action heretofore taken thereunder.

Mr. WHERRY. Before we proceed with the consideration of the bill, I should like to ask whether the bill as it comes from the committee has to do only with title II.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It has to do with title II. It makes the powers granted applicable to the present emergency. The committee reported the bill with a limitation, that the powers conferred by the bill are in no event to continue in force longer than June 30, 1952.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no objection to the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas wish to make further comment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. In view of the answer I have just given to the distinguished minority leader, I do not believe it necessary to discuss the bill. I am sure every Senator is familiar with it and understands it, and I ask that the amendment be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 3, after the word "designate", it is proposed to insert the words "but in no event beyond June 30, 1952."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am trying to get this matter clear in my own mind. This bill would amend title II of the Second War Powers Act, would it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in favor of the legislation, I may say, but will not the Senator state why it is necessary to do what the bill provides for?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I can point out the reason. The powers which were conferred by title II in the original act of 1941 contained this language:

The President may authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the war effort—

That referred to the war effort of that time. In the bill now pending the language has been changed so as to read "in connection with the national defense." The intent is merely to bring the statute up to date, to make it applicable to the present emergency, rather than to World War II.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not sure of the number of the section, but does not section 401 of the Second War Powers Act provide that the power shall remain in full force and effect until a concurrent resolution adopted by the Congress terminates the war?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say that the position many take is that the war is still in force, but the original enactment referred to the "war," which meant World War II. We are not now proceeding under a declaration of war, so far as the present national emergency is concerned, and the purpose is to amend the War Powers Act, since it is still in force, so as to make the powers apply to the national emergency which the President declared a few days ago.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the Senator knows my feelings, and that I am absolutely in favor of what the Senator is attempting to accomplish. But in order to keep the record straight, I will say that, in my opinion, section 401 of the Second War Powers Act is in full force and effect so far as national emergency is concerned, and if it is the power is already in existence. I am not concerned over taking the action now proposed. I think it is a good thing. It shows what the intention is. But I ask: If it is necessary to amend title II of the act to do what the Senator proposes to do with respect to contractual authority, what about title I under which it is proposed to set up the central agency for Mr. Charles Wilson?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that he certainly knows that the President requested such powers, or amendments of title I, so as to confer those powers.

Mr. WHERRY. But does the Senator from Arkansas think title I is necessary?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That I have not decided. I may say that our committee has held hearings on the matter. We are still holding hearings on that question. We have not reported a bill for that purpose. We simply know there is a distressing situation existing in regard to contracts.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in favor of alleviating that situation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If legislation for that purpose is not immediately passed the defense effort may be retarded. Therefore the committee acted as quickly and expeditiously as it could with reference to that subject. There can be no question as to the importance of this authority.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Am I correct in my understanding that Mr. Wilson will appear before the Senator's committee tomorrow?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Wilson will appear before the committee tomorrow at our invitation. I may say I intended to announce this afternoon to all Members of the Senate that the hearings were in progress; that Mr. Wilson will appear, and because of what I believe to be adequate considerations, I have concluded that that should be an executive session, of course with an invitation extended to any Member of the Senate to be present who may care to attend.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I commend the Senator from Arkansas for the expedition and speed with which he has handled this phase of the recommendations made by the President. I think everyone understands the importance of immediate legislation on the contract feature of the World War II Powers Act. I also believe that something will have to be done with respect to title I. I do not know what Mr. Wilson will say about it. But I am satisfied, from what I can learn in a cursory way, that some legislation will have to be passed if Mr. Wilson is to have the kind of power he believes he ought to have. I know the Senator from Arkansas will consider that and, of course, establish safeguards with respect to any and all reorganization features, which we have heretofore discussed from time to time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I may say to the able majority leader, that the immediate problem, of course, is to ascertain just what powers are actually needed. The committee felt yesterday, after the conclusion of hearings such as we were able to have, that we should invite Mr. Wilson to discuss this subject with the committee and give us the benefit of his thinking at this time.

I may assure the majority leader that it is the purpose of my committee to expedite these matters. Certain safeguards may be necessary. We are trying to give the subject full consideration, and not act hastily or blindly. We are trying to obtain all the facts in respect to the subject, and do what we honestly believe to be in the best interest of our country by providing the powers we find are needed.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. Is it not a fact that the method devised of having a separate enactment such as proposed by the majority leader, and also by the Senator from Arkansas, is the preferable method because of a unanimous decision of the committee that there should be a termination date fixed, which, as provided in the bill, is June 30, 1952. Rather than attach it to the existing law, this separate enactment is considered to be the preferable method?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think so. I think the committee is trying to handle the matter in the most judicious manner possible.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am heartily in accord with what the Senator is attempt-

ing to do. I am glad the Senator from Arkansas reported the bill as amended, restricting it to title II.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the able Senator we felt there should be no delay about the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. Has the distinguished Senator made up his mind with relation to the observation previously made that, if the authority requested already exists, the proposed legislation might in any way take away any of that authority?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The bill would take away nothing.

Mr. WHERRY. As the Senator knows, I spoke previously with reference to title I.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The pending bill has no relationship whatever to title I. Title I is still in the same category, has the same status, has the same force and effect it has had.

Mr. WHERRY. But assuming, if the Senator will, that section 401 continues titles I and II in full force and effect, what I am asking is if the amendment is needed? What does it do?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think it is to make the powers applicable to a declared emergency rather than to the prosecution of a former war.

Mr. WHERRY. That is something that should be cleared up.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It certainly does no harm. It clarifies the language. If the proposed legislation is enacted there can be no question with respect to the powers.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. Is it not a fact that there are now a total of some 45 disputed matters in connection with which there has been a difference of opinion on the legal side as to whether they can be handled under the existing law?

Mr. McCLELLAN. There are 45 such contracts in the Army alone. That does not include the Navy and the Air Force. We have that much positive testimony. How many there are in other branches the committee does not have information, but there are similar situations in the other branches of the service. This proposed legislation is important and is needed. I am convinced that unless it is enacted, deliveries and production may be retarded, and we ought not to incur any delay.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the position of the Senator is maintained so far as title II is concerned, then is it the Senator's opinion that additional legislation will have to be asked for to amend title I, to carry out its provisions?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say that the committee is proceeding on that premise at the present time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no objection to the bill on our part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment to Senate bill 4266, on page 2, line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR obtained the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the measure.

Mr. FREAR. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas asks for a vote on the measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Delaware also wishes to be recognized, but if the junior Senator from Delaware desires to proceed with his speech, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Delaware is recognized, and he may proceed with his remarks.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Delaware to yield until we can conclude the business at hand, without his losing the floor thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has asked that the junior Senator from Delaware may yield, without losing the floor thereby, so the Senate may conclude the business at hand. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to that request, if it can be understood that I may be recognized after the junior Senator from Delaware has concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is sure we can cooperate in the spirit of brotherly love.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I yield.

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

The bill (S. 4266) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 838) is hereby amended by striking out the words "the prosecution of the war effort" and the words "the prosecution of the war," appearing in such section, and inserting in lieu of each stricken provision the words "the national defense."

SEC. 2. Title II of such act, as amended, shall remain in force during the national emergency proclaimed by the President December 16, 1950, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate, but in no event beyond June 30, 1952.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall prejudice anything heretofore done under the said title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, or the continuance in force of any action heretofore taken thereunder.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2460. An act for the relief of George O. Drucker, Livia Drucker, and their minor daughter, Gloria Elizabeth Drucker;

S. 2888. An act for the relief of Frances Ethel Beddington;

S. 2981. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Merlinet Forgnone;

S. 3044. An act for the relief of Berniece Josephine Lazaga;

S. 3125. An act for the relief of Dr. Lutfu Lahut Uzman;

S. 3241. An act for the relief of George Brander Palohelmo and Eva Leonora Palohelmo;

S. 3259. An act for the relief of Ethelyn Isobel Chenalloy;

S. 3260. An act for the relief of Richard H. Bush;

S. 3261. An act for the relief of Willard Sidmer Ruttan;

S. 3378. An act for the relief of Armando Santini;

S. 3554. An act for the relief of Jose Manzano Somera;

S. 3699. An act for the relief of Linda Leo;

S. 3945. An act to amend sections 3052 and 8107 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the powers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

S. 3966. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.; and

S. 3967. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4803) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 8759. An act for the relief of Rev. Andrew Chai Kyung Whang;

H. R. 8973. An act for the relief of Archibald Walter Campbell Seymour;

H. R. 9145. An act for the relief of Tomoko Yamaya; and

H. R. 9236. An act for the relief of H. Halpern & Bro., Inc., of Boston, Mass.

PROPOSED MEETING OF THE DISTRICT COMMITTEE DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is recognized.

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

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the Senator how long he expects to speak?

Mr. FREAR. I may say to the distinguished majority leader it will be about 8 or 10 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield to me in order that I may place before the Senate a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FREAR. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois if I do not lose my right to the floor by doing so.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object; was that a request, may I ask the distinguished majority leader, for unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may meet?

Mr. LUCAS. This afternoon; yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall have to object to that request. I object in response to requests made by members of that committee who are attending other committee hearings.

The reason I have been asked to object is that those Senators were not present to vote on the appropriation bill and they felt that the other committee hearings were more important. They asked me not to give consent to this matter, at least until they could be notified.

If it is not absolutely mandatory that consent be obtained at this time, I wish the majority leader would wait until tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not have to make any excuses; I think I understand.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I withdraw the excuses, then. [Laughter.]

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in line with the preceding statement, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate bill 4268, providing for a Federal civil-defense program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no objection to the immediate consideration of the bill, if the Senator will go a step further and will say that he intends to have the bill debated this afternoon, and to have the votes taken on the bill tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the understanding, and no excuses will be offered.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4268) to authorize a Federal civil-defense program, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is taken up at this time in accordance with the understanding reached earlier in the day.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the majority leader feel that any other business which might necessitate yeand-nay votes may be taken up this afternoon? Several Senators are preparing to leave.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot guarantee that no Senator on either side of the aisle may not move to have some other measure taken up at some time later today. However, I understand that no Senator on this side of the aisle will do so. On the other hand, during these last 2 days of my life in the Senate, I refuse to guarantee anything. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think we can rely on the Senator's understanding in that regard.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a number of Senators have asked about a call of the calendar. I think that on tomorrow we can proceed, if we have the time—as undoubtedly we shall—to have a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, beginning where the last call of the calendar concluded. However, under no circumstances will I agree to have any other bills considered during the call of the calendar. I am not willing to have the Senate debate over again a number of bills which have been debated heretofore.

Mr. WHERRY. If I correctly understand the position the Senator takes, it is that if a call is had of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, the call will include only the bills on the calendar beginning at the point where the previous call of the calendar ended.

Mr. LUCAS. If we have a call of the calendar tomorrow—and I am certain that we shall—we shall begin where the last call of the calendar ended, and we shall discuss and debate only the bills to which there is no objection. We will not return to the bills previously on the calendar, before the unobjected-to bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then it is the understanding that the call of the calendar will commence following the end of the last call of the calendar.

SOUND MONEY

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate or prevent it from making progress at this time on its ambitious program. I shall take only a few minutes of the very valuable time of the Senate.

Mr. President, the excess profits tax bill which we have passed has been urged on the Congress as an equitable way of increasing the Nation's current payments on the defense program. The measure recognizes a condition which is common to all periods of rising prices and expanding activity. That condition is the wide differences among corporations and among individuals with respect to size of income and with respect to increases in income.

The tax legislation requires payment of additional taxes by corporations which acquire unusual profits from defense contracts or from civilian business. When such revenue is added to the tax increases already imposed on individuals and corporations in the Revenue Act of 1950, substantial additions are made to the funds available for meeting the requirements of our expanding defense program. The tax also has the objective, beyond that of an equitable current payment for the defense program, of encouraging defense production. It does that by limiting the profits, and thus the attraction of the alternative, which is civilian production.

If the defense program is put on a pay-as-you-go basis, by means of this tax and other actions which the Congress may take, and if it is made effective quickly by a rapid increase in defense production, the total cost of procurement will be held to a minimum consistent with the effectiveness of defense;

the mobilization program will not pump credit into an economy which already is inflated; and the future value of the dollar will not be endangered by further accumulation of indebtedness that requires repayment as well as interest costs. As I see it, the tax bill is not designed with the one aim of maintaining the future value of the dollar. However, like other legislation, such as the Revenue Act of 1950, and the Defense Production Act, it has that aim, along with the aim of meeting immediate conditions of a more particular nature, such as raising revenue, reducing profiteering, authorizing priorities, controlling installment and real estate credit, and so on. The aim of maintaining the soundness of the dollar should always be included when the justification of a legislative proposal is offered during inflationary circumstances.

This aim, a sound dollar, is common to many legislative enactments. It is of greater importance than any of the particular objectives sought by those enactments. Unless the aim of sound money is realized, attempts to attain the other objectives are, in my opinion, without much point. The reason for this is simple and fundamental. The people of our Nation make their living by producing for sale to other people, and by buying from others, the things they need but do not produce or own. The common denominator for stating the value of commodities produced, and the value of productive work, and the means for making payment when buying commodities or services, is the dollar. Without a common denominator for such diverse items as bushels of wheat, work at a machine, consideration of legislation, railroad transportation, and the many other products and occupations familiar to everyone, an economy of free bargaining, free choice of occupation, free business enterprise, would be impossible. Many or most of the products and occupations would be impossible.

If the common denominator fails to function properly, or if it is forced into disuse, the form of our economic system will change.

The common denominator must be sound; that is to say, its value must be stable from day to day and year to year, so that those who work, save, borrow, lend, and invest, can plan ahead, develop efficiency and skill, build productive capacity, and provide for their own future. That is what sound money means. It does not imply a particular form of currency; but it does imply that whatever the form, it will continue; and the value of it, in terms of the things and work for which it is a common denominator, will go on without great interruptions and changes. Sound money in this sense is the basic requirement of capitalism, and always should be given first consideration when appraising our economic situation and any proposals for legislation affecting it. Unfortunately, sound money as a descriptive term, sometimes has been identified with a specific form of money which, whatever its other virtues, would require discontinuation of the form then current. In debates over monetary proposals, the term sound

money has fallen somewhat out of repute. But the objective of sound money, which is a reliable common denominator for exchange, and for planning of the affairs of individuals and of governments probably is more important today than at any time within the last three quarters of a century.

The first of the circumstances which makes sound money of such importance is the obvious one that more of the Nation's people depend on money income and expenditure for their living than in the past. The second is the circumstance, likewise well known, that more people are debtors or creditors, and for larger amounts, than in the past; and, of course, that the Federal Government has a greater volume of debt than in the past. The third circumstance is that the value of the dollar has depreciated considerably in recent years. The fourth and most compelling reason for attention to the soundness of the dollar is that we are nearer than in many years to a danger point at which money begins to lose its acceptability as a common denominator of value in trade and industry. This is the point at which individuals and corporations may begin resorting on a wide scale to inflation hedges, then to barter and to theft rather than to the use of money, for exchanging or acquiring commodities and services. It is also the point at which the Government is compelled to use requisitions rather than money to obtain what it wants. Development of these latter conditions usually is followed by introduction of a new money, and is accompanied with political disturbances, sometimes of a revolutionary nature.

The circumstances referred to above, in my opinion, make sound money at least equal in importance to military strength. Any appraisal of our position and prescriptions for it, require at least a brief description and analysis of those circumstances.

Since our economy is entirely a money economy, it seems to me that its soundness is essential if production is to be adequate, either for ordinary consumption and business purposes, or for these, plus defense preparations. We must remember that the whole economy is organized around money payments.

Money measures the value of work and of commodities, and so it measures debts and credits. Sound money is essential to equity between debtor and creditor. The biggest debtor is the Federal Government. Its direct obligations at the end of November 1950 totaled \$257,076,619.514. Its biggest group of creditors were the banks, which held slightly less than one-third of these obligations. Individuals held slightly less than one-quarter of the total. Insurance companies held about one-twentieth. Other corporations held about the same portion. The principal other holder, United States Government investment accounts, held as much as insurance companies and nonfinancial corporations together. Nearly all of the Federal debt is World War II debt. Those who loaned money to the Government during World War II have lost purchasing power on long-term securities which they have retained.

The loss on about \$150,000,000,000 of long-term Treasury bonds and Savings Bonds issued before 1950 and still outstanding has amounted to something more than \$40,000,000,000 in purchasing power. The Government, of course, has not necessarily gained that much. It is not essentially true that the Government's ability to obtain tax revenues has changed by the same amount as the price index which indicates a loss in purchasing power to investors. There have been both increases and decreases in real wages which, with other factors, determine ability to pay taxes to the Government. With reference to some periods, the gain in taxable capacity may have exceeded losses to creditors.

There have been increases in debt and credit in many places other than the Government. For example, new non-farm mortgages of less than \$20,000 each have amounted to one billion one hundred million to one billion six hundred million dollars in each month of the last year. Any change in the value of the dollar would affect seriously the creditors who have extended the money secured by these mortgages, and would as well affect the hundreds of thousands of borrowers. As another example, consumer credit has increased to about \$19,300,000,000, an increase by 28 percent during 1 year. Bank loans increased nearly \$5,000,000,000 in the first 3 months after the beginning of war in Korea. The inequities between creditor and debtor probably have been, and will be, less in the case of business and installment loans than in the case of real estate loans and Government bonds. The reason is that the term is shorter and the amount smaller.

The fluctuations of the value of the dollar in recent years, and particularly in recent months, have come with considerable changes in the position of groups other than creditors and debtors. While the value of the dollar has declined by two-fifths since the beginning of World War II, money wages have tripled; profits after taxes have quadrupled; dividends more than doubled; rental incomes doubled. Federal taxes have increased more than eightfold. This span of years has comprised three periods of depreciation of the dollar—the war, the postwar years of 1946–48, and the months of 1950. In each of these periods, the different indicators of economic change have varied with respect to which moves first, which moves fastest, and which moves farthest. The rates of change in consumer prices in 1950 have been only three-fourths as fast as in 1946–48, while wholesale prices have risen one and a sixth times as fast. Sales have risen two and three-quarters times as fast; profits two and two-fifths times; total wages only nine-tenths as fast; industrial production four times as fast; employment less than half as fast, and weekly earnings one and one-quarter times as fast. A comparison of recent months with 1939–44 shows a different picture. As in comparison with 1946–48, however, wholesale prices have risen faster in recent months than in the earlier periods; this has been true also of profits.

What has been the moving force toward depreciation of our money? In the first half dozen years of the war and postwar inflation, the moving force clearly was the increase in Federal Government expenditures. In the period 1946-48, money saved out of the period of large expenditures was spent in a period of inflation, while governmental expenditures were being cut very sharply. In the recent months, inflation or depreciation of the value of the dollar has proceeded without an increase in Government expenditures. However, in the period of the sharpest recent increases, additional Government expenditures have been anticipated and have led both business and consumers to spend more. Federal expenditures have been of such a large amount as to maintain the economy close to full employment, even though they have been financed principally out of taxes. An increase in such expenditures now, particularly if it is made by pumping additional money into the economy, will increase prices more than proportionately. The reason is that production is near to capacity throughout the economy, and responses to higher prices and better markets will be made only if the benefit of a response is unusually high; that is, only if much higher prices can be obtained.

As the value of the dollar depreciates, a danger point may be reached. Mr. Edwin Nourse has spoken of that danger point as follows:

The greatest thing we have to fear in the economy of the United States is a spreading fear of the future of the dollar. That distrust is already upon us in some degree. It is not too late to cure it by sound public and private policy. * * * The signs of fear are daily accumulating as people ask each other, "What is the best hedge against inflation?" Hedging against inflation is a flight from the dollar. * * * Those who are ready to take a chance on "containing" inflation may well ponder what happens when a stampede once gets started.

Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR HATTIE W. CARAWAY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is with sadness and deep regret that I announce the death of my esteemed former colleague in this body, the Honorable Hattie W. Caraway. Death came to Mrs. Caraway at the Whitehall sanitarium, Falls Church, Va., at 11:15 a. m. today as the result of an illness she has suffered since early last January.

Senator Hattie W. Caraway, the widow of former United States Senator Thaddeus H. Caraway, had a most enviable career as a public servant. Upon the death of her illustrious husband, the Honorable Thaddeus H. Caraway, while he was serving as a Member of this body, she was appointed a Member of the United States Senate from the State of Arkansas on November 13, 1931, to fill the vacancy occasioned by his death.

Thereafter she was elected by the people of Arkansas to fill out the unexpired term. She was subsequently elected to this high office by the people of Arkansas in 1932 and in 1938 for 6-year terms.

As I recall, Senator Hattie W. Caraway was the first member of her sex ever elected by the people of a sovereign State of this Union to represent it in the United States Senate. Her reelection to two full terms is a testimonial to her and proves the great esteem and confidence in which she was held by the citizens of my State.

After her term as Senator expired on January 2, 1945, she was appointed by the President of the United States as a member of the United States Compensation Appeals Board, in which position she served faithfully until recently, when she was compelled to resign on account of ill health.

In the course of her service here she attained national recognition as an able legislator and made a host of admiring friends throughout the Nation, who, I know, today share with the citizens of my State the deep sorrow that they feel in the loss of this distinguished woman.

It was my extreme good fortune to have her warm personal friendship and to have labored with her as a colleague in the United States Senate. Her attitude toward me as a junior member of this body during the 2 years in which I served with her was one of utmost kindness, consideration, and cooperation. These magnificent personal qualities she exemplified in all of her labors.

She was in her womanly tenderness and understanding devoted to the cause of human welfare, and was always solicitous and diligent in her efforts to promote and advance the interest of the common man and to contribute in every way possible to a higher standard of life for our people and toward the building of a stronger Nation.

Among relatives and loved ones who survive her are two distinguished sons, Col. Paul Caraway and Col. Forrest Caraway, of the United States Army, both of whom are graduates of the Military Academy at West Point, and both of whom have dedicated their lives in the service of the defense of their country.

Mr. President, I extend to those relatives and loved ones my heartfelt sympathy. I share with them the sorrow and grief that I know they are experiencing in the loss of their mother, who was my esteemed friend and for whom multitudes of American citizens mourn today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by my colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas. It was with profound sadness that I heard of the death of former Senator Hattie W. Caraway. She was an old and close friend of my mother and of myself. Her husband, the late Senator Thaddeus Caraway, was, as many Members of the Senate know, one of the outstanding Members of this body for many years.

Former Senator Hattie Caraway was a fine character and was greatly devoted to the interests of her State and of the Nation. She labored long and faithfully

in behalf of her country and of the people of my State. I know that I speak for all the people of Arkansas and all the Members of the Senate in expressing my deep sympathy to her family.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to join the distinguished Senators from Arkansas in what they have said in regard to former Senator Hattie W. Caraway. I am very glad I had the opportunity of knowing her and that I can be remembered as one of those who were her friends. She was a lovely lady. She served her family, her State, and her Nation well and with great distinction.

THE GOVERNMENT'S DISPOSAL OF ESSENTIAL AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES UNDER CLASSIFICATION OF "SURPLUS AND NONESSENTIAL"

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, last Friday the President, in speaking to the American people, emphasized that our country was confronted by two grave threats: First, the threat of communism; and, second, the threat of inflation.

To combat these threats the President called upon the American people to forget the "business as usual" policies and requested that we all pull together in an effort to rebuild our Military Establishments, conserve our natural resources, and check the current inflationary spiral.

To accomplish this goal the President on the following day declared that a "state of emergency exists in our country," and thereby paved the way for price and wage controls.

Conferences are being held today in Washington between leaders of the meat industry and administration officials to discuss the need of price controls on meats. Price controls have already been declared in effect in one major industry, and similar conferences to those which are being held today are scheduled with representatives of other industries.

On Monday of this week the Price Stabilization Director, Michael V. Di Salle, indicated that later this week he would call for an honor-system freeze on all prices and wages, appealing to the patriotism of the American people to cooperate with their Government in this grave emergency.

From reading the American newspapers in which the plans of the Government officials are outlined, we are given the impression that at long last the administration has recognized that a war is going on. The days of reckless Government waste accompanied by the politics as usual slogans are being replaced by a call for a united effort, without regard to politics, for greater production, stockpiling, and conservation of our Nation's resources.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Evening Star of December 18, 1950, entitled "United States Aims at 10 Percent Rise in 1951 Crop Output."

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

UNITED STATES AIMS AT 10 PERCENT RISE IN 1951 CROP OUTPUT; WOULD TOP 1948 PEAK

The Government's crop production targets for 1951 will call for at least 10 percent more

food, livestock feed, and fiber commodities than was harvested this year.

Under the threat of war, the Agriculture Department is outlining production programs which, if realized, would top the record farm output of 1948.

This year's crop volume turned out to be bigger than had been forecast. In its final report of the year, issued yesterday, the Department said the harvest was the third largest of record.

LONG FALL SEASON WAS FACTOR

A prolonged fall season for maturing and harvesting crops helped improve the quantity and quality of many items, the Department said.

The aggregate volume of this year's harvest was 126 percent of the 1923-32 average. This compares with the record of 137.5 percent in 1943 and 132 percent in 1949.

Much of next year's increase will be sought in cotton, wheat, and corn. A very short cotton crop this year has led the Government to urge farmers to produce at least 60 percent more in 1951.

LARGER CORN CROP SOUGHT

While supplies of corn are large the Government would like to see next year's crop top this year's by 15 to 20 percent. Corn is the major raw material for production of meat, milk, and poultry products.

This year's harvest was a well-balanced one, with the single exception of cotton. Only a few crops in themselves set records—soybeans, grain sorghums, and sugar beets. But many crops were far above average.

In the class of large crops were corn, oats, hay, rice, potatoes, tobacco, cranberries, and alfalfa and sweetclover seeds. Larger-than-average crops of flaxseed, sorghum, silage, peanuts, sugarcane, hops, apples, pears, cherries, citrus fruits, and truck crops were harvested.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in this article it is pointed out that the Department of Agriculture is calling on the farmers of this country to increase production of all basic agricultural commodities, and they emphasize the fact that these commodities are essential to our national welfare. It also calls attention to the critical shortage with which this country is faced in regard to cotton.

In view of this background and after listening to the patriotic appeals on the

part of the President and other administration leaders, I was shocked this week to find that the administration, while calling upon the American people for greater sacrifices and expressing great concern with the threatening rising cost of living, were at the same time launching one of the greatest international bargain day sales of the twentieth century.

In order that the Members of Congress might realize the size of this bargain day sale, I shall insert in the RECORD a copy of United States Department of Agriculture Bulletin No. 2873-50 dated December 1, 1950, in which the Department of Agriculture announced its December sales prices for agricultural commodities which are listed as nonessential, declared surplus, and offered for sale in export trade only. These commodities are being offered with a strict provision that under no circumstance are these bargains available to the consumers in the United States or its Territories, nor are they available for purchase by foreign countries using ECA dollars.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the above-described bulletin.

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

CCC ANNOUNCES DECEMBER EXPORT SALES PRICES FOR SURPLUS COMMODITIES

Ralph S. Trigg, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, United States Department of Agriculture, today announced the prices at which approximate quantities of the Corporation's commodity holdings will be available to commercial exporters for export sale during the month of December 1950. The following commodities will be available during the month: Dried whole eggs, nonfat dry milk solids, raw linseed oil, flaxseed, dry edible beans, dry edible peas, Austrian winter pea seed, wheat, oats, barley, corn, grain sorghums, potato starch, fresh Irish potatoes, and gum rosin.

The list, which varies from month to month as additional commodities become available, or commodities formerly available are dropped, is designed to aid in moving CCC's excess inventories into export through regular commercial channels. By knowing

in advance the commodities and quantities that are available, private exporters are in position to develop export sales before the commodities are actually purchased from CCC.

Since the beginning of the program, in January of this year, sales for export, reported through November 23, totaled \$77,374,780, covering the following commodities:

Commodity	Quantity	Dollar value
Mexican canned meat		
pounds.....	30,242,260	\$2,747,977
Mexican canned beef.....do.....	120,120	24,336
Dried whole eggs.....do.....	4,191,528	1,090,214
Frozen turkeys.....do.....	141,171	38,099
Shelled peanuts.....do.....	11,000,000	893,750
Cottonseed oil, crude.....do.....	3,240,000	429,300
Flaxseed.....bushels.....	1,172,499	4,522,818
Dry edible beans		
hundredweight.....	520,134	2,971,679
Dry edible peas.....do.....	285,643	815,314
Wheat.....bushels.....	12,862,249	30,487,625
Barley.....do.....	4,151,942	5,373,107
Corn.....do.....	11,133,320	17,623,270
Grain sorghums		
hundredweight.....	2,784,815	5,980,512
Fresh Irish potatoes.....do.....	4,801,383	48,014
Gum rosin.....do.....	508,580	3,534,895
Linseed oil, raw.....pounds.....	4,783,026	699,624
Nonfat dry milk solids.....do.....	1,206,716	124,246

¹ Includes sales only through April 1950. In May this commodity was dropped from sales list and sold "as available."

The December list of commodities, the approximate quantities for sale, the points where available, and the export sales prices, are given below. Sales are restricted to buyers not using ECA dollars or other funds of the United States Government, but commodities for which the sales prices are not less than the domestic market price on the date of sale may be resold to buyers using such funds.

The CCC will entertain offers from prospective buyers for the purchase of any commodity on the current list. Offers accepted by CCC will be subject to the terms and conditions prescribed by the Corporation. These terms include payment by cash or irrevocable letter of credit before delivery of the commodity, and the conditions require removal of the commodity from CCC storage within a reasonable period of time and proof of exportation.

Announcements containing all terms and conditions of sale will be furnished upon request. Interested persons are invited to communicate with the Production and Marketing Administration, USDA, Washington 25, D. C., with respect to all commodities.

December export price list

Commodity	Approximate quantity available (subject to prior sale)	Export sales price
Dried whole eggs, in carload lots only: 1950 pack (in barrels and drums).....	10,000,000 pounds.....	{ F. a. s. vessel, United States Gulf or east coast ports: 1950 pack, 60 cents per pound. 1948-49 pack, 30 cents per pound. F. o. b. cars or trucks at warehouse locations: 60 cents per pound for 1950 pack or 30 cents per pound for 1948-49 pack, less freight based on the average gross shipping weight, at the lowest export freight rate to New York or New Orleans, whichever is lower.
1948-49 pack (in barrels, drums, and 14-pound containers).....	11,150,000 pounds.....	
Nonfat dry milk solids, in carload lots only: Spray process.....	165,000,000 pounds ¹	{ For export to all countries except those listed below: Spray process, 12½ cents per pound f. o. b. location of stock in any State. Roller process, 10½ cents per pound f. o. b. location of stock in any State. For export to Western Hemisphere countries except Canada and colonial possessions of foreign countries, and territories and possessions of the United States: Spray process, 9½ cents per pound f. o. b. location of stock in any State, less freight based on the average gross shipping weight, at the lowest export freight rate from that location to nearest port of export. Roller process, 7½ cents per pound f. o. b. location of stock in any State, less freight based on the average gross shipping weight, at the lowest export freight rate from that location to nearest port of export. 14 cents per pound f. o. b. tank cars at storage locations (Buffalo; San Francisco; Los Angeles; Cleveland; New York; Philadelphia; Baltimore; Portland; Oreg.; Houston, Tex.; Kenedy, Tex.; and Good Hope, La.). No. 1, \$3.50 per net bushel (56 pounds pure flaxseed) bulk, basis in store Minneapolis or other points of storage, subject to stocks. For other grades market differentials will apply.
Roller process.....	75,000,000 pounds ¹	
Linseed oil, raw.....	529,000,000 pounds ¹	
Flaxseed, bulk.....	2,000,000 bushels ¹	

¹ These same lots also are available at domestic sales prices announced today.

December export price list—Continued

Commodity	Approximate quantity available (subject to prior sale)	Export sales price
Dry edible beans:		No. 1 grade 1948 crop f. a. s. vessel at locations shown below:
Pinto, bagged.....	920,000 bags ¹	\$5.90 per 100 pounds, San Francisco and Portland, Oreg.; \$6 per 100 pounds, United States Gulf ports.
Pea, bagged.....	250,000 bags ¹	\$5.50 per 100 pounds, east coast and North Pacific ports.
Red kidney, bagged.....	505,000 bags ¹	\$6 per 100 pounds, New York.
Great Northern, bagged.....	1,370,000 bags ¹	\$5 per 100 pounds, Portland, Oreg.; \$5.10 per 100 pounds, United States Gulf ports.
Baby lima, bagged.....	150,000 bags ¹	\$5.50 per 100 pounds, San Francisco.
Pink, bagged.....	126,000 bags ¹	\$5.25 per 100 pounds, San Francisco.
Red kidney, bagged.....	65,000 bags ¹	No. 1 grade 1949 crop: \$6.50 per 100 pounds f. a. s. vessel, New York.
		Discounts for grades on all beans:
		No. 2, 25 cents less than No. 1.
		No. 3, 50 cents less than No. 1.
		At CCC's option, 1949 crop beans may be furnished in lieu of 1948 beans in instances where stocks are exhausted of 1948 beans of the type and grades desired.
Dry edible peas, bagged.....	600,000 hundredweight ¹	No. 1 grade, 1949 crop, \$3.75 per 100 pounds f. a. s. vessel, North Pacific ports.
		If sold at point of production deduct cost of transportation, and cost of processing if sold on basis thresher run.
		Peas may be used for splitting provided entire quantity of split peas produced therefrom is exported.
Austrian winter pea seed, bagged.....	73,000 hundredweight.....	Market price on date of sale at place of delivery, provided delivery takes place within 15 days, unless otherwise agreed upon.
Wheat, bulk.....	100,000,000 bushels ¹	Do.
		Wheat may be used for milling export flour, provided the entire quantity of flour produced therefrom is exported.
Oats, bulk.....	11,675,000 bushels ¹	Market price on date of sale at place of delivery, provided delivery takes place within 15 days, unless otherwise agreed upon.
Barley, bulk.....	28,300,000 bushels ¹	Do.
		Barley may be exported as malt or pearled barley when all the malt or pearled content is exported.
Corn, bulk.....	100,000,000 bushels ¹	Market price on date of sale at place of delivery, provided delivery takes place within 15 days, unless otherwise agreed upon.
		Corn may be used for the manufacture of starch, provided the entire quantity of starch produced therefrom is exported.
Grain sorghums, bulk.....	16,000,000 hundredweight ¹	Market price on date of sale at place of delivery, provided delivery takes place within 15 days, unless otherwise agreed upon.
		Grain sorghums may be used for the manufacture of starch, provided the entire quantity of starch produced therefrom is exported.
Potato starch, in carload lots only:		
Pearl type, packed in 200-pound burlap bags with paper inner liners.....	600,000 pounds ¹	
Powdered type, packed in 100-pound and 200-pound burlap bags with paper inner liners.....	4,860,000 pounds ¹	\$4.50 per hundredweight f. a. s. vessel, Boston, Mass.
Fresh Irish potatoes, packed in usual 100-pound burlap sacks, in carload or truckload lots only.....	Substantial quantities, as available in Aroostook County, Maine.	U. S. No. 1 grade when loaded at CCC's point of purchase: 50 cents per sack f. o. b. cars at country shipping point, for export to areas other than United States possessions, Canada, Mexico, Cuba, or the Caribbean area.
		Consideration will be given to offers to purchase potatoes packed in crates at above price plus additional costs to CCC. Communicate with the Director, PMA Commodity Office, 67 Broad St., New York, N. Y. Telephone Digby 4-8300.
Fresh Irish potatoes, for processing into potato food products for export.....	Quantities as available in the late potato-producing States.	Basis 1 cent per hundredweight bulk ungraded at farm, plus reimbursement for approved marketing services required to be performed.
Gum rosin, in metal drums averaging 517 pounds net each.....	80,000 drums ¹	\$8.50 per hundred pounds net, grades M through G, \$8.65 grade N, \$8.75 grade WG, and \$9 grades X and WW, "as is," on storage yards in Georgia and Florida.

¹ These same lots also are available at domestic sales prices announced today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to call particular attention to the fact that included in the bulletin are 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, 100,000,000 bushels of corn, and millions of bushels of other grains. They are all listed as surplus. At the same time that they are being classified as surplus and nonessential the Department of Agriculture is asking for greater production, and the Price Administrator has said this week he would consider setting price controls on such commodities in order to hold down the price. Nevertheless they are still being declared surplus and nonessential.

In this bulletin it will be noted that under this surplus-disposal program, the sales since January through November 23, 1950, total \$77,374,780. As of June 23, immediately prior to the outbreak of war in Korea, the sales under this program for the first 6 months totaled only \$11,366,648.

Immediately following the outbreak of the war in Korea and during the succeeding months, export sales under this surplus disposal program jumped an average of over 600 percent, and it is significant that the sales during the month of November jumped an average of 1,300 percent over the average sales for the

6 months prior to the outbreak of the war in Korea.

The dollar sales recorded do not tell the full story since they do not reflect the losses which were sustained on some of these commodities.

For instance, in this \$77,000,000 reported as sales there is reflected only the amount we received in payment and not the cost of the goods to the American taxpayers.

As an example I call attention to the fact that the 4,801,385 bags of potatoes, 100 pounds each, were sold at an average price of 1 penny per bag, and the amount reflected in the receipt column is only \$48,014.

This is an extreme example, but nevertheless in each instance the total volume is reflected only as the amount received and in practically all cases the sales price was substantially below the cost of the items.

I call attention again to the fact that these commodities which are being offered for export are not a part of the agricultural commodities which are being shipped to Europe under the ECA program.

It is almost beyond comprehension that we find our Government through the Commodity Credit Corporation today, 5

months after the beginning of the Korean War, still liquidating its inventories under the classification "surplus and nonessential."

This is particularly hard to understand when we find that the same Government agency, the Department of Agriculture, only yesterday issued an appeal to the American farmers to put forth an all-out effort to increase their production of these same agriculture commodities in 1951 by at least 10 percent.

I fully recognize that if these commodities are held in reserve at this time and if during the subsequent months the war clouds were to vanish, our Government would not realize as much money in their sale as it would under the existing circumstances. However, the difference in the price which we would receive for these commodities today and that which we would receive in the event of world peace 1 year from now, is a small amount to pay for this country's security.

On the other hand, if the war clouds continue and we become involved in a third world war, the vast inventories of agricultural commodities in this country which we had on hand at the beginning of the Korean episode would prove a godsend.

At a time when our country is being threatened by an outside aggressor, with the cost of living reaching an all-time high, with price controls being considered on all food and agricultural products, and at a time when every sensible and loyal American recognizes that we must conserve our resources, there is absolutely no possible justification for the existing policy of treating these inventories as "surplus and nonessential."

It is inexcusable that this administration, through the Department of Agriculture, while under the threat of war clouds, should continue stripping the American cupboard bare and distributing our resources to the far corners of the earth.

To further emphasize the contradiction of this dumping program, I call your attention to the fact that only today the Congress is being asked to appropriate about \$17,000,000 to be used in the replenishing of our stockpiles of strategic materials and in the rebuilding of our national defense.

Also, we are proposing to draft millions of American boys in the Army. These drastic measures are being authorized on the assumption that there is a grave threat of another world war.

Yet we still find the same administration which is advocating these wartime measures conducting its activities in the Department of Agriculture as if there were no threat either of inflation or of war.

In order that the Members of Congress might better realize the gigantic scale upon which our reserves are being depleted through international bargain sales, I shall summarize these offerings, reduced in terms of carload lots, basis 50 tons for each car.

Remember all of these are still classified as surplus.

First. Two thousand four hundred carloads dried milk solids, or 240,000,000 pounds.

Second. Five thousand carloads raw linseed oil, or 529,000,000 pounds, representing 66,000,000 gallons.

Third. One thousand one hundred and twenty carloads bulk flaxseed, or 2,000,000 bushels.

Fourth. Nine hundred and twenty carloads dried pinto beans, or 92,000,000 pounds.

Fifth. Two hundred and fifty carloads dried pea beans, or 25,000,000 pounds.

Sixth. Five hundred and seventy carloads dried red kidney beans, or 57,000,000 pounds.

Seventh. One thousand three hundred and seventy carloads Great Northern dried beans, or 137,000,000 pounds.

Eighth. One hundred and twenty-six carloads dried pink beans, or 12,600,000 pounds.

Ninth. One hundred and fifty carloads dried baby lima beans, or 15,000,000 pounds.

Tenth. Six hundred carloads dried edible peas, or 60,000,000 pounds.

Eleventh. Seventy-three carloads Austrian winter pea seed, or 7,300,000 pounds.

Twelfth. Sixty thousand carloads wheat, or 100,000,000 bushels.

Thirteenth. Three thousand seven hundred carloads oats, or 11,675,000 bushels.

Fourteenth. Fifteen thousand carloads barley, or 28,300,000 bushels.

Fifteenth. Fifty-six thousand carloads corn, or 100,000,000 bushels.

Sixteenth. Sixteen thousand carloads grain sorghum, or 1,600,000,000 pounds.

Seventeenth. Fifty-four carloads potato starch, or 5,460,000 pounds.

Eighteenth. An unspecified quantity of fresh Irish potatoes, listed as available at a price of 1 cent per hundred-weight at the farm.

Nineteenth. Four hundred carloads gum rosin, or 80,000 drums.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. FREAR. I think the Senator made reference to fresh Irish potatoes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Does not the senior Senator from Delaware think the unspecified quantity will be higher in the next few months than it was when the present figures were prepared?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In this bulletin issued on December 1 they did not place any figure or quantity with reference to surplus potatoes. They listed potatoes as an unspecified amount. That is the language they used. Apparently the potatoes which are being offered are potatoes which are now coming from the State of Maine, and they are being sold as fast as they are received. Apparently they do not know how many they will have, and therefore they did not specify the amount of potatoes which are to be offered. They did say it would be a substantial quantity.

Mr. FREAR. Does it not seem to the senior Senator from Delaware that there may be good reason for using the term "unspecified amount" or "unspecified quantity"?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In view of the fact that they used specified amounts with respect to other commodities, it would seem to me that the reason for using the reference to an unspecified amount was because they did not know how many potatoes they would get from the State of Maine, although they estimated it would be in the millions of pounds. Prior to this, they had sold 4,000,000 bags of potatoes at a penny a bag.

Mr. FREAR. Does not the senior Senator from Delaware think it is reasonable to assume that the quantity will be so high that public opinion in this country on the potato issue will be what it was about 12 months ago?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unless I miss my guess, public opinion will not only be the same with reference to potatoes, but there will also be public resentment to any agricultural commodity's being classified as surplus or nonessential when at the same time the Government is asking Congress to give them power to put price controls on such commodities in order to hold down the price. At the same time, they are calling on farmers for an all-out increase in production of the same commodities which are classified as surplus and nonessential. To make mat-

ters worse, we are losing hundreds of millions of dollars annually on the disposal program.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator, and I thoroughly agree with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are also 210 carloads of dried eggs representing 63,000,000 dozen in shell form. Altogether this accounts for approximately 160,000 carloads of agricultural commodities, most of which are nonperishable.

It is estimated that there are about 110 freight cars to the mile. If they were all put into one train they would make a solid train of surplus commodities reaching from Independence, Mo., to the White House. Instead of calling it the Missouri mule train, it should be called the international gravy train.

In addition to the sales of agriculture commodities through export, substantial quantities of our inventories as of June 30 have been sold to domestic merchants, who in turn have redistributed the goods through domestic channels or export.

That portion of sales which has been made to domestic dealers does not affect the over-all national supply since the goods if sold to domestic dealers, would still be in this country and available to the American people.

However, it does make a great difference when these inventories are sold for export either directly by the Government or indirectly through private exporters.

Of course those commodities which are perishable must be moved in some form, but the perishable commodities represent but a small percentage of the over-all sales and offerings covered by the list of December 1.

A major percentage of the commodities which have been declared surplus as of December 1 and offered for resale—export only—are nonperishable commodities and commodities which could readily prove essential to our national welfare in the event of war or of an unexpected crop failure.

Reserve supplies of wheat, cotton, wool, corn, linseed oil, dried beans, and all other types of grains are just as essential to our national defense program as are guns and planes. These, nonperishable items should be stockpiled particularly in the face of a grave international crisis—even more so than some items which are currently on the stockpiling list.

I have previously called attention to how our Government during the recent months declared surplus and disposed of a huge inventory of wool at a loss to the taxpayers of around \$25,000,000. Now they are proposing to replenish this inventory at an increased cost of more than 50 percent over its sales price.

Cotton: Since the outbreak of war in Korea on June 25 our Government has liquidated its holdings of approximately \$600,000,000 worth of cotton. Large quantities of this cotton which have been sold since the outbreak of war have been exported from this country with the result that today our Government finds itself extremely short of this critical war material as was pointed out yesterday by the Secretary of Agriculture, when

he appealed to the southern farmers to increase their acreage in 1951. Yet we have completely liquidated the 3,500,000 bales of cotton from the inventory which we had June 30, 1950, valued at approximately \$600,000,000. A substantial amount of that cotton has been exported.

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. O'Connor) has called the attention of the country to the fact that substantial quantities of other war materials have been exported from this country to China since the outbreak in Korea, and the country as a whole has been rather critical of the shipping companies which have been named as transporters of these goods.

I made the statement previously—and I am sure the Senator from Maryland will agree with me—that while we do not excuse any American shipping company from their obligation to reject shipments to China under the wartime conditions existing since June 1950, we are not so much interested in the names of the shipping companies who were acting as common carriers but in the names of the exporting firms and manufacturers in America who were attempting to profiteer by selling war materials to an enemy of our country in time of war.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am in entire agreement with the statement just made by the Senator from Delaware. So far as investigations have progressed thus far, I do not feel that the entire blame rests upon the shipping companies. It is unquestionably true, as the senior Senator from Delaware has just stated, that when those carriers are presented with licensed items for transportation, items with respect to which approval has already been received from the Government, they are faced with a difficult situation. When manufacturers undertake to make the shipments, it is understandable that the shipping companies face that situation, and may not, therefore, be entirely to blame. I quite agree that the Senator has very properly stated the situation.

While I am on my feet, I should like to pay tribute to the senior Senator from Delaware for the painstaking study he has made of this particular subject matter. I express the hope that the subject will be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am sure that under the leadership of the Senator from Maryland the subject will be investigated, because I know that the committee of which he will be the chairman, and of which I am hoping to be a member, intends to go into this question. I believe that that is one of the main things the American people want to know. They want to know who is responsible for these shipments. The shipments are going out of this country with the endorsement and blessing of our Government. We should know the names of the Government officials who are endorsing these shipments, and the departments in which they operate. Perhaps we should know the reasons why they endorse them.

I should like to point out, as I have stated before, that at the outbreak of war we had 3,500,000 bales of cotton on hand with the Government, which was a very good stockpile with which to enter a national emergency. About \$600,000,000 of the money of the American taxpayers was invested in this reserve. Since June 1950 that reserve has been liquidated, with the exception of a little less than \$20,000,000 worth of cotton.

The exports from this country are as follows: During the month of June we exported 740,533 bales; during the month of July we exported 265,000 bales; August, 355,000 bales; September, 372,000 bales; October, 283,000 bales, or a total of over 2,000,000 bales. The value of these exports since the outbreak of the war in June exceeds \$371,813,000, not including the large quantities for which export license have been granted since October.

On September 8 the Government put in export controls over cotton. One would think that the Government was going to stop the exports, but it seems that it was merely desired to channel the exports to those whom the Government wanted to handle the business. Since export licenses have been put into effect, the allocations requested for cotton exports have increased. On October 10, the Department of Agriculture approved the allocation of 2,000,000 bales of cotton for export. On November 2 it approved the allocation of 146,000 bales. On November 7 it approved the allocation of 1,350,000 bales of cotton. The Department of Agriculture approved the allocation of this cotton for export on the assumption that cotton was not a strategic material and was not essential to our national welfare. Any man in his right senses knows that cotton is an essential wartime commodity. The country recognizes that there is a great shortage of cotton at this time.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from Delaware have any information as to whether any of this cotton which has been shipped abroad has been sent behind the iron curtain, to any country which is in conflict with our desire for world peace?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am coming to that. Some of this cotton, unfortunately, has gone to China and other communistic controlled countries. As I have stated before, I do not know to what countries the wheat, corn, beans, potatoes, and other commodities were exported. I refer to those which have been exported since the outbreak of the war. However, it is an established fact that substantial quantities of cotton and other essential war materials of which there is a critical shortage in this country have been exported since the outbreak of war in Korea. A substantial quantity of cotton has been going behind the iron curtain, and even direct to China.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, does the distinguished Senator from Delaware have any information as to whether or not reports have been made to the proper agency and to the Senate Committee on

Agriculture and Forestry of what has actually been transported since the outbreak of the Korean War in this respect?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not being a member of the Agricultural Committee, I am unable to answer that question. I will say that it took quite a while to dig out this much information. So it must not have been too much of an open book so far as the Senate is generally recognized.

We know of six shipments involving 50,000,000 pounds of cotton which have been exported to Manchuria and Red China direct since the outbreak of the war in Korea. How much more through rerouting I am unable to say. These shipments from this country to China have been with the full knowledge of the administration officials. They were made from New Orleans during the months immediately following the outbreak of the Korean episode. These shipments were made from allocations directly from the Commodity Credit Corporation's inventory, with the full knowledge and consent of that agency, to the exporting concern with the understanding they were going to Red China.

These shipments were as follows:

Date	Amount exported (bales)	Destination
July 13, 1950 (2 shipments)...	13,000	Dairen, Manchuria.
July 17, 1950....	1,857	Do.
Aug. 7, 1950....	7,520	Do.
Aug. 7, 1950 (2 shipments)...	3,946	Do.
Aug. 21, 1950....	10,127	Do.
Aug. 21, 1950....	3,615	Tientsin-Taku Bar, China.
Aug. 24, 1950 (2 shipments)...	800	Do.
Aug. 28, 1950....	2,839	Dairen, Manchuria.
Aug. 28, 1950....	4,859	Do.
Total....	48,563	

Do not forget that these were allocated by the Commodity Credit Corporation to this export concern to go to China and Manchuria under these contracts after we had gotten into the war with China.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Does the distinguished Senator from Delaware have any information that would throw any light upon the proposition of why these shipments of somewhat critical material, such as cotton, would be made after war was under way? Does the Senator have any explanation as to how that came about?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I talked with the Department officials, and they said their excuse for shipping this was that prior to the outbreak of war in Korea they had entered into negotiations with China and Manchuria, by which they were to send them certain amounts of cotton in return for soybeans. These soybeans, as Senators know, are not strategic war materials, and can be bought freely. They said that after the war—or rather, after the police action broke out in Korea—since it was not recognized by the Government as a war, they felt that they were to a certain extent honor bound to continue these shipments and complete their agreements.

Of course, I fail to understand that, because prior to June 24 we also had a

gentlemen's agreement that we would not shoot the Chinese or North Koreans, and that they would not shoot us, but that gentlemen's agreement was broken after June 24, as any American soldier in Korea will tell you.

It is ironic to note that the cotton used to fill these orders was allocated to the exporting firm by the Commodity Credit Corporation, who at the time knew that the shipments of cotton were going to Manchuria and Red China.

Altogether approximately \$370,000,000 worth of cotton was exported from this country, a substantial portion of which was accounted for by Government sales, how much, if any, of the other commodities mentioned have been exported to China or other communistic countries, either directly or through re-routing in transit, I am unable to say at this time. I am advised by the Department officials that it will take some time for them to compile the information, but I shall insist that this information be furnished to the committee.

I am advised that the customary procedure to follow in licensing the export of these commodities is that the exporting firm will put on his shipping statement that he is guaranteeing to ship the commodity to X country. There seems to be no follow-through to see that the shipment goes to that country. The main thing the Government agency seems to endeavor to ascertain by its follow-through is that the commodity is shipped out of the country. There does not seem to be too much of a check here as to whether or not the commodity is rerouted in transit or what finally happens to it. One segment of our Government seems more concerned about stripping the American cupboard bare and getting rid of these commodities and getting them out of the domestic markets.

With \$600,000,000 worth of cotton being sold at domestic prices and under the threat of export controls the market naturally was not as high as the world market. Following the sale of that cotton to the American cotton merchants, export releases were made of 3,500,000 bales whereby that cotton could be exported out of this country into a world market which averaged about 20 to 30 percent higher than the domestic market. The profits which automatically accrue to the firms which bought this cotton prior to the allocation of these export licenses run into the hundreds of millions of dollars, and I am determined to find out who made this profit.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does the Senator from Delaware have information as to the names of the concerns to whom these sales were made?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have the names of one or two of the concerns, which I would rather not give at this time for certain reasons. The only exporter whose name I am going to reveal at this particular time is the Government itself. I think the American people are entitled to know the names of all manufacturers in this country, exporters, or

any business concerns, that have been trading with the enemy since June 24. They are entitled to know the names of all Government officials or agencies who have condoned this practice. I think the American people are especially entitled to know that one agency of the Government itself, namely, the Commodity Credit Corporation, is guilty. So I do not think we should be too harsh in our criticisms of some of our corporations for doing what the Government itself is doing, and that is failing to recognize that a war is going on.

I am reporting this information to the Senate and the country since I believe that each of us should know what this Government agency has been doing since June 23 while the American forces have been fighting in Korea.

I am ashamed of the fact that the name of the first exporter to be revealed as responsible for shipments of strategic materials to Red China since the outbreak of the Korean War should be an agency of the United States Government. Their effort to excuse these shipments on the basis that a contract was entered into prior to the outbreak of the war has no weight whatsoever. It is common knowledge that war cancels all prior contracts, and the mere fact that the administration has seen fit to describe the conflict in Korea as a police action instead of war in no way lessens their responsibility to see that all aid to our enemy was stopped immediately.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not had the pleasure of hearing all of the Senator's speech. However, I know something about the subject matter and about what is covered by his remarks. I should like to state that I am in complete sympathy with the observations the Senator has made.

It is unfortunate that at this late date we have now to begin to investigate these matters. I was proud of the fact that the Committee on Rules and Administration reported immediately the resolution providing for the creation of a special committee to investigate the very violations—as I call them—or, at least, the procedures under which the Government agencies have been operating.

Mr. President, I do not seek to take credit for what has been done; but while I am on my feet I wish to say that I am sure some Senators will remember the determined fight which has been made in the past 2 or 3 years by distinguished Senators. At one time a resolution was signed by some 53 or 55 Senators, calling for an investigation of the shipment of strategic materials to Russian satellite countries; and Senators asked that such shipments at least come within the provisions of our own export controls. I refer now to the goods which were shipped from the United States to Russian satellite countries, under the reciprocal trade agreements and bilateral agreements.

As long as 2 years ago it was pointed out that Russia and the satellite coun-

tries were obtaining strategic materials, which were being sent from the United States, at the expense of the American taxpayers, to the ECA countries. Now we find that those goods have been used to make the very bullets that are killing our boys in Korea.

Certainly it is most regrettable that the horse is out of the barn. The failure of those in charge of the foreign relations of our country to act effectively to stop the flow of war materials to Russia and her satellites is one of the contributing causes of the national emergency that now confronts the United States. We are reaping the whirlwind of many failures in foreign policy.

I think it behooves the next Congress—for it looks as if the present Congress is about to end its session—to appropriate the money required for the investigations which I hope will be conducted by the very able Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] under the provisions of the resolution, so that this matter will be investigated, and so that these infringements and violations, as I call them, will be terminated by the Government. Certainly some new procedures should be entered into.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his statement. I know that on numerous occasions during the past few years he has led the fight to stop the shipment of such strategic materials to Russia and her satellite countries. I also wish to join him in paying tribute to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], because I think the action of the Senator from Maryland in calling our attention to the fact that such strategic materials were leaving this country and were going to China is certainly one of the greatest contributions which has been made by any Senator, and I am proud of what he has done. I shall join him in the future in all attempts to get to the bottom of this problem and to stop these shipments.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator will remember the names of all of the 55 Senators who signed the resolution, and that the Senator will especially recall the work done by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who about a year ago compiled many statistics in regard to the shipments of strategic materials. That job was a very difficult one, because it was almost impossible to obtain those statistics from the Government agencies. However, the junior Senator from Missouri did a masterful job in reporting that information to the Members of the Senate and to the people of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator. Many shipments have been made. However, even as of today the Government is declaring 60,000 carloads, or 100,000,000 bushels, of wheat to be a nonessential, surplus commodity, and 100,000,000 bushels of corn to be a nonessential, surplus commodity. They are offered for export, except that they cannot be sent to ECA countries as a substitute for ECA funds.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish the Senator to misunderstand what I said.

When I said the horse is out of the barn, I was referring to what the investigation will reveal.

However, the point is that when this matter was pointed out 2 years ago, and then was very forcibly called to the attention of the Senate, we were very much better off in respect to that situation than we are now.

I am totally in sympathy with the resolution, and I favor it. We reported it from the Committee on Rules and Administration the same day it was called to our attention. The resolution has already been agreed to and the committee has been set up to hold hearings until January 31, at which time it will be necessary to request a new authorization for the committee. I certainly hope the Senate will support the request at that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator, and the country would have been much better off today had the administration heeded the advice of the Senators from Nebraska and Missouri in checking the shipment of these strategic materials.

Mr. President, I think the Government should put an immediate end to the exporting and declaring as surplus of any agricultural commodities, particularly those which are not perishable. I think there is no excuse at all for the classification of a long list of agricultural non-perishable commodities as surplus and exportable. It is absolutely inexcusable for this Government, since the outbreak of war, to have completely liquidated its cotton holdings, comprising approximately \$600,000,000, and to have agreed, as it has, to the exportation of practically all that cotton from this country, when we need it here in the United States, and when at the same time the Government has been calling for the

farmers of the United States to increase their production.

I think the greatest contribution this Government could make to the war effort would be to have a Cabinet meeting downtown and for those in charge of the executive departments to make up their minds whether we are in war or out of war. If we are in war, then let the Government itself begin to make its contribution to the war effort.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder whether the Senator from Delaware saw in the New York Herald Tribune of this morning the report headed as follows:

Hong Kong Sees United States Embargo as a Peril to It—Colony Charges That Curb Will Strangle Trade and Provide Red Propaganda.

The article is by Homer Bigart, a special correspondent to the New York Herald Tribune.

The first part of the article reads as follows:

Hong Kong, December 20.—Faced with possible economic ruin by the American embargo on shipments to Red China, this British colony, grown incredibly fat on record trade profits of the past 2 years, is trying with pathetic intensity to believe that everything is going to be all right.

The initial reaction to the embargo was one of bitterness against the United States. That was perfectly normal, since this colony lives by trade and at least one-fourth of its business is with Communist China. If the embargo and Peking's retaliatory measures are effective, Hong Kong stands to lose the equivalent of nearly \$800,000,000 a year.

A similar article appears in the New York Times, Mr. President.

I shall not read further from the article. However, let me state that it appeared that last year there was done

from Hong Kong, largely with Red China, over \$1,000,000,000 worth of business.

Is it the idea of the Senator from Delaware that the impact of those shipments, in terms of the attacks upon our boys in Korea, may be a matter of very vital concern?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no question at all about that. I may say that in addition to the shipments I have mentioned, substantial quantities of cotton have been shipped to Hong Kong. When I referred to shipments made to China I was not referring to shipments going to Hong Kong, but I was then referring only to shipments going directly to China. Although there is no question but that shipments made to Hong Kong eventually go to Red China, yet such shipments are made under the guise of sending materials to the British colony of Hong Kong. I think it is past time that all such shipments were stopped.

Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, a chart which outlines the exports of cotton from the United States between June and October of this year. These figures are the latest I have been able to obtain.

These exports are broken down by countries. The figures are presented both in terms of bales and in terms of dollar volume. They represent exports of 2,017,687 bales, or about two-thirds of the inventory in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of June 30, 1950, and they represent a sales volume of \$371,813,000.

I now ask that these statistics be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

United States exports of raw cotton—June to October 1950

Schedule C No.		Quantity in bales					Value in thousands of dollars						
		June	July	August	September	October	Total	June	July	August	September	October	Total
101	Greenland												
122	Canada, including Newfoundland and Labrador ¹	26,028	18,562	10,921	22,406	32,637	110,554	4,383	3,143	2,013	4,373	6,628	20,540
223	Costa Rica ²				20		20				4		4
239	Cuba ²	100	400	1,000	900	2,171	4,571	18	64	202	185	478	947
242	Jamaica ¹		300		200		500		63		42		105
247	Dominican Republic ²		150		94	50	294		26		20	9	55
301	Colombia ²	12,283	4,160	5,818	2,401	2,856	27,518	2,174	741	1,026	487	650	5,078
307	Venezuela ²	349	774	688	1,666	368	3,845	67	143	144	363	81	798
337	Chile ²	3,729	2,083		467		6,279	686	378		99		1,163
401	Sweden (ECA)	3,060	847	893	8,863	1,305	14,968	512	142	160	1,893	263	2,970
403	Norway (ECA)	1,774	105	893	2,568	1,771	7,111	321	20	165	510	380	1,396
409	Denmark (ECA)	4,613	1,246	1,626	1,533	1,762	10,780	836	249	355	326	367	2,133
412	United Kingdom ¹ (ECA)	1,919	12,160	67,143	63,257	35,020	179,499	339	2,152	12,440	12,877	7,427	35,235
419	Ireland ¹ (Eire) (ECA)			300	805	200	1,305			59	166	42	267
421	Netherlands (ECA)	27,483	565	619	6,493	12,903	48,063	4,907	110	115	1,426	2,884	9,442
423	Belgium and Luxemburg (ECA)	11,359	4,918	3,886	6,023	7,423	33,609	1,848	834	704	1,190	1,519	6,095
427	France (ECA)	116,882	4,744	10,668	31,611	39,778	203,683	19,775	844	1,982	6,213	8,089	36,903
431	Germany (ECA)	168,451	7,032	9,661	37,640	36,655	259,439	30,136	1,306	1,957	8,059	7,989	49,447
433	Austria (ECA)	19,432	1,466	371			21,289	3,442	278	70			3,790
435	Czechoslovakia (E)	2,550	3,000	4,941		400	10,891	505	603	1,035		80	2,223
437	Hungary (E)		201				201		35				35
441	Switzerland (ECA)	2,141	200	813	5,755	3,603	12,512	343	32	145	1,169	684	2,373
455	Poland and Danzig (E)	859	17,127	1,123			19,109	154	2,758	228			3,140
469	Spain	5,427	6,571	4,227	3,925	256	20,406	928	1,253	876	825	61	3,953
475	Italy (ECA)	110,108	1,942	3,556	9,939	12,936	138,481	18,560	346	681	2,160	2,760	24,507
476	Free Territory of Trieste (ECA)	278					278	46					46
479	Yugoslavia (E)		2,500	20,450	1,600		24,550		494	4,086	334		4,914
484	Greece (ECA)	12,379	1,386	128	658		14,551	2,204	250	27	128		2,609
485	Rumania (E)	5,109					5,109	779					779
507	Iran		46			9	55		8			2	10
509	Israel and Palestine ¹	500	500	250	500		1,750	86	87	58	124		355
533	India ¹	35,886	5,628	1,839			43,353	5,945	1,006	321			7,272
551	French Indochina and French India	4,850		778	4,987		10,615	883		132	906		1,921
561	Indonesia (Netherlands Indies)	1,000	829				1,829	180	183				363
565	Philippines, Republic of	863	600	1,073	1,601		4,137	156	109	230	329		824
571	China	22,802	15,361	50,227	500		88,890	3,613	2,538	8,411	74		14,636

¹ Countries included in "British Commonwealth of Nations".

² American republic.

United States exports of raw cotton—June to October 1950—Continued

Schedule C No.		Quantity in bales					Value in thousands of dollars						
		June	July	August	September	October	Total	June	July	August	September	October	Total
573	Manchuria (including Kwantung).....		22,377	17,798			40,175		3,407	2,729			6,136
581	Korea (Chosen).....	9,071					9,071	1,335					1,335
582	Hong Kong ¹	15,390	20,637	25,678	603		62,308	2,493	3,300	4,080	108		9,981
583	Taiwan (Formosa).....	2,010	39				2,049	4,575	6				4,581
587	Japan.....	109,260	106,307	108,405	154,950	89,187	668,109	18,768	18,888	19,972	30,670	18,381	106,679
711	French Morocco.....	1,703					1,703	300					300
792	Union of South Africa ¹	684	400	202	416		1,702	124	66	37	86		313
	Total.....	740,533	264,982	355,975	372,381	283,816	2,017,687	127,203	45,826	64,441	75,148	59,195	371,813

¹ Countries included in "British Commonwealth of Nations."

COMMENTS ON THE ADDRESS TO THE NATION BY HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have been seeking recognition in order that I might begin the debate on the civil defense bill.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think I shall be very long in making the speech, but I should like to exercise my right to make it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to say to Senators that there is on the desk before him a list of Senators desiring to speak, which list the Chair has been endeavoring to follow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise, with a great deal of temerity, to discuss extemporaneously various questions of foreign policy which were raised last night in a speech by a great American. I find myself in agreement with a great many parts of the speech. I find myself in disagreement with certain assumptions which I think were made in President Hoover's speech, which are false assumptions. I feel free to discuss his speech because as he has pointed out in the speech itself, debate on foreign policy is very desirable. Therefore, Mr. President, in these extemporaneous remarks I wish to present at least a point of view on foreign policy which I think I owe it to myself to make clear for the record.

In view of the fact that this is a purely extemporaneous speech, I shall not yield during the course of the speech, because what it really represents is the junior Senator from Oregon thinking aloud on vital questions of foreign policy, as he sees them, which have been raised by former President Hoover's speech. The junior Senator from Oregon has not had the time since the deliverance of the Hoover speech to prepare a manuscript, which would protect him as to the continuity of his remarks in case of interruption as he proceeded; therefore, he will not yield at any time during the speech, until he finishes it. He will then be very glad to yield for such questions as his colleagues may wish to ask him.

At the outset I wish to say that in my opinion, it is incumbent upon my party, the minority party, which, in recent months and in recent days in this session of Congress, has been taking stands on foreign policy in conflict with what we thought was a bipartisan—nonpartisan foreign policy, to come forward with

a specific foreign policy program of its own. I register a strong dissent from the notion that it is the primary duty of the minority party merely to take a negative, critical attitude toward the foreign policy of the present administration. I think that if the leaders of the Republican Party do not wish to support the foreign policy program of the present administration, they owe it to the American people to specify wherein they except and to offer constructively and affirmatively their substitute proposals on each one of the issues in regard to which they take exception with the administration. Certainly in an hour that is so dark and critical as this, my great party, the Republican Party, cannot justify standing before the American people and saying "We ask you to support us, because we oppose the foreign policy of the administration, in part or in whole," and then refuse to tell the American people exactly and specifically and affirmatively what substitutions they would make for any part of the program of the administration.

I desire to make it very clear that in these extemporaneous remarks I speak only for myself; but I honestly believe, in presenting the views I express here this afternoon that there will be found support for them among millions of Americans and among millions of voters within the Republican Party and among millions of voters within the ranks of the independents, as well as among the Democratic voters of the country. I desire to say again as I have said so many times in the past, that in my judgment we are dealing here with an issue so vital to the very survival of America that the challenge of statesmanship which confronts everyone who holds office in these days is to rise above the level of partisan politics and take the great question of foreign policy to the heights of statesmanship. We should keep faith with the principles of the platforms of both major parties of 1948 when, in essence, they pledged themselves that partisanship would stop at the water's edge so far as foreign policy was concerned.

I do not speak for him this afternoon, Mr. President, but I would, in my humble way, honor him this afternoon and pay tribute to him, when I say that, in my judgment, one of the great statesman in the field of foreign policy in the past decade has been the great giant from the State of Michigan, the senior Senator from that State, Mr. ARTHUR VANDENBERG. And I think it is well in this hour of crisis that my party, the

Republican Party, review again the basic tenets of the doctrines on foreign policy which the giant statesman from Michigan has so valiantly presented and defended and promulgated in this body in a series of historic speeches, and which he has exemplified and sought to implement as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, under the leadership of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] when the Democrats have been in a majority, and under his own brilliant leadership during the Eightieth Congress, when my party was in power. As I have thought through these great problems of foreign policy during the past critical weeks, I have tried to answer with complete intellectual honesty this question: "What vote that you have cast on foreign policy since you have been in the Senate of the United States would you now change, not on the basis of the facts you had then, but on the basis of the facts you have now?"

To my way of thinking that is the acid test. O Mr. President, each one of us can say, in a spirit of rationalization, that on the basis of the facts we had when we cast our vote we would still stand by that vote, but I think the acid test of the voting record of each one of us is this: How would you vote now on the same issue, if, ab initio, this were the first time the issue was presented to you? How would you vote now on the basis of the facts you now have?

Mr. President, there is not a single vote on a single major issue of foreign policy that I have cast during my term of office that I would change on the basis of present day facts if I were now called upon to vote.

Having said that, Mr. President, I think I have summarized and epitomized as well as I can my chief evaluation of the speech delivered last night by a great American, former President Hoover, because, on the basis of some of the assumptions set forth in that speech, if the facts supported the assumptions, I would have answered the question differently. On the basis of some of the assumptions contained in that speech, some of my votes in the past 6 years would have to be modified. However, I am satisfied that the facts do not support certain assumptions made in Hoover's speech last night.

I intend, Mr. President, later in this speech, to take specific paragraphs of former President Hoover's speech of last night and tell wherein I find it impossible for me to go along with certain of his

assumptions. But let me say this early in my speech, that I find myself, as the RECORD tomorrow will show, on the basis of my remarks today, in agreement with many of the major points of the Hoover speech. But, with equal clarity, let me say that I do not think the Hoover speech last night enunciates the specific points for a foreign-policy program either for the Republican Party or for the American people that either group should follow in toto. There are some statements in it which I would make a part of the Republican foreign policy if my party is going to be insistent upon establishing a Republican foreign policy in contrast with the foreign policy of the administration instead of meeting the challenge of working on a cooperative and consultative basis with the administration. I believe that so far as Republican policies are concerned, my party should raise this great issue to a level of statesmanship and support one foreign policy for the United States, a foreign policy around which all leaders of America can gather and which they can in unity and unison support.

In fact, Mr. President, in comparison of the Hoover speech last night with the speech delivered a few nights ago by the titular head of the Republican Party, the Governor of New York, Mr. Dewey, I would say that I think that, in the main, the Governor of New York made a much more objective and realistic speech, in view of present world conditions, than the great ex-President of our country made last night. When I say that, it is not to be interpreted that I think the Dewey speech was the complete answer as to what the Republican position should be, nor does it mean that I do not believe there should be some modifications or revisions of the Dewey speech as the basis for a foreign policy program. But there is this great difference between the two speeches: In my judgment, the Governor of New York, in his great speech, was much more realistic in connection with one all-important, vital fact than was the great former President Hoover in his speech last night. I think the speech made by the Governor of New York recognized that the security of America is dependent upon the survival of Europe to a much greater extent than that point was recognized by the former President of the United States in his speech last night.

It is because of that fundamental difference in point of view on foreign policy which I think exists within my party at this hour, that I, with great temerity, rise to speak extemporaneously of some of my views on foreign policy.

Mr. President, as I read through the Hoover speech and concluded my reading of it, I said to myself, "That would be a great speech if all the assumptions in it were true. That would be a reassuring speech, a comforting speech, a speech that would appeal to my desire to be safe and to my desire to have 160,000,000 fellow Americans safe, if all the assumptions in it were true."

Unquestionably, many of the assumptions in it are true, but in regard to the importance of Europe to the survival of America, it seems to me the great Mr.

Hoover failed in the preparation of his speech to give adequate weight to certain realities which confront us in respect to Europe.

Mr. President, some days ago the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] not only on the floor of the Senate but elsewhere, expressed to those of us who always are eager to get his point of view on foreign policy—and I think this body knows the high esteem in which I hold the junior Senator from Massachusetts and the confidence I have in his thinking, leadership, and statesmanship in the field of foreign policy—the warning that we should not underestimate the importance of the Ruhr to the security of America. He made that statement before Mr. Hoover made his speech.

One of the things that concern me about some of the assumptions in the Hoover speech of last night is the great danger that psychologically it will be looked upon by many in Europe as an invitation to surrender Europe to communism. We Americans cannot take the position that we and we alone are going to dictate the terms of European cooperation. We Americans cannot take the position, from the standpoint of our own safety and survival of the freedom way of life in the world, that all the freedom-loving nations within the United Nations, who have so much at stake and so much to risk so far as the threat of spreading communism is concerned, must abide by our decisions, our wishes, and our mandates.

Mr. President, though certainly the great ex-President of the United States had no such intention—and I hope the fear I am about to voice is ill-founded, but I doubt it—I fear that there are many people in Europe who will look upon the speech as a weakening of the North Atlantic Pact. I fear that psychologically the speech will not lend strength to the North Atlantic Pact at almost the hour of the close of the Brussels Conference.

I am not in a position to say with authority how successful the Brussels Conference was. I shall have to await a full disclosure of the agreements, commitments, and understandings which were entered into. However, to the extent that I have been advised informally and unofficially, as a Member of this body I was greatly cheered today by advice and information which I received in connection with the Conference at Brussels. Such advice and information caused me to believe that great progress has been made at Brussels. The Conference apparently moved forward for a strengthening of the North Atlantic Pact. The appointment of the great American soldier and leader, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, as the head of the North Atlantic Pact military forces is enthusiastically received by our allies in Europe. It is a great builder of morale. The conference gave every indication that our allies in Europe fully understand the importance of their cooperating with us shoulder to shoulder, manpower for manpower, industry for industry, in building up the defenses of Europe in order to meet the potentialities of a Russian attack.

I would, Mr. President, that the speech last night of the great Hoover had laid greater emphasis upon the importance of the North Atlantic Pact and the progress which has already been made in connection with the North Atlantic Pact, instead of being phrased, as it was, in terms which I feel will cause too many of our loyal and enthusiastic friends in Europe to be filled with discouragement. I fear the Hoover speech will cause too many dissident groups in Europe that are seeking to spread propaganda against us to spread further misrepresentations about the heart and soul of the American people in this fight for freedom. I fear that Russia will undertake to paint the picture that we are ready to walk out on Europe and leave her to her own protection and defenses. I fear that because of the assumption of the speech that the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans are sufficient protection for our national security if we arm the Air Force and the Navy to the teeth.

Speaking now as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and on the basis of my knowledge as a member of that committee, but again speaking only for myself and not for the committee, I think the American people need to be told today by our Government that arming our Air Force and our Navy to the teeth is no guaranty of the ultimate security and survival of America.

The Hoover speech failed to take into account some of the military realities about which I think it is perfectly proper to speak.

The Soviet Government and its satellite forces have in being today a tremendous submarine power. In my judgment the submarine power of the Communist part of the world in being today necessitates some modification of the assumptions in the Hoover speech to the effect that we can survive safely by withdrawing into ourselves and rely upon the oceans, and our Navy and Air Force for internal security. The Hoover speech clearly implied that he thinks it would be safe for us to walk out of Europe. I think it would be a very dangerous thing to do.

Likewise, I think the great ex-President overstated his case from the standpoint of the military aspects of it, with his emphasis on the Navy and upon air power. By all means we must keep the American Navy as strong as possible, both so far as surface and undersea vessels are concerned, and we must strengthen it as quickly as possible. The record is perfectly clear that such has been my plea ever since I have been a member of the Armed Services Committee or member of the old Naval Affairs Committee. As a member of that committee I have been constantly urging and pleading for greater strengthening of the naval forces as well as the air forces and the land forces of our country.

There was another assumption in Hoover's speech of last night in which I think he overstated his case from the standpoint of our military posture. That was the assumption that with the two oceans, with the American Navy on them, plus the arming of the Air Force to the teeth, we would be secure against Russia.

He overlooked the fact that Russia, too, is arming to the teeth, both as to submarines and as to all types of air force. He overlooked the fact that the tremendous Russian air forces based both in Siberia and Manchuria, the ones in Manchuria being close to thousands of American boys at this hour, are now capable of delivering a strike of devastating proportions. That striking power will not be limited to areas of the world other than the continental United States.

I happen to be one who believes that the Russian striking forces will first be leveled at the United States, with tremendous leveling consequences on our major cities when and if it strikes. So, Mr. President, I will not be a party to a proposal which seeks to arouse in the American people a sense of security which would be a false security. I think the Hoover speech will cause many Americans to assume that they are more secure than they really are. I think it was a serious mistake for him to give the American people the view that if we direct ourselves to a maximum strengthening of our Navy and a maximum strengthening of our air forces, we have reasonable assurance of survival no matter what happens in Europe. I would emphasize, if I emphasize nothing else in these extemporaneous remarks, the point made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] the other day, that the industrial power of the Ruhr is of vital importance to the security of America.

Comforting as a head-in-the-sand attitude may be, emotionally satisfying as wishful thinking sometimes is, I urge the American people today to evaluate very carefully and consider long what I think is the clear import of the Hoover speech of last night, that we can survive if we withdraw unto ourselves and try living unto ourselves alone with a powerful air force and a powerful navy, letting Europe go down if necessary, provided Europe does not do exactly what we desire to have it do.

I wish to be fair to the ex-President in my critical analysis of his speech. As I read portions of his speech in a moment I shall point out for the RECORD where I clearly agree with him, but also where I would urge caution on the part of the American people, who at this hour are looking for anything that will give them hope that they are going to be secure. The American people would welcome a psychological escape, but there is no escape, psychologically or otherwise, from the realities of the situation which confronts us.

In this country we have always rallied, in times of great crisis around the principle that "United we stand, divided we fall." We have rallied around it as applied to the people of the United States; but I wish to plead with the American people today to recognize that now we must rally around the principle "United we stand, divided we fall" as applied to and as encompassing our freedom loving allies abroad, because I repeat that if Europe goes down Russia will have the Ruhr. If Russia obtains the industrial war-making power of the Ruhr and the rest of Europe, with the slave labor

which her police-state methods will make it easy for her to obtain, she will have the potential war-making power to drive against America, not for 1 year, but for a quarter of a century, or for so long as it will take gradually to whittle us down and finally subdue us.

I believe that the great danger which confronts America is that the plan of Stalin to isolate us from the rest of the world may prevail if Communist Russia succeeds in isolating us from Europe. Who will stand with us once Europe is down? Then we are in for a death struggle with communism. I do not think the realities support what I consider to be the false assumption in the great ex-President's speech of last night. We cannot isolate ourselves and survive.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize in these extemporaneous remarks that I think the military implementation of the North Atlantic Pact, the allied military forces, naval, land, and air, contemplated by it, and the allied plans within it under the leadership of the great Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, presently represent the greatest defense America has. I think it is the only hope for preventing the Ruhr from falling into the hands of Russia, the only hope for preventing the industrial war-making power of our allied friends in Europe from falling into the hands of Russia. I believe this basic point—and I would call it a basic fact, because I think it is basic—must not be lost sight of by the American people. Our security and possibly our survival depends upon preventing Russia from capturing the war-making power of Europe.

It seems to me it was not given the proper emphasis in the speech by Mr. Hoover last night, but, in my opinion, it is the point that should be emphasized above all else. Thus, in this great parliamentary body in the weeks ahead as we proceed with what all evidence indicates is going to be one of the most historic debates ever held within these walls—a debate on foreign policy between sincere and patriotic men on each side of the aisle—we must not lose sight of the relation of Europe to our security. Let me say here and now for the RECORD that I have complete confidence in the patriotism and the sincerity and the motives of those within my party and within the party of the opposition with whom I do not agree as to what the objectives of our foreign policy should be. I pray they give to those of us who disagree with them credit for the same high motives of patriotism and sincerity and a desire to do anything and everything we can that the facts indicate should be done to protect the security of our freedom way of life.

Mr. President, as I interpret portions of the Hoover speech of last night I am left in doubt as to how the ex-President would have answered the question that at the beginning of my remarks I said was the acid test question, if he had been a Member of the Senate during the critical years just past, when, under the leadership of the giant from Michigan, Senator VANDENBERG, we developed what has become known as a bipartisan foreign policy.

Let us take some of those major issues. There were those of us who followed VANDENBERG, and, we hope in our humble way, helped the development of the great idea which, after all, was the basic tenet of every pronouncement he ever made on the floor of the Senate in the field of foreign policy; namely, the goal of eventually setting up a system of international justice through law. There is no hope for the survival of mankind itself, Mr. President, unless in the century to come we reach that goal. Later I shall speak further on that point. As we followed the leadership of the great Senator from Michigan we voted for the Truman doctrine in Greece. Let those who today, on the basis of the present facts, to say nothing of the facts that existed at the time we cast that vote, who now think they would not vote that way, make their position clear in the historic debate that is to come in the weeks ahead. Let them explain what they think would have happened if we had not gone to the aid of Greece.

For the junior Senator from Oregon I want the record perfectly clear that if the vote on the Truman doctrine in Greece was before the Senate today I would vote for it still. Yet in a recent campaign in my State, those who sought to defeat me because of my position on foreign policy, cited it as one of the votes which they claimed justified my defeat.

Let us move to the next great issue. Let those in my party and in the Democratic Party who are now making such a fight on foreign policy, who yet have to come forward with a constructive program of their own, but who voted for ECA, rise on the floor of the Senate in the historic debate ahead and tell the American people that if they had that vote to cast again—not on the basis of the facts that existed when they voted, but on the basis of the facts that exist today—they would vote differently.

O Mr. President, in applying this acid test I want to give them every benefit and every advantage. I want to let them meet the issue as to what they would do today on foreign-policy issues. Yet as we listen to some of their public pronouncements and as we check some of their votes within the party conference as well as their statements on the floor of the Senate, I think we are led to believe that apparently they would now change their votes on foreign-policy issues if they had an opportunity to change them. But, as for the junior Senator from Oregon, let the RECORD be perfectly clear that respecting ECA I would vote today exactly as I did when I first cast the vote. Why? Because, Mr. President, it is my opinion that Europe today would be overrun by Russian communism if it had not been for the millions upon millions of American taxpayer dollars that went to the economic rehabilitation program in Europe through ECA. I think the millions of dollars we have spent for ECA were well spent for American security and were a sound investment in freedom. In my judgment, those millions of dollars were spent at a time when it was nip and tuck in Europe, touch and go, as to whether or not Italy and France, for

example, would capitulate completely to the rising tide of communism which the vicious, false, lying propaganda of the Russians was selling to the troubled minds of the people of Europe. A vicious propaganda that was used as a psychological bombardment upon their minds, developed to the point that many of us were fearful as to whether Italy and France would survive as free nations.

Oh, of course, there were wastes, there were mistakes, and many of them. There were some administration failures. But let me hasten after that sentence to add here a word of tribute to and commendation of the great Paul Hoffman who did such a statesmanlike and valiant job as the Director of the ECA. I think he is one of the great Americans of our time; a man who saw the vision of the century.

Mr. President, the great goal of this century is to establish a system of international justice through law. However, there is no hope of doing that; the possibility of it is extinct the moment Europe goes down to communism.

To my friends in the Republican Party who do not share my views on the need for a nonpartisan, coalition foreign policy, I continue to ask them the question, What chances do you think there are for a system of international justice through law in the century that is ahead of us, if Europe becomes a totalitarian state? My answer to that question is, "None."

That is why, Mr. President, I say that one of the basic assumptions of the speech Mr. Hoover made last night—namely, the return to the concept that the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans can protect us and keep us secure—constitutes an overstatement on his part. I think he failed to evaluate correctly the significance of the industrial war-making power of Europe and the threat of that war-making power to the United States once it falls into Russian hands. We must prevent that threat to our security from occurring. Russia must not be allowed to get the Ruhr.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I wish to say that the American people should not overlook the fact that a great revolution is going on in the world. A little later I shall say something about the attitudes of our allies in Europe. Our allies in Europe should not forget that there is going on in the world a great revolution which will probably last 100 years before there will be reached a point of social and political equilibrium that will permit of the successful operation of a system of international justice through law. That revolution is the revolution of the colored masses as well as suppressed and exploited peoples of all color of the world for a better way of life. At the present time it is not a revolution involving a political ideology. For the most part, those millions are illiterate, ignorant, uninformed, with little understanding, if any, as to the distinctions between the great political system of democracy and systems of totalitarianism. They are millions of human beings who for the most part are motivated by their feelings and their instincts, their desire to survive, and their recognition that, after all, they have a right to a better way of

life. They are going to struggle and to fight, if necessary, for food and shelter and clothing and security for their offspring. That is one of the great realities of the time in which we live. I fear that Hoover failed to give it sufficient consideration when he prepared his speech.

Mr. President, that revolution is rather basic, so far as its instinctive motivations are concerned. That revolution is going on, and nothing can stop it. I think it is an inevitable part of the evolution of mankind itself.

In that revolution we Americans have a tremendous stake. We have a stake so important that I think the outcome of that revolution in the coming century will determine the destiny of America itself. If in the midst of that revolution we play a short-sighted policy and if we proceed to allow the totalitarian states to capitalize, by means of their propaganda, upon an American policy which supports either colonialism or imperialism in the backward areas of the world, I fear that at the end of that revolution we may find ourselves with the colored masses of the world aligned against us. As they improve their industrial power, as their standard of living gradually rises during the course of that revolution—as I believe will be the inevitable result—we had better find ourselves on one side of the colored masses of the world, and not aligned against them. Therefore, Mr. President, I think that in the century ahead we Americans are going to have to take freedom to them and manifest it, in the first place, in the form of economic freedom. That is why I have been heard to say, and why I have repeated here today, for the purposes of emphasis, that before we can instill an understanding of the ways of democracy in the minds of the colored masses of the world who are in revolution, we have to pay some attention to their empty stomachs.

That is why I have felt that the point 4 program is so important. Incidentally, it is not alone a Democratic program; in fact, I think one of the paradoxes involved in the discussion we are having today in this country is that the basic principles of the point 4 program were germinated and generated in the administration of a great former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover. If we study the policies of his administration, both when he was a great leader as Secretary of Commerce, and later as President of the United States, we find that he understood the importance of bringing to the backward peoples of the world an improved economic status, a better way of life. We see that he recognized the importance of putting into practice the great Christian principle that we are our brother's keeper, and that political democracy itself is bottomed upon and rests upon great religious tenets, all of which flow to the basic principle that a society of free men believes in protecting the dignity of the individual.

Mr. President, you cannot study our constitutional debates, you cannot study the biographies of our constitutional fathers, you cannot analyze the Consti-

tution and the Declaration of Independence, you cannot fully understand the rich meaning of the San Francisco Charter, without recognizing that the American people, from the birth of our Nation to this day, have always dedicated themselves to the proposition that, under our system of self-government, we seek to protect the dignity of the individual. We must apply that ideal in our foreign policy. We must apply it in connection with our relationships to backward countries. Therefore, most politely but with great sincerity of purpose, I would say to my friends in Great Britain, in France, in Holland, and in the other allied countries, "We who are ready to make a fight for the freedom way of life need to recognize that imperialism and colonialism in the world are through, and that we only play into the hands of Communist propaganda, if in our foreign policy we follow a course of action which seeks to perpetuate in any degree colonialism and imperialism." That means that in developing our foreign policy, we should exercise much greater care than we have in the past, in seeing to it that we do not in the countries to which we seek to bring aid place our stamp of approval upon reactionary economic, social, and political policies and thereby allow our action to be interpreted as favoring a perpetuation of exploitation of the weak through imperialism and colonialism.

In furtherance of that basic principle, let me say, particularly in view of some discussion which took place on the floor of the Senate earlier this afternoon, that I think in the years gone by we should have been emptying thousands upon thousands of tons of food which is surplus in America into empty stomachs abroad rather than into empty Government bins, when our Government knew that from 20 to 60 percent of such surplus foodstuffs would be wasted by becoming unfit for human consumption before they ever came out of the bins. I think we should have exchanged such foodstuffs for good will, if that is all we could have exchanged them for. But we know, Mr. President, that thousands of tons of food could have been exchanged, in years gone by, for strategic materials. Such an exchange would have placed us in a stronger position today in this great fight for freedom around the world, and would have been one of the most effective answers we could have given to the voice of Russia which has bombarded the air waves of the world with its lying, false representations against us. The former President of the United States very correctly deplored last night in his speech the lying tactics of Russia.

Mr. President, what I am trying to say is that we, the people of the United States, are going to have to demonstrate to the other peoples of the world that we intend to practice our democratic principles, that we intend to put into practice the spiritual meanings of democracy, that we intend to translate into action our faith in the dignity of the individual and our resolve to set up, in the century of struggle ahead, a system of international justice through law, under which great issues of international conflict can

be settled through the processes of adjudication, rather than through a contest of armaments.

I believe we need to demonstrate to the world that we stand ready and willing to execute, along with all other countries, including Russia—and necessarily Russia must be included—a true disarmament program, as one of the steps which eventually must be taken if peace is to replace war in the relations of mankind. If in the century ahead we do not so develop a system of international justice through law that peace can replace war as an instrument for settling disputes among nations, then I think I make no overstatement when I say that I seriously doubt the survival of freedom in the world. However, talk of disarmament today is but wishful thinking, so long as Russia commits one aggression after another.

Now, Mr. President, with these as general principles, outlining at least my philosophy in regard to the approach which I think we ought to take in our foreign policy, I desire to turn to certain very specific arguments and proposals made in the Hoover speech last night. Let me insert at this point a conclusion to the argument which I began a few moments ago, and from which I digressed. I had come to the point of ECA, and I asked the question, "How many who voted for ECA would now, on the basis of facts as they exist today, change their votes? I placed myself on record as one who would not. Let us now move into the next great specific proposal which has characterized our bipartisan foreign policy. Bipartisan foreign policy must not become to the American people merely a name or a label. As leaders in the Congress, we have the obligation of taking to the American people point by point the platform, indeed, the specific planks of the platform of our bipartisan foreign policy.

The next great milestone in its development was the North Atlantic Pact. On the basis of conditions as they exist today—not only as they existed when the vote for the pact was cast, but as they exist today—how many of those on the Republican side of this aisle, who are now apparently so critical of the foreign policy of the United States, but who voted for the North Atlantic Pact, would vote differently today? The junior Senator from Oregon wants the Record to show that he would cast the same vote today on the North Atlantic Pact that he cast when the vote was taken.

The next great step in the development of the so-called bipartisan foreign policy was the military implementation of the pact about which a series of international conferences have been held and in regard to which, primarily, the recent conference in Brussels was held. How many of my Republican colleagues who, in their public statements, are now so critical about the bipartisan foreign policy, who voted for the military implementation of the pact, would change their vote today on the basis of facts as they today exist, if they were given such an opportunity? Let them speak out, Mr. President, when the debate proceeds at the beginning of the

next session of Congress, because their votes are a matter of record.

The American people are entitled to know from them "What do you, as Republicans, propose to substitute for the record which a majority of the Republicans made in the Senate of the United States under the leadership of the great giant from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and how does it differ from the specific proposals for which you voted?"

I repeat, Mr. President, that an obligation rests upon my party not only to criticize the specific things with which it disagrees—and I would it would be more specific in its criticism—but the obligation also rests on the Republican Party to come forward with a specific program on the very issues which now, apparently, through the hindsight of some, they would change if they were in power.

If the specific proposals in the Hoover speech are to be the foreign policy of the Republican Party, then let us formally tell the American people so, and, in keeping with our democratic processes of a free ballot, let them in due course of time, when the opportunity presents itself exercise their choice. But, as for me, Mr. President, I would again vote for the military implementation of the North Atlantic Pact. Mr. Hoover said last night that there is a clear obligation upon the people of Europe to do their share, and in that I am in complete agreement. But I feel that the North Atlantic Pact and its implementation is the greatest defense America has at the present moment.

What else, Mr. President, in broad outline, encompasses the bipartisan foreign policy in Europe? I think the great issues I have mentioned are the major ones. Does the attack on our foreign policy limit itself only to Asia? If so, then the leaders of my party should make that crystal clear.

Let us now take a look at Asia, Mr. President. Of course, as we all realize, with respect not only to Asia but everywhere else in the world following VJ-day, we demobilized too rapidly; but I am proud to say, Mr. President, that we did not demobilize too rapidly with any encouragement from the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate. The record is perfectly clear. Our attitude could be described as dragging our heels, urging that the process not proceed too rapidly. For that too rapid demobilization the primary responsibility has to rest on the shoulders of the 160,000,000 American people, because, after all, Congress, under a system of self-government, is bound to reflect to a remarkable degree the attitudes and the pressures of the electorate. There is nothing surprising about that, and there is nothing bad about it, either. As individual Members of Congress, we have an obligation of leadership, and we all agree we should not yield on principles. But men who hold office are human beings, and although I would not take away from the Congress its fair share of responsibility for a demobilization program which went too fast, nevertheless I would place the primary responsibility for it upon the American people themselves. The demand of the overwhelm-

ing majority of the people of the country in the months following World War II, for fast demobilization at such a rate that the security of America abroad was endangered was yielded to by the Congress and by the administration. That demobilization program played right into the hand of Communist Russia, for during those months and years Russia did not demobilize.

As we were weakening our Armed Forces Russia proceeded to devote a totalitarian economy to the building up of the weapons and arsenals of war. That has been the Russian program. We knew it. The leaders of our Government knew it. Yes, Mr. President, I think we can take judicial notice, so to speak, of the fact that the American people knew it. The record is perfectly clear. Too many of our people were bent on returning to business as usual, profits as usual, yes, an over-all pattern of selfishness as usual.

That is, again, something that is easy to understand, so far as human behavior is concerned. But we are talking today, Mr. President, about causes and effects. We are talking today about results of a pattern of behavior which we laid down for ourselves as a people. We are trying to balance accounts, and we find that our liabilities, because of our own shortsightedness, are large. Of course, our rapid demobilization affected the situation in Asia, because we now know that we did not leave ourselves in an adequate position of defense in Asia. We did not leave ourselves in an adequate position of defense at the outposts of America, which, figuratively speaking, are within a stone's throw of tremendous concentrations of Russian forces. We followed such a shortsighted policy following VJ-day, that we greatly weakened the defenses of the outposts of America in Alaska, for example. This can now be said, because it no longer is true, but at one time since VJ-day we weakened those defenses to such a point that Alaska could not have offered effective resistance to an oncoming Russian air-strike. The defenses of Alaska were utterly weak, at a time when one of the greatest concentrations of air power ever gathered in the world was assembled by Soviet Russia in Siberia. During the period of time that Alaska was in such weak condition the American people, in my judgment, as far east as Chicago were at the mercy of that Russian Air Force. It is to our credit that we proceeded to strengthen those defenses. It is to the credit of the Congress of the United States that from time to time since VJ-day, as the public and the Congress became aware of the critical security situation in which we found ourselves, it appropriated the funds necessary to start to rebuild the defenses of our country.

I use Alaska only as one example. There are many other examples I could cite to show that the demobilization program of America weakened our position in the world, not only militarily, but psychologically as well, because our allies were at a loss to understand why we should do it, knowing full well what Russia was doing by way of directing

her whole program into building up her arsenals of war.

What was our next mistake? As I have said so many times, and as I have indicated very briefly today, I think the greatest weakness in our foreign policy has been our Asiatic policy. One of the first great mistakes we made was in our failure in China to link together military aid and economic reform which would bring to the Chinese people themselves the benefits of the millions of dollars we were pouring into China. It is not a good record in the pages of American history, and I do not think the white paper is an answer to it, an explanation of it, or a full disclosure of what happened. In my opinion the white paper contains within it too much alibi-ing and rationalizing of a mistaken policy in Asia.

The responsibility for it must be placed primarily on the doorstep of the State Department. I think every effort should have been made by members of both parties to insist upon a correction of our Chinese policy. It is my understanding that for the most part during that period of time the State Department did not carry out to the full measure it should have done the joint consultation and bipartisan cooperation which characterized its policy with respect to Europe. This is only to the best of my recollection, and I am not certain as to the dates, but I believe the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that a colloquy took place on the floor of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress in which the great giant, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, was specifically asked how long it had been since the administration had consulted with the Committee on Foreign Relations with regard to Asiatic policy. A checking of the RECORD will show, I think, that the Senator from Michigan replied to the question by rather reluctantly admitting that it had been many months.

In the same colloquy discussion took place with respect to whether or not the Foreign Relations Committee had been apprised with respect to the contents of the Wedemeyer report. I think the record will show that the reply of the Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, was to the effect that the committee had not been apprised as to its contents. So I say here today, as I have said so many times in the past several years, that in my judgment, the State Department is deserving of severe criticism and censure for its failure to keep the Congress of the United States and particularly the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House informed as to the State Department's policies in Asia.

Mr. President, I hope that sometime during the debate in the weeks ahead evidence can be submitted to those of us who are not members of the Committee on Foreign Relations which will show that our viewpoint in regard to the shortcomings of the State Department

in this respect is in need of some revision. However, if there is any evidence existing at the present time which would support a revision of such viewpoint the State Department itself has been derelict in its duty not bringing forth the evidence.

I should like to stress the failure of the State Department frankly to advise the Congress of the United States through the Committee on Foreign Relations of information and facts which the State Department might have had in regard to specific programs, specific issues, and the specific problems as they arose in Asia. Had that been done, we might today find America following quite a different course of action throughout Asia. The assumption that under the Constitution the only thing the administration need submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations is something which it pleases to call a treaty, and not something which it pleases to call an executive agreement is in my opinion unsound as a matter of constitutional theory and causative of much of the misunderstanding over foreign policy which has developed in our country. Again I say that the responsibility for the growth of that misunderstanding must rest squarely on the doorstep of the State Department.

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

Mr. MORSE. No. As I have already explained, I shall not yield until I have concluded my remarks. There is no one to whom I should be more pleased to yield than the senior Senator from Maine. However, I am thinking out loud on this subject, and for the sake of continuity I want to go along on the general points which I desire to cover. Then I shall be glad to submit myself to cross-examination.

Mr. President, I shall not engage in personalities. I did not join in a resolution of my party in conference recommending that the Secretary of State resign primarily because I thought it was a great mistake, particularly at the time the resolution was submitted, to adopt such a resolution. I know what I would have done if I were the Secretary of State. I have said this publicly many times in my State and elsewhere. I know what I would have done had I been Secretary of State and found myself in a position where I seemed unable to win the cooperation of a large section of the Senate of the United States, which has such great responsibility in regard to foreign policy, greater responsibilities, Constitution-wise, than has the House. I know that if I were satisfied that I could not regain the confidence necessary for cooperation in carrying out a truly bipartisan foreign policy, if I could not thrash out in consultation and conferences differences at least to the point that we could have a friendly understanding and could go forward united in executing a bipartisan foreign policy, I would resign. I am satisfied that if I had reached the conclusion that it was hopeless to try to win the confidence of the Members of the Senate as to make it possible to execute a bipartisan foreign

policy, then, from the standpoint of protecting the interests of my President, I would resign.

The Secretary of State did not decide to follow that course of action, and I considered it a personal matter between himself and the President. I felt that it was a great mistake, practically on the very eve of his departure to represent our country in Brussels, to adopt a resolution which at best could not strengthen him at Brussels. It certainly could not be interpreted by anyone that the resolution passed by a majority of the Republicans would be an aid to him in the conference in Brussels.

I felt also that the resolution represented more a negative reaction to a personality than to a policy. I thought the resolution was a contribution to national disunity rather than to unity. When we come to the specific questions of foreign policy which we have passed upon point by point in the Senate of the United States during the past few years—the Truman doctrine in Greece, the ECA, the North Atlantic Pact and its military implementation, Asiatic aid, Korean aid, and the final decision to go back into Korea—the majority of my Republican colleagues, under the leadership of the great VANDENBERG, voted for those proposals. Many of us have disagreed with some of the State Department procedures in respect to Asiatic policies, but for the most part we have agreed as to the objectives of those policies. Therefore, I could not convince myself that this manifestation of a lack of confidence in the Secretary of State, as set out in the Republican resolution, was basically bottomed upon a disagreement with policy, unless those who supported the resolution wanted to answer in the affirmative the question which I stated at the beginning of my remarks was the acid test by saying, "Yes, we would vote differently now on the major provisions of our bipartisan foreign-policy program of recent years." If that is their view I am sure that as the historic debate of the next few weeks progresses they will say so. If that is their view, then I think there may be some fallacy in the argument which I now make when I say that I formed the feeling primarily that the anti-Acheson resolution was just what my label indicates—anti-Acheson rather than anti-policy. But I did not feel that the time the resolution was offered was the hour to make a manifestation of personal disapproval, which I am persuaded many of those who voted for the resolution had in mind. I felt that at that hour, as the Secretary of State was about to go forward to a historic world conference, which I believe will prove with the passage of time to be of tremendous importance to the future security of America, we should have buried our personal differences and sent him forth to the conference armed as fully as he could be armed with the backing of his government, hoping that as our representative—as he had a right to be at that time under the Constitution of the United States—he would come back with agreements and understandings which would

strengthen America's position in this fight for freedom.

That is why I could not vote for the resolution, although, as I have said, I am sure that if I had been in Mr. Acheson's position in recent months and had become satisfied that the chances of winning the full cooperation of an overwhelming majority in the Senate of the United States were not very good, I would have resigned.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood if I can prevent being misunderstood, although I know that we are discussing a subject today which can easily give rise to misunderstanding. No matter what one may say or how carefully he may try to phrase his remarks, there is always the possibility of misunderstanding. I have sought to phrase my remarks very carefully. That is why I have spoken so deliberately, and I am sure it must have appeared to the listeners rather ponderously. No matter how careful one is these days in phrasing his remarks, on the very controversial subject of foreign policy there will be some who will be bound to misunderstand him. In an endeavor to protect myself as best I can, I wish to turn now to a few of the paragraphs of the great Hoover speech of last night. I wish to point out my complete agreement with some of them, and my reservations with respect to other parts.

Mr. Hoover said among other things:

We may first survey the global military situation. There is today only one center of aggression on the earth. That is the Communist-controlled Asian-European land mass of 800,000,000 people. They have probably over 300 trained and equipped combat divisions with over 30,000 tanks, 10,000 tactical planes and further large reserves they can put in action in 90 days. But they are not a great sea power. Their long-range air power is limited. These congeries of over 30 different races will some day go to pieces. But in the meantime they are cannon fodder.

Mr. President, with much of that paragraph I agree; but there are two assumptions contained in it which I would modify by way of reservations.

I point out that the implication that since Russia is not a great sea power we are relatively safe because of the assumed protection of the Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans needs to be qualified. As I suggested earlier, at this moment Russia is a great submarine power. We cannot be sure that her possible superiority in submarines may not prove to be a greater asset than superiority in surface craft. Whether Russia is superior in submarines today I do not know; but I do know, Mr. President, that they have tremendous submarine striking power, and when I say that, I disclose no military secret, because that information has been made available to the American people for many months past.

The next assumption in that paragraph which I would qualify is that—

These congeries of over 30 different races will some day go to pieces.

I say most respectfully, Mr. President, that I deem that to be a bit of wishful thinking on the part of the ex-President. Would that we could be sure of it. I pray to God it might be true. But we must not count on it. I think it is a false

assumption categorically to state that these congeries will eventually go to pieces. I think it is based on the assumption that totalitarianism cannot survive, and that police-state methods cannot control masses of people in subjugation for centuries. I think it is also one of the most serious mistakes of assumption made by the great ex-President last night in his significant speech.

We Americans cannot afford to engage in the wishful thinking, the false assumption, the adoption of a false security attitude that the Communist section of the world which is pitted against us will eventually and for a certainty go to pieces. It will not go to pieces, at least in time to save the freedom way of life in the world in the century ahead unless the freedom-loving peoples of the world unite around the principle to which I referred earlier in my remarks and to which we must now rededicate ourselves, namely, that united we stand, and divided we fall. That principle must be applied by and to all the people in all the freedom-allied countries of the world.

We cannot justify withdrawing into ourselves on this continent and taking solace in the assumption of the great ex-President that sooner or later these congeries, comprising more than thirty different races will some day go to pieces. Mr. President, such an assumption in history gone by was made by foreign peoples with respect to the United States. In fact, it is a part of the Communist philosophy today that eventually capitalism and democracy will disintegrate. We think we know better.

When we are dealing with an enemy I like to assume he is just as smart as we are. One of the things the American people must do, in my opinion, is to take it for granted that in this struggle for freedom around the world we are pitted against forces and leaders who in many respects are as smart as we are. We can be pretty sure that they are going to do everything in their power to see to it that this assumption of the ex-President of the United States does not come to pass. I seriously question that there is any possibility of it coming to pass within our generation or within a period of time soon enough to prevent the destruction of America if we proceed to withdraw into ourselves and live unto ourselves alone, and accept the assumption which is interwoven in the speech of the great ex-President that we can proceed in safety if we arm our Navy and our Air Forces to the teeth, and rely upon the Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans for protection, forgetting, as I said earlier, what will happen to us if the great industrial war-making power of Europe falls into the hands of Communist Russia.

Later in his speech the ex-President said:

Facing this menace on the continental European front there are about 160,000,000 non-Communist people who, excluding Spain, have less than 20 combat divisions now available, few tanks and little air or naval force. But their will to defend themselves is feeble and their disunities are manifest.

It is that language, Mr. President, I had in mind when I said earlier in my

speech that from a psychological standpoint I thought there was language in the ex-President's speech that was unfortunate, and I cite that as my exhibit. I cite it as my exhibit particularly when there has just closed in Brussels a conference which sought to strengthen the North Atlantic Pact and the military implementation program thereunder, a conference which sought to bring greater unity and determination to our allies in Europe and to make clear a manifestation on the part of the American Government that we fully recognize the threat Russia is to freedom in Europe and through Europe to freedom in the United States. I think the language of Mr. Hoover which I have quoted will be interpreted by many in Europe as language of defeatism, as language of surrender on the part of the United States so far as support of Europe is concerned. I think it came at a very unfortunate time, so shortly after the Brussels Conference.

Mr. President, let me make clear, if I make nothing else clear in the course of this speech, that I believe it is most important that the American people and the other freedom-loving peoples of the world understand that the aggressive enemy of freedom today is primarily Russia, with her tag-along satellite nations who, under her police-state methods, are helpless now, in my judgment, to do anything else but carry out her program of aggression and totalitarianism. I would have my country—as I said over a national radio broadcast three times within the past 2 weeks—face the fact that today Russia is carrying on a form of hot war against us. Russia has been making hot war against us ever since the Berlin incident. I do not know whether she will go into an all-out, full-scale hot war, but I know that we are sticking our heads in the sand for a certainty if we fail to recognize the fact that today Russia is carrying on a hot war against freedom. We cannot with safety follow the language of that part of the Hoover speech which might be—and, I fear, will be—subject to the interpretation that now we are ready to withdraw into continental United States, to protect our freedom against that hot war, unless the peoples of Europe follow a course that meets with our pleasures and decisions. No, Mr. President; in view of the circumstances which exist today in the world, I think that statement by ex-President Hoover which I have just quoted from his speech was an unfortunate one.

The next important paragraph of Mr. Hoover's speech to which I would call attention is as follows:

Of importance in military weight at this moment there is the British Commonwealth of 150,000,000 people, with probably 30 combat divisions under arms, a superior navy, considerable air force and a few tanks.

And there are 150,000,000 people in the United States preparing 3,500,000 men into a gigantic Air Force and Navy, with about 30 equipped combat divisions.

If we weigh these military forces as they stand today we must arrive at certain basic conclusions.

(A) We must face the fact that to commit the sparse ground forces of the non-Communist nations into a land war against

this Communist land mass would be a war without victory, a war without a successful political terminal. Any attempt to make war on the Communist mass by land invasion, through the quicksands of China, India, or Western Europe is sheer folly. That would be the graveyard of millions of American boys and would end in the exhaustion of this Gibraltar of western civilization.

Mr. President, with the basic premise of that paragraph, I am in agreement. I am in accord with the view that we cannot and should not fight a land war in the sections of the world which the great ex-President enumerated in that paragraph of his speech. However, I would have my country be on guard against the over-all conclusion which I fear he draws in his speech after he lays down these sound premises.

I agree with his next major premise, when he says:

Even were Western Europe armed far beyond any contemplated program, we could never reach Moscow. The Germans failed with a magnificent army of 240 combat divisions and with powerful air and tank forces as contrasted with the 60 divisions now being talked about.

However, Mr. President, I think there should be added to that observation on the part of the ex-President, the very important one that without an adequate mass of land troops in Europe, in case the hot war becomes an all-out war, we cannot stop the mass of Communist land troops from extending itself all over Europe. That is why I think there was need in the speech of the ex-President for a greater emphasis on the North Atlantic Pact program. It seems to me he overlooked, in this part of his speech, the importance of a mass of Allied land troops in Europe and its ability to prevent an invasion of Europe by the massed Russian forces. I do not agree with any assumption that the North Atlantic Pact and the Allied nations participating therein cannot, through the navy and the air forces and the land troops, build up a resistance which will stop an invasion of Europe by Russia. We are not talking about an invasion of Russia, to Moscow; but we are talking about saving the Ruhr from falling into the hands of Russia, because on the control of the Ruhr depends, I believe, the ultimate security of this country in an all-out war with Russia.

The ex-President's next point in his speech is as follows:

(B) Equally, we Americans alone with sea and air power can so control the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans that there can be no possible invasion of the Western Hemisphere by Communist armies. They can no more reach Washington in force than we can reach Moscow.

I say most respectfully, Mr. President, that I believe that assumption by Mr. Hoover is glaringly false. I would that his assumption were true. However, if we become encircled by Communist countries, if all Europe falls to communism, if we lose any foothold in the Pacific, in my judgment, any assumption that Communist armies cannot invade America is clearly false, and represents, I am sorry to say, an example of wishful thinking. In my opinion, there would be great danger of invasion of America

by Communist armies if we should lose our Allies abroad and find ourselves encircled by communistic regimes and police states. That false assumption on the part of the ex-President in his speech is so serious that I think it colors a great many of the other conclusions he reaches.

Mr. President, if, in the years immediately ahead, we become encircled by Communist countries, as the result of the fall of Europe and the loss of American strongholds in Asia; if, for example, a Pearl Harbor should occur in the area of Korea, today, both to our naval forces afloat there, and to our Armed Forces located there and to our Air Force located near there in combat with what is known to me to be a powerful Russian air force based not far from them, we would find it difficult to tell the people of the Pacific coast that there would be no danger of an invasion of the west coast. Why, Mr. President, if Alaska should fall to Communist attack and the Communists obtain bases there, you would have a most difficult time telling the people of the West, as far east at least as Chicago, that there would be no danger of a Communist invasion of the west. I think that this part of Hoover's speech which I am criticizing will have the effect of giving those who assume it to be sound a sense of false security in America, if they are not warned of its unsoundness. I think the American people ought to be told that there will be danger of invasion by Russia, if we become encircled by Communist countries and Russia obtains the great war-making industrial potential of the Ruhr, for example, or knocks out Alaska, or stages a Pearl Harbor attack on our Air Force and Navy in the Pacific, and gets by with it. The danger is real, and I propose to raise my voice in expressing to the American people the sincere belief that it is real, and that the assumption of the ex-President, contained in this paragraph, needs marked qualification.

Mr. Hoover further said:

(C) In this military connection we must realize the fact that the atomic bomb is a far less dominant weapon than it was once thought to be.

I think he is entirely correct, and I believe it was well he told the American people that. I am afraid there has been stirred up in the minds of the American people a sense of false security so far as the atomic bomb is concerned. It is a devastating weapon, there is no doubt; but, that it is the type of weapon which will knock out Soviet Russia for a certainty, is at best exceedingly questionable; and the ex-President, according to my view, is completely correct in making the point he does about the atomic bomb. I think the American people need also to realize that we have no monopoly on it; that, devastating as that weapon is, it can be used against us as well as for us. We need to recognize that there is also a great difference in the industrial concentration and dispersement of the war-making power of the two nations. I am satisfied that the atomic bomb, once the Russians get a stockpile in numbers closely approaching our own, can wreak

greater damage on the United States than we can wreak on Soviet Russia, so far as future war-making potentialities are concerned. That is true because it is pretty well known that our great industrial institutions are more concentrated, whereas Russia has followed to a greater degree, so we are informed, a program of dispersement and a policy of effective concealment, so far as her war-making plants are concerned.

The ex-President then says:

(D) It is obvious that the United Nations have been defeated in Korea by the aggression of Communist China. There are no adequate forces in the world to repel them.

I think he is dead right. I happen to be one who believes that we should withdraw from Korea to a line in the Pacific we can defend; that we should stretch as effective a blockade against Communist China as we can; that we should encourage guerrilla warfare in Communist China by Asiatics; that we should make very clear to Great Britain that she, too, has an obligation to cooperate in this matter, and that no American boys are going to die to save Hong Kong. Great Britain must recognize that Hong Kong is a war casualty, and Great Britain's good faith in this joint enterprise to defend freedom, for herself and for us, must cause her to take a realistic position about Hong Kong. We cannot stand by and see her feed Communist China economically, and American boys die as a result of the war goods which the Chinese Communists get from the Russian Communists as the result of a direct and indirect trade cooperation by Great Britain. But I think it is a matter that can be settled and determined in honest, sincere, good-faith conferences between the leaders of these two great democracies.

In my judgment the ex-President is right in pointing out that we cannot hold Korea; but in making that statement I hasten to add that it does not justify the assumption that we made a mistake in Asiatic policy, in drawing the issue with Russia over Korea. We drew the issue with Russia when we went back into Korea after the invasion by the Russian sponsored North Koreans. I think the invasion of South Korea by the North Koreans, backed, as we now know, by the Communist Chinese and the Communist Russians, was a signal on the part of the Communist section of the world that they intended to carry on an aggressive course of action in Asia. I think, also, it was the test put up to us as to whether that was the time for Russia to start her conquest of Asia. Although we have suffered a military defeat, and although I think it is shameful that we were not in a position more adequately to protect the lives of American heroes who fought in the Korean War and who are dying there today, nevertheless the decision to go back into Korea had to be made. The mistake was, not in the decision, but in the fact that we were not strong enough at that hour to back up the decision with greater military strength.

No, Mr. President; I am not one of those who think it was a mistake to call Russia's hand, because, after all, we called not the North Koreans alone, not

the Communist Chinese alone, but Russia's hand. We made the decision to go back into Korea in opposition to her renewed aggressive course of action in Asia.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to yield, but I said at the beginning that I would not yield until I finished my speech. I am merely thinking out loud, and speaking much longer than I intended to, maybe selfishly, but, at least from the standpoint of my record, I want the people of my State to know my thoughts on foreign policy questions as they come out of my head today in response to what I think is a very, very critical situation which exists.

Of course, Mr. President, I believe we made some very serious mistakes on the Korean issue long before the invasion. Some Senators have previously heard me say that I think we made a mistake as early as July 1945, and some of us in this body felt, at the time the San Francisco Charter was before the Senate for ratification that we should insist upon the recognition of the provisional government of Korea and should insist that a trusteeship or mandate of the United Nations be placed over Korea until such time as a free election could be held. That was then my view, and it has always remained my view. But instead of doing that, a few months thereafter the administration actually joined with Russia in the partitioning of Korea along the thirty-eighth parallel, giving as its excuse or explanation the argument that it was doing it for military convenience. When we did that we joined with Russia in the partition of the freedom of Korea. History will so record. From the time the administration did that, it proceeded with a whole chain of mistakes in Korea. It knew about them when it was making them. That is the sad part of it.

I have always been at a loss to understand why so many people, in discussing the question of foreign policy in recent years, have not recognized the nature of the Russian pattern. Russia has never varied it. She has applied it uniformly and consistently with respect to every satellite country which has been taken over. She applied it in Korea. We knew, or should have known, that that is exactly what Russia would do. What did she do? The moment the United States joined with Russia in the partition of Korea, Russia dropped her iron curtain along the thirty-eighth parallel. Russia always does that. The iron curtain is basic to her pattern. It is the warp and woof of her pattern. That is why it has always been so difficult for me to understand the gullibility, the short-sightedness, of so many people who have discussed the Russian problem since VJ-day in terms of the oft-repeated suggestion that we should try to understand the Russians. We were told, "They really do not mean what you think they mean by their iron-curtain policy. They do not mean it as an unfriendly gesture."

Nonsense, Mr. President—nonsense and gullibility. Ever since the Russians dropped the iron curtain along their own

borders, to say nothing of dropping it along the borders of satellite countries in which we had an interest, at least, as a free nation in the world to see to it that the principle of self-determination was not trampled under military foot by aggressive nations—we had that much of an interest in the satellite countries—her action can be interpreted as nothing but unfriendly and a manifestation of a clear intention to follow a warlike policy against the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

So, Mr. President, I repeat today what my colleagues have heard me say on this floor during the past several years, that, so far as I am concerned, I shall have to continue to assume that Russia's intentions are not intentions of peace so long as she makes the warp and woof of her foreign policy the iron curtain.

Peoples who have the intentions of friendship, peoples who believe in good neighborliness, peoples who want to cooperate and be friendly, do not put signs in their front yards saying "Stay out or suffer the consequences." That is what Russia has done. One of the sad things about this whole picture is that so many Americans fail to appreciate the fact that during World War II Russia never really functioned as an ally. She never cooperated as an ally. She conducted herself simply as a nation that had a common enemy. She would not even permit American military missions behind her iron curtain during the war. Her record during the war, as well as immediately after the war, in the occupational zones of Europe, was a record of noncooperation, obstruction, and of act after act that made it perfectly clear that she was not friendly. Certainly she took advantage of all the matériel we made available to her to help her fight the common enemy. But, Mr. President, the record is so overwhelming, and we knew it before Korea, that her conduct indicated an attitude of unfriendliness and an intention to violate the peace whenever it served her selfish purposes to violate it, that we should have given greater heed to that pattern of behavior on the part of Russia before we joined with her in the partition of Korea's freedom along the thirty-eighth parallel. We certainly should have given greater heed to it when we observed what she did once she dropped the iron curtain along the thirty-eighth parallel.

What did she do? There has been much said about our military intelligence, and about the fact that we did not know what was going on north of the thirty-eighth parallel. Such a charge needs qualification. Certainly we did not know all we should like to have known, but we knew a great deal. Do not sell American military intelligence short in analyzing this problem. It was not because we did not know what was going on north of the thirty-eighth parallel; it was because at the time, for some inexplicable reason which I shall never be able to understand, a short-sightedness continued in America. I think it existed in the State Department as well as in the Military Establishment also. It was a shortsighted belief that the Korean problem would work itself out. It was said, "They are bluffing. We will wait.

Russia is bluffing." If so, they have been bluffing for a long time, with consequences which have been very gainful to them and detrimental to us.

What did the Russians do? They proceeded to train a Communist army in North Korea. They did not train the army with Russians in any great numbers. They trained them with Koreans who had been brought down in large numbers from the army in Manchuria, which was a Russian-trained army. It was a well trained army, too. They separated those Koreans from the Manchurian army—officers and foot soldiers alike—infiltrated them among the forces of North Korea, and proceeded to train a Communist army in North Korea.

What did we do? We trained a police force in South Korea. We told the world we were going to train a police force. We told the world we were going to train a force which would be capable of taking care of internal disturbances and police actions, and which would be strong enough to handle border raids along the thirty-eighth parallel. We were very careful to announce to Russia and the world at large that we were not going to train an army. We did not train an army. We did a pretty good constabulary job, but certainly we did not train an army. The record which the South Koreans have made in the Korean War is an exceptionally good record, particularly when there is taken into consideration what we did in South Korea so far as giving military training is concerned and what the Russians did north of the thirty-eighth parallel in North Korea through their Communist Koreans who had been brought down from Manchuria for the purpose of training a Communist army in North Korea.

Mr. President, that was not the only mistake we made. After Russia got her Communist Army trained in North Korea by the use of Russian-trained Koreans taken from the Manchurian Army, she started to bombard the airwaves of the world, particularly of Asia, with her vicious lying propaganda that she was ready and willing and, in fact intended, to proceed to withdraw Russian occupation forces from North Korea, but that militaristic America, imperialistic America, exploiting America was keeping the South Koreans under the militaristic heel of the American Army. That is the rot which she fed to the people of Asia. She repeated over and over again the technique of the big lie. The sad thing about that technique is that unless it is combated, many people believe it.

What did we do? Let the record of the Congress of the United States speak for itself. We cut the appropriation for the Voice of America. We cut the appropriation when what we should have done was to greatly enlarge it. Not only should we have enlarged the appropriation for the Voice of America program, but we should have enlarged the appropriation for every other type of service that would have been helpful in meeting the vicious lying propaganda of the Russian Communists. At that time we should have enlarged the appropriations for the point 4 program in Asia, because that was the time to win the good will of millions of Asians whose good will we

will sorely need in the great contest for freedom which will mark the coming decades.

Did we stop with that mistake? No. In quotation marks, Mr. President, we cooperated with Russia. We yielded to her propaganda. We pulled out of South Korea. We took out our forces, and with our forces we took out most of our equipment. We did all that at the very time when we knew that there was great military activity north of the thirty-eighth parallel and at the very time when there were periodic raids across the border on the part of segments of the North Korean army. I shall never forget the testimony before the Committee on Armed Services by the American general who was in command of the American forces in Korea. He testified that he was on board ship in the Pacific on his way back to the United States when he heard over the radio that an invasion of South Korea had begun. I cannot quote verbatim what the General said, but I am sure I am quoting him quite accurately when I say that he testified before our committee to the effect that he did not think it was anything serious. At first he assumed it was merely another one of those border raids which had been going on for months and that it would spend itself in a few days. He thought it was a raid for the purpose of getting control of quantities of rice, because the area in which the raid occurred was an area of heavy rice production. We knew those raids were going on. We knew they had been going on for some weeks preceding our withdrawal from Korea. I say it was a great mistake to withdraw at that time.

The next mistake was that in South Korea, as in China before, we repeated the China mistake of not seeing to it that economic reform was linked to military aid. I do not want to spend a great deal of time elaborating the point tonight. However, I wish to assert, and I am satisfied that the record will sustain me, that by and large we did a very poor job in South Korea in bringing to the South Koreans as individuals benefits of economic reform which should have characterized our program in South Korea but did not. Here again the Russian propaganda machine took advantage of every little disturbance within South Korea, of every conflict between the Government and the people of the lower classes, and of every protest about lack of economic aid to the people themselves. For this, too, I think the State Department must assume its full share of responsibility.

I think that after all, under our Constitution and the powers with respect to foreign policy which rest in the President and are executed through the State Department, we had the right to look to the State Department for recommendations and proposals, and for requests for advice and consultation in connection with the implementation of our program in South Korea. I hold to the view that if the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate had been fully apprised of some of the things we now know occurred in South Korea during those months we would have avoided some of the serious mistakes which I am outlining here this evening.

Of the many other mistakes, I wish to mention one more—perhaps the major one of all—a mistake which I think was very disturbing to the thinking of the people not only in Korea, but elsewhere in Asia, and particularly in India. It was a mistake which I have a feeling—I have nothing on which I can substantiate it except my interpretation of his conduct and some of the language he has used since—has caused some shift of attitude on the part of the leaders of India, particularly Nehru. I believe that we Americans must keep our eyes on India. I think we must give great heed to Nehru and to the point of view of his followers. We must be realistic about it, because in my judgment, so far as the free part of Asia is concerned, as India goes so, most likely, will the rest of Asia go. India is of vital importance to the defense of Asia for freedom. That is why I said earlier in my remarks this afternoon that I would that we had paid more attention in the years gone by to getting our surplus food into empty stomachs in Asia than keeping it in Government bins where much of it was bound to spoil. I believe that such a course of action would have been one of the most effective manifestations in the whole field of foreign policy of putting Christian principles of democracy to work.

I have the feeling that the last mistake in Korea which I wish to mention had a tremendous effect in India, in Indochina, in Indonesia, and, for that matter, in all of the free sections of Asia. I refer to the announcement last January by the State Department that our line of defense in the Pacific primarily was to be a line from the Aleutians through Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. I think that announcement had a tremendous psychological effect in Asia. I do not believe that the effect was very good for America.

Again referring to the testimony of General Roberts, who was in charge of our occupational forces in Korea, and who testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee, I recall that he did not like to answer these questions. I recall that some of us on the Armed Services Committee asked him for his opinion as to the effect of the American announcement that our line of defense was to be the line I have just mentioned. He preferred not to answer the question, but I remember that a couple of us insisted that he give us the benefit of his personal opinion. Of course, his answer was exactly the answer anyone should have known. It was to the effect that the announcement helped to speed up Communist activity in Korea. I think it helped to speed up Communist activity throughout Asia. It was a terrible mistake, Mr. President.

That, it seems to me, is a perfect example of where the administration and the State Department should have put into practice the true meaning of a bipartisan foreign policy, as I understand its meaning—a consultation with the leaders of both parties in the Congress in advance of any public enunciation of policy, because I dare say that if the Secretary of State had advised us in the Senate, for example, that such was

his thinking, careful consideration would have been given to it by the leaders of Congress, and probably the decision would never have been made public. Certainly some Members of the Senate would have been able to perceive the dangers of any such policy as that, dangers which were bound to come to pass, and did come to pass. I think that from that time on there was a tremendous speed-up of Communist activity in Asia. The Communists took it for granted—and I believe they had the right to take it for granted—that we were not going to defend Korea, in fact, that we were not going to engage in military activity beyond the announced line of defense.

I know that there are those who in good faith, and with motives just as sincere as mine, feel that such an interpretation of the State Department's announced policy is taking out of context the true intent of the State Department. But the best they can say for themselves, on the basis of their own assumption, is that even if that be true—which I question—the choice of their language was most unfortunate, because the language which they chose went around the world as notice to people everywhere, Communists and non-Communists alike, totalitarian and freedom-loving people equally, that we were withdrawing from Asia.

As I stated earlier, I do not think it was a mistake to go back into Asia because we had no other choice unless we then wanted to surrender all of Asia to Russia.

Had we not taken a stand for freedom in Korea, I am satisfied in my own mind that our failure to do so would have been a signal for the advance of Communist forces all over Asia. It is an historical shame that we were not in a position of defense and military power so that we could have given to our heroes who have sacrificed their lives in Korea the support to which they were entitled.

Mr. President, I have made these comments on Asia because they set forth my views on the subject and give the background as to why I believe the ex-President was right last night when he pointed out that now we cannot stay in Korea. In my opinion, he is right. Now I think we have to withdraw to lines of defenses in the Pacific we can hold, and, as I said earlier in my remarks, stretch a blockade in the Pacific which will make perfectly clear that we recognize Communist China as an aggressor against freedom, and that we recognize Russia as the power behind the aggressor.

I now want to comment on another paragraph of the speech of ex-President Hoover last night.

We may explore the American situation still further. The 150,000,000 American people are already economically strained by Government expenditures. It must not be forgotten that we are carrying huge burdens from previous wars, including obligations to veterans and \$200,000,000 of bond and currency issues from those wars. In the fiscal year 1952, Federal and local expenditures are likely to exceed \$90,000,000,000. That is more than our total savings. We must finance huge deficits by further Government issues. Inflation is already moving but we might, with stern measures, avoid the economic disintegration of such a load for a

very few years. If we continue long on this road the one center of resistance in the world will collapse in economic disaster.

I think he is dead right, Mr. President, in his economic analysis of the fiscal problems which confront us. I have tried to point out for years that the greatest defense weapon America has is not the atomic bomb at all, but our economy. We have got to make great sacrifices now to preserve it. One of the paradoxes is that in preserving our economy some individuals and companies and economic forces in this country, yes, all of us, are going to have to suspend—I should like to put it in terms of suspending rather than sacrificing—some of our economic freedoms for a little while. There is no other way. I know it is a paradox.

It was well stated to us by Jim Forrestal, at some time in 1947, when he testified before the Armed Services Committee. I shall never forget what he said for it was utterly sound. We were talking then about a proposed armed services budget of some \$21,000,000,000 out of a then proposed total national budget of \$40,000,000,000. The then Secretary of Defense thought it was too high. He thought at least it ought to be very carefully screened and scrutinized to see what savings could be made. The usual argument was made as it was made in those days: "But, Mr. Secretary, you know if we get into a war to preserve freedom it is going to cost us many times \$21,000,000,000." And Jim Forrestal very quickly replied, "Yes; I know that is true, but I also know that if we get into that war one of the paradoxes of it will be that we will go to war to save freedom, to protect and preserve our freedom, but in a large measure, for the duration of the war and for some time after the war, we will lose much of our freedom at home."

That is true, Mr. President. It is a very difficult concept for the American people fully to grasp as to its implications, but I think they have got to be told. It is important that those of us who have the responsibility of casting votes in the Congress of the United States on various proposals for economic mobilization as well as military mobilization should have the courage and the frankness to tell the American people that during this crisis some of their freedoms are going to be curtailed; that in time of great national crisis all our freedoms as individuals are relative, subordinate to the great goal of preserving the Government itself. And now as we enter into a course of action that must be adopted in order to meet this crisis, we in the Congress of the United States should tell the American people that a great many of their freedoms will have to be curtailed. We cannot have the kind of economic stabilization and mobilization which I think is clearly implied in the language of the great ex-President in his speech last night, as he discussed the fiscal problems of our country, without a great deal of economic regimentation and a great deal of economic direction on the part of the

Government over all American industry and labor and every other segment of our economy.

To my labor friends let me say here and now that they have to face the fact that all of us in America are going to suffer a lowering of the standards of our living during this crisis. I believe we are guilty of the most inexcusable type of political hypocrisy if we, as Members of the Congress, lead labor, or farmers, or businessmen, or consumers generally, to believe that in this crisis we can mobilize for the preservation of freedom in our country and in the world and at the same time maintain the present high standards of living in America. That cannot be done. It is not going to be done. I believe that a great deal of conflict and misunderstanding can be avoided if we frankly inform the American people that it cannot be done, that this is a crisis more serious in its import than any crisis we have ever faced heretofore, and that the word "sacrifice" is no platitude, but is a meaningful outline of a course of sacrifice which we all have to proceed to follow at once.

In my opinion American labor is not going to be able to set itself off to one side and separate wage control from price control. They are inseparable. They must be combined, in my judgment, under the jurisdiction of one board or tribunal.

Labor has to face the fact that so-called escalator clauses, highly desirable in a peacetime economy, cannot stand up in a wartime economy, because they are a part of the vicious circle of inflation, and it is necessary to break into that vicious circle of inflation. So all of us, including labor, will have to make sacrifices.

Knowing labor as I do, I have no doubt what its patriotic response will be. Once the facts about the crisis are made clear to labor, it will join in whatever sacrifices are necessary. It rightly will take the position that on the economic front the Congress and the administration must do everything within their power to see to it that the sacrifices are equalized, and that unfair discriminations, favorable to one group as against another, are eliminated. However, that labor will willingly sacrifice, along with farmers and businessmen and consumers generally, I have no question, once the facts are made clear.

Mr. President, to avoid the economic dangers which the ex-President so well stated in his speech of last night, let us have no more talk about voluntary controls and piecemeal stabilization. We are now in a fight to the finish, and it calls for the greatest of speed, consistent with the maximum of efficiency possible during an emergency, with all-out economic and military mobilization.

The next paragraph of the ex-President's speech on which I wish to comment is as follows:

Whether or not the United Nations is to have a moral defeat and suffer the collapse of its whole moral stature now depends on whether it has the courage to—

(A) Declare Communist China an aggressor.

I agree.

(B) Refuse admission of this aggressor to its membership.

I agree.

(C) Demand that each member of the United Nations cease to furnish or transport supplies of any kind to Communist China that can aid in their military operations. Such a course honestly carried out by the non-Communist nations is not economic sanctions nor does it require military actions. But it would constitute a great pressure for rectitude.

I agree. In fact, Mr. President, I have already covered my views on this point earlier in my remarks, in my argument for the imposition of a blockade of China.

I read further:

(D) For once, pass a resolution condemning the infamous lies about the United States.

Any course short of this is appeasement.

I agree.

A little later in his speech the ex-President said:

It is clear continental Europe has not in the 3 years of our aid developed that unity of purpose and that will power necessary for its own defense. It is clear that our British friends are flirting with appeasement of Communist China. It is clear that the United Nations is in a fog of debate and indecision on whether to appease or not to appease.

Mr. President, I think that statement in the ex-President's speech is somewhat unfortunate. It does not seem to me to be wholly accurate or fair, so far as concerns describing the conduct of our allies in Europe in connection with the ECA program or in connection with the North Atlantic Pact and the military implementation of it.

I agree with the ex-President, as I said earlier in my remarks, that our British friends certainly are going to have to be more realistic about the situation in Communist China, and will have to recognize that as they aid Communist China, they do injury to freedom and to their freedom-loving Allies; as they bring economic aid to Communist China, they do damage to the defenses of the United States. I think that we, as copartners with them in this great struggle to preserve freedom in the world, have the right to have them join with us in seeing to it that economic aid to Communist China comes to a halt.

A little later in his speech the ex-President said:

We can, without any measure of doubt, with our own air and naval forces, hold the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans with one frontier on Britain (if he wishes to cooperate); the other, on Japan, Formosa, and the Philippines. We can hold open the sea lanes for our supplies.

I devoutly hope that a maximum of cooperation can be established between the British Commonwealth and ourselves.

Mr. President, I have already commented on that paragraph of the speech.

Again I summarize my position simply by saying that I think the ex-President

overstates the case. I think there is pregnant in those remarks a great deal of hopeful thinking and wishful thinking that cannot be squared with the realities of the situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. Hoover also said:

We should give Japan her independence and aid her in arms to defend herself.

I am in agreement, and I think we should proceed to execute a peace treaty with Japan, regardless of Russia.

Mr. Hoover then also said:

We should stiffen the defenses of our Pacific frontier in Formosa and the Philippines. We can protect this island chain by our sea and air power and without land power.

Mr. President, I certainly believe we should strengthen our defenses in the Philippines. So far as Formosa is concerned, I think we are going to have to face the fact that we are involved in some international commitments which never should have been made and which, in my judgment, amount to a circumvention of the treaty-making clauses of the Constitution of the United States. In my opinion, that is exactly what the international agreements in respect to Formosa constitute. Nevertheless, they were entered into; and we are going to have to face that reality as one of the problems of international law which must be solved by adjudication. I think there we should rely heavily upon the procedures of the United Nations for a negotiation and an adjudication of the Formosan issue.

Next, Mr. Hoover said:

Fourth. We could, after initial outlays for more air and navy equipment, greatly reduce our expenditures, balance our budget, and free ourselves from the dangers of inflation and economic degeneration.

I most certainly agree with that point.

Mr. President, I do not agree with the great ex-President of the United States in regard to the assumption, which I think is implicit in his speech taken in its entirety, that we should not proceed at this time with the military-manpower program that is contemplated for America. I think that program is essential to our safety. That is why I am one of the most ardent supporters in the Senate of a universal service law, and that is why I think we must go ahead with military mobilization, including the mobilization of ground troops, for the time being, as a clear notice to Russia that we intend to do all within our power to defend our frontiers of defense at home and abroad. We must make clear to Russia that we intend to do what we can to help our allies in Europe, with their complete cooperation—and with the ex-President's comment on that point, I am in agreement, in defending the Ruhr, so that the Ruhr will not fall to Russia.

A little later in the speech, Mr. Hoover said:

Sixth. We should have none of appeasement. Morally there is no appeasement of communism. Appeasement contains more dangers than Dunkerque. We want no more

Tehrans and Yalta. We can retrieve a battle, but we cannot retrieve an appeasement. We are grateful that President Truman has denounced such a course.

Mr. President, I agree with the premises laid down in that paragraph; but I would most respectfully suggest to ex-President Hoover that if we withdraw unto ourselves, into continental United States, that act itself will be looked upon around the world as a form of appeasement. It will be looked upon as walking out on what I think are great obligations on our part to defend freedom in Europe in order to preserve freedom in the United States.

Then, in his speech, Mr. Hoover said:

Seventh. We are not blind to the need to preserve western civilization on the continent of Europe or to our cultural and religious ties to it. But the prime obligation of defense of western continental Europe rests upon the nations of Europe. The test is whether they have the spiritual force, the will and acceptance of unity among them by their own volition. America cannot create their spiritual forces; we cannot buy them with money.

You can search all the history of mankind and there is no parallel to the effort and sacrifice we have made to elevate their spirit and to achieve their unity. To this date it has failed. Their minds are confused with fears and disunities. They exclude Spain, although she has the will and means to fight. They huddle with Germany, although she is their frontier. They vacillate in the belief that they are in little danger and they hope to avoid again being a theater of war. And Karl Marx has added to their confusions. They still suffer from battle shock. Their highly organized Communist Parties are a menace we must not ignore.

Mr. President, although there is a considerable amount of truth in what the ex-President said in that passage, again I think his emphasis was unfortunate, because in that passage he sells short the North Atlantic Pact. He sells short the great significance of the military program which is being worked out under the North Atlantic Pact; and he sells short the great job which the great Eisenhower is going to Europe to perform.

I would be the first to agree with the ex-President that the people of Europe have shown serious shortcomings, but their problems have been different from ours. We have not lived quite so close to the shadows of Russian guns. We have not lived quite so close to the shadows of the wings of Russian planes. Although I shall continue to insist, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, that we receive a greater amount of cooperation and a fuller performance of promises on the part of our allied friends in Europe, nevertheless I do not share the emphasis which I think the ex-President put on that particular passage of his speech.

He goes on to say:

In both World War I and World War II (including West Germany) they placed more than 250 trained and equipped combat divisions in the field within 60 days with strong aid and naval forces.

Of course they did, Mr. President, but we have got to face the fact that since

then they have been tremendously reduced in war potential. We have a very definite responsibility of cooperation with them in the reestablishment of that potential. Let America not forget that, after all, that war was our war as well as theirs. As history has shown, it was our war from the first day, not merely from the day that we got into it.

Without in any way excusing or justifying any failure on their part to give us all-out cooperation since VJ-day, I believe the situation also calls for a charitable attitude, and an understanding on our part of their war psychology and of their great fear of what is likely to happen to them if the North Atlantic Pact is not successful in stopping the overrunning of Europe by the Russian horde. That is what the challenge is all about, as I see it. It seems to me that on the very eve of trying to put into effect a joint Allied common-defense program in Europe under General Eisenhower, neither our allies nor our own security are strengthened by placing just the emphasis which the ex-President placed in his speech by way of criticism of our European allies.

In concluding his speech, Mr. Hoover said:

We can hope that sometime the evils of communism and the disintegration of their racial controls will bring their own disintegration. It is a remote consolation, but twice before in world history Asiatic hordes have swept over a large part of the world and their racial dissensions dissolved their empires.

That is true. But, Mr. President, it would also be very fallacious to outline America's future defense program on the basis of the assumption that the particular pattern of history referred to by the ex-President will repeat itself. The great danger is that, even should it repeat itself, before the repetition takes place the United States may have ceased to exist as a free Nation. I think the time element was too much overlooked by the ex-President as he indulged in that kind of assumption in his speech last night, because I know of no set of facts which justifies the assumption that the Communist segment of the world will collapse before it has its death struggle with the free areas of the world. Unless we keep ourselves in a position of strong defense cooperation with our allied friends in Europe, I fear for the survival of America. So that assumption of the ex-President I would consider with a great many reservations attached to it.

Mr. President, in closing my speech let me tell my colleagues in the Senate that I am sorry to have taken this amount of time, but I felt obligated to do it, in order to keep my own record straight, in order to clear up certain misunderstandings which exist here in the Senate and elsewhere in the country in regard to my position on foreign policy; and in order to place in the RECORD at least a point of view which qualifies somewhat and sets forth reservations, in specific respects, to the speech which was made last night by the great ex-President of the United States. Taken

as a whole, I think it was a great speech by a great man. I have tried to make clear that I agree with a great many portions of it, but I thought it important that those of us who disagree with the basic implication of the speech, namely, that it would be safe for America to treat the Pacific and the Atlantic as adequate defenses provided we armed to the teeth so far as our Army and our Air Force are concerned, should express reservations to the argument of the ex-President, because I think his argument rests on a very unsound and false assumption.

Mr. President, I close with laying down again the major premise of my remarks, namely, that I think the American people must face the fact that our principal line of defense does not happen to be the eastern shore of the United States, but it happens to be the eastern line of the territory of our allied friends in Europe. Unless we prevent Soviet Russia from taking over the industrial war-making power of Europe, particularly the Ruhr, I seriously question that we can survive in the decades ahead of us in an all-out struggle against a world in which we should find ourselves an island of freedom surrounded by the turbulent, stormy waters of communism.

Mr. President, as separate and distinct from my comments on the Hoover speech, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement on foreign policy which I think is deserving of the serious attention of every Member of the Senate, and which appeared recently in the New York Times. It takes the form of a letter to the President of the United States issued by the Citizens Committee on Foreign Policy. There are attached to it the names of some great American leaders. I particularly want to stress the planks in this proposed foreign policy in connection with the Asiatic problem, with special emphasis on the recommendation of the committee for a blockade of Communist China.

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

CITIZENS COMMITTEE
ON FOREIGN POLICY,
New York, December 12, 1950.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The leaders of the Communist world have clearly shown their intent to attack the free world by military means as well as by subversion and propaganda. It is therefore of first importance to realize that both the United States and the United Nations are under planned attack, and to formulate out of the welter of confusion a specific program of action by the United States against the greatest danger which it has ever faced. We, therefore, urge that:

1. The President and Congress proclaim a state of national emergency.
2. The Government undertake immediate full-scale mobilization of the Armed Forces and the industrial economy.
3. We reaffirm our unalterable determination to support the decision of the United Nations to defend Korea against aggression whether or not military necessity calls for the temporary withdrawal of United Nations forces.

4. The United Nations enforce economic and other necessary sanctions against Communist China unless its forces are withdrawn from Korea.

5. We refuse to recognize the Chinese Communist Government, and we oppose recognition by the United Nations.

6. We provide economic aid and military supplies to the Chinese Nationalist Government on Formosa and maintain the United States fleet there.

7. We provide economic aid and military supplies to the anti-Communist forces on the Chinese mainland, French Indochina, and Malaya.

8. We encourage India and Pakistan to strengthen themselves against any contingency, and we provide them with economic and military supplies.

9. We accelerate the negotiation of peace treaties with Japan and Germany, providing for their rearmament under agreed controls.

10. We use all means to bring about the fullest measure of common defense by every member of the Atlantic Pact, giving our utmost support to those nations which fully cooperate in mobilizing their strength, recognizing that the defense of the North Atlantic area is our major strategic interest and responsibility.

11. The Government create a nonpartisan advisory council, representing all segments of the population, including management, labor, agriculture, etc.

12. The executive departments regularly consult with the leaders of both parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives in formulating national policy in the current emergency.

13. We intern all Communists and subversives classified as dangerous by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

14. We assist, within the limitation of essential military priorities, all governments and individuals willing to fight Communist aggression.

Yours truly,

Gen. Donald B. Adams, Dr. William S. Bernard, George V. Denny, Jr., Charles Edison, Maj. George Fielding Eliot, John Ellis, Christopher T. Emmet, George B. Ford, Rev. William J. Gibbons, S. J., Arthur J. Goldsmith, Robert R. Guthrie, Dr. Alvin S. Johnson, H. V. Kaltenborn, Frederick C. McKee, Hugh Moore, Mrs. Natalie Paine, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Victor F. Ridder, Herbert Bayard Swope, Westmore Willcox, Jr.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). The clerk will read the order.

The legislative clerk read the order, as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] be assigned to membership on the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the order submitted by the Senator from Illinois.

The order was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make this one statement so that the Senator from Rhode Island will understand that this is only a temporary appointment, and that when the new Congress comes in and new committees are appointed, any assignment which he

desires at that time will be considered. I say that because I do not want the Senator to be under any apprehension that he is permanently assigned to the committees referred to in the order.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the distinguished majority leader state how late he intends to keep the Senate in session today?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot advise the Senator as to that at this time. I understand that a long speech is to be made by the Senator from Florida.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if it has not already been printed in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 4268 be printed in the body of the RECORD preceding my remarks.

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

S. 4268

A bill to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sec. 2. Declaration of policy.
Sec. 3. Definitions.

Title I—Organization

Sec. 101. Federal Civil Defense Administration.
Sec. 102. Civil Defense Advisory Council.

Title II—Powers and duties

Sec. 201. Detailed functions of Administrator.
Sec. 202. Relation of Defense Production Act of 1950 to civil defense.
Sec. 203. Mutual aid pacts between several States and foreign countries.
Sec. 204. Identity insignia.

Title III—Emergency authority

Sec. 301. National emergency for civil defense purposes.
Sec. 302. Utilization of Federal departments and agencies.
Sec. 303. Emergency powers.
Sec. 304. Immunity from suit.
Sec. 305. Waiver of Administrative Procedure Act.

Title IV—General provisions

Sec. 401. Administrative authority.
Sec. 402. Exemption from certain prohibitions.
Sec. 403. Security regulations.
Sec. 404. Transfers to Administration.
Sec. 405. Utilization of existing facilities.
Sec. 406. Applicability of act.
Sec. 407. Appropriations and transfers of funds.
Sec. 408. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
Sec. 409. Atomic Energy Act of 1946.
Sec. 410. Federal Bureau of Investigation.
Sec. 411. Separability.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the policy and intent of Congress to provide a plan of civil defense for the protection of life and property in the United States from attack. It is further declared to be the policy and intent of Congress that this responsibility for civil defense shall be vested primarily in the several States and their political subdivisions. The Federal Government shall provide necessary coordination and guidance; shall be responsible for the operations of the Federal Civil Defense Administration as set forth in this act; and shall provide necessary assistance as herein-after authorized.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act—

(a) The term "attack" means any attack or series of attacks by an enemy of the United States causing, or which may cause, substantial damage or injury to civilian property or persons in the United States in any manner by sabotage or by the use of bombs, shellfire, or atomic, radiological, chemical, bacteriological, or biological means or other weapons or processes;

(b) The term "civil defense" means all those activities and measures designed or undertaken (1) to minimize the effects upon the civilian population caused or which would be caused by an attack upon the United States, (2) to deal with the immediate emergency conditions which would be created by any such attack, and (3) to effectuate emergency repairs to, or the emergency restoration of, vital utilities and facilities destroyed or damaged by any such attack. Such term shall include, but shall not be limited to (A) measures to be taken in preparation for anticipated attack (including the establishment of appropriate organizations, operational plans, and supporting agreements; the recruitment and training of personnel; the conduct of research; the procurement and stockpiling of necessary materials and supplies; the provision of suitable warning systems; the construction or preparation of shelters, shelter areas, and control centers; and, when appropriate, the non-military evacuation of civil population); (B) measures to be taken during attack (including the enforcement of passive defense regulations prescribed by duly established military or civil authorities; the evacuation of personnel to shelter areas; the control of traffic and panic; and the control and use of lighting and civil communications); and (C) measures to be taken following attack (including activities for fire fighting; rescue, emergency medical, health and sanitation services; monitoring for specific hazards of special weapons; unexploded bomb reconnaissance; essential debris clearance; emergency welfare measures; and immediately essential emergency repair or restoration of damaged vital facilities);

(c) The term "organizational equipment" means equipment designated by the Administrator as of such a type or nature as to require it to be financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government. It shall not be construed to include those items which the local community normally utilizes in combating local disasters excepting when required in unusual quantities dictated by the requirements of the civil-defense plans;

(d) The word "materials" shall include raw materials, supplies, medicines, equipment, component parts and technical information and processes necessary for civil defense;

(e) The word "facilities," except as otherwise provided in this act, shall include buildings, shelters, utilities, and land;

(f) The term "United States" or "States" shall include the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, and the possessions of the United States.

TITLE I—ORGANIZATION

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established in the executive branch of the Government a Federal Civil Defense Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration") at the head of which shall be a Federal Civil Defense Administrator appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Federal Civil Defense Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") shall receive compensation at the rate of \$17,500 per year.

(b) There shall be in the Administration a Deputy Administrator who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the

Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of \$16,000 per year. The Deputy Administrator shall perform such functions as the Administrator shall prescribe and shall act for, and exercise the powers and perform the duties of, the Administrator during his absence or disability.

(c) The Administrator shall perform his functions subject to the direction and control of the President.

CIVIL DEFENSE ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby created a Civil Defense Advisory Council, hereinafter referred to as the Council, which shall advise and consult with the Administrator with respect to general or basic policy matters relating to civil defense. The Council shall consist of the Administrator, who shall be chairman, and 12 additional members to be appointed by the President, of whom three members shall be representative of the State governments, three members shall be representative of the political subdivisions of the States and the remaining members shall be selected among the citizens of the United States of broad and varied experience in matters affecting the public interest, other than officers and employees of the United States (including any department or agency of the United States) who, as such, regularly receive compensation for current services. The following organizations shall be invited to establish panels of names for the members representative of the States and of the political subdivisions thereof:

The Council of State Governments.

The Governor's Conference.

The American Municipal Association.

The United States Conference of Mayors.

The representatives of the States and the political subdivisions thereof appointed by the President shall be selected from the panels established by the above-mentioned organizations. Not more than a majority of two of the members shall be appointed to the Council from the same political party. Each member shall hold office for a term of 3 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of the enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, four at the end of 1 year, four at the end of 2 years, and four at the end of 3 years, after the date of the enactment of this act. The Council shall meet at least once in each calendar year and at such other times as the Administrator shall determine that its advice and counsel will be of assistance to the program.

(b) The Administrator may appoint such other advisory committees as are deemed necessary.

(c) The members of the Council and the members of any other advisory committees, other than the Administrator, may be compensated at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be paid actual travel expenses and not to exceed \$15 per diem in lieu of subsistence.

TITLE II—POWERS AND DUTIES

DETAILED FUNCTIONS OF ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 201. The Administrator is authorized, in order to carry out the above-mentioned purposes, to—

(a) prepare national plans and programs for the civil defense of the United States, making such use of plans and programs previously initiated by the National Security Resources Board as is feasible; sponsor and direct such plans and programs; and request such reports on State plans and operations for civil defense as may be necessary to keep the President, the Congress, and the several

States advised of the status of civil defense in the United States;

(b) delegate, with the approval of the President, to the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government appropriate civil defense responsibilities, and review and coordinate the civil defense activities of the departments and agencies with each other and with the activities of the States and neighboring countries;

(c) make appropriate provision for necessary civil defense communications and for dissemination of warnings of enemy attacks to the civilian population;

(d) study and develop civil defense measures designed to afford adequate protection of life and property, including, but not limited to, research and studies as to the best methods of treating the effects of attacks by atomic, radiological, chemical, bacteriological, biological, or other weapons and processes; developing shelter designs and materials for protective covering or construction; and development equipment or facilities and effecting the standardization thereof to meet civil defense requirements;

(e) conduct or arrange, by contract or otherwise, for training programs for the instruction of civil defense officials and other persons in the organization, operation, and techniques of civil defense; conduct or operate schools or classes, including the furnishing of subsistence and quarters for trainees and instructors subject to reimbursement on terms prescribed by the Administrator; and provide instructors and training aids as deemed necessary;

(f) publicly disseminate appropriate civil defense information by all appropriate means;

(g) assist and encourage the States to negotiate and enter into interstate civil defense compacts; review the terms and conditions of such compacts in order to assist to the extent feasible in obtaining uniformity therein and consistency with the national civil defense plans and programs; assist and coordinate the activities thereunder; aid and assist in encouraging reciprocal civil defense legislation by the State which will permit the furnishing of mutual aid for civil defense purposes in the event of an attack which cannot be adequately met or controlled by a State or political subdivision thereof threatened with or undergoing an attack; *Provided*, That a copy of each such civil defense compact shall be transmitted promptly to the Senate and the House of Representatives. The consent of the Congress shall be granted to each such compact, upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which the compact is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and expiration of such sixty-day period, there has not been passed a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not approve the compact;

(h) procure, by condemnation or otherwise, construct, lease, transport, store, maintain, renovate or distribute materials and facilities for civil defense, with the right to take immediate possession thereof; *Provided*, That facilities acquired by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this Act, prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 255): *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall report not less often than quarterly to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives all property acquisitions made pursuant to this subsection;

(i) make financial contributions, on the basis of programs or projects approved by the Administrator, to the States for civil defense purposes, including, but not limited to, the procurement, construction, leasing, or renovating of materials and facilities. Such

contributions shall be made on such terms or conditions as the Administrator shall prescribe, including, but not limited to, the method of purchase, the quantity, quality, or specifications of the materials or facilities, and such other factors or care or treatment to assure the uniformity, availability, and good condition of such materials or facilities: *Provided*, That except as otherwise provided in section 303 (d) of this act, no contributions shall be made for State or local personnel and administrative expenses, or for items of personal equipment for State or local workers, or for the procurement of land: *Provided further*, That the amounts authorized to be contributed by the Administrator to each State for organizational equipment shall be equally matched by such State from any source it determines is consistent with its laws: *Provided further*, That financial contributions to the States for shelters and other protective facilities shall be determined by taking the amount of funds appropriated or available to the Administrator for such facilities in each fiscal year and apportioning same among the States in the ratio which the urban population of the critical target areas (as determined by the Administrator) in each State, at the time of the determination, bears to the total urban population of the critical target areas of all of the States: *Provided further*, That the amounts authorized to be contributed by the Administrator to each State for such shelters and protective facilities shall be equally matched by such State from any source it determines is consistent with its laws and, if not matched within a reasonable time, the Administrator may reallocate same to other States on the formula outlined above: *Provided further*, That the value of any land contributed by any State or political subdivision thereof shall be excluded from the computation of the State share: *And provided further*, That the amounts paid to any State under this subsection shall be expended solely in carrying out the purposes set forth herein and in accordance with State civil defense programs or projects approved by the Administrator. Whenever the Administrator, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing the State, finds that there is a failure to expend funds in accordance with the terms and conditions governing the Federal contribution for such approved programs or projects, the Administrator shall notify such State that further payments will not be made to the State from appropriations under this act or from funds otherwise available for the purposes of this act (or in his discretion from appropriations under this act or from funds otherwise available for the purposes of this act for any approved program or project with respect to which there is such failure to comply) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until he is so satisfied, the Administrator shall either withhold the payment of any financial contributions to such State, or limit payments to the program or project with respect to which there is substantial compliance with the terms and conditions governing the Federal contribution for such program or project.

(j) arrange for the sale or disposal of materials and facilities found by the Administrator to be unnecessary or unsuitable for civil-defense purposes in the same manner as provided for excess property in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and any funds received as proceeds from the sale or other disposition of such materials and facilities shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

RELATION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950
TO CIVIL DEFENSE

SEC. 202. The terms "national defense" or "defense" as used in title II of the Defense

Production Act of 1950 shall be construed to include "civil defense" as defined in this act.

MUTUAL AID PACTS BETWEEN SEVERAL STATES
AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES

SEC. 203. The Administrator shall give all practicable assistance to States in arranging, through the Department of State, mutual civil defense aid between the States and neighboring countries.

IDENTITY INSIGNIA

SEC. 204. The Administrator may prescribe insignia, arm bands, and other distinctive articles (including designs previously covered under Letters Patent which were assigned to the United States and held by the Office of Civilian Defense created by Executive Order No. 8757 issued May 20, 1941) which may be manufactured for or possessed or worn by persons engaged in civil-defense activities pursuant to rules and regulations for the manufacture, possession, or wearing thereof established by the Administrator.

The manufacture, possession, or wearing of any such insignia, arm band, or other distinctive article otherwise than in accordance with such rules and regulations shall be unlawful and shall subject such person to a fine of not more than \$250 or imprisonment of not more than 6 months, or both.

TITLE III—EMERGENCY AUTHORITY

NATIONAL EMERGENCY FOR CIVIL DEFENSE
PURPOSES

SEC. 301. The provisions of this title shall be operative only during the existence of a state of civil defense emergency (referred to hereinafter in this title as "emergency"). The existence of such emergency may be proclaimed by the President—

(a) upon a declaration of war by the Congress;

(b) upon the declaration of the existence of a national emergency by the President or by concurrent resolution of the Congress; or

(c) at any time when the President determines that the national safety requires the invocation of the provisions of this title and, after transmitting notice of such determination to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, directs the Administrator to proceed pursuant to the provisions of this title.

Any such emergency shall terminate upon—

(1) the proclamation of the termination thereof by the President;

(2) direction to the Administrator, after prior notice to the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, to terminate action pursuant to this title; or

(3) the passage by the Congress of a concurrent resolution terminating such emergency.

UTILIZATION OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND
AGENCIES

SEC. 302. During the period of such emergency, under such terms and conditions as to donation, compensation, or return as may be prescribed, the President may direct, after taking into consideration the military requirements of the Department of Defense, any Federal Department or agency to provide, and such departments and agencies are hereby authorized to provide—

(a) their personnel, materials, and facilities to the Administrator for the aid of the States;

(b) emergency shelter by construction or otherwise; and

(c) on public or private lands, protective and other work essential for the preservation of life and property, for clearing debris and wreckage, and for making emergency repairs to, and temporary replacement of, communications, hospitals, utilities, transportation facilities, or public facilities of States or their political subdivisions damaged or destroyed by attack.

EMERGENCY POWERS

SEC. 303. During the period of such emergency, the Administrator is authorized to—

(a) exercise the authority contained in section 201 (h) without regard to the limitation of any existing law, including the provisions of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a), and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), and section 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U. S. C. 259 and 267), and the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended;

(b) sell, lease, lend, transfer, or deliver materials or perform services for civil defense purposes on such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall prescribe and without regard to the limitations of existing law: *Provided*, That any funds received from the sale or other disposition of materials or for services shall be deposited to the credit of appropriations currently available and made pursuant to this Act and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of such appropriations;

(c) coordinate and direct the relief activities of the various departments and agencies of the United States as provided in section 302 hereof;

(d) reimburse any State, including any political subdivisions thereof, for the compensation paid to and the transportation, subsistence, and maintenance expenses of any employees while engaged in rendering civil-defense aid outside the State and to pay fair and reasonable compensation for the materials of the State government or any political subdivision utilized or consumed outside of the State, including any transportation costs, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator. As used in this subsection, the term "employees" shall include full- or part-time paid, volunteer, auxiliary, and civil defense workers subject to the order or control of a State government or any political subdivision thereof, and such employees shall not be deemed by reason of such reimbursement to be employees or appointees of the United States;

(e) provide financial assistance for the temporary relief or aid of civilian injured or in want as the result of any attack; and

(f) employ temporarily additional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws and to incur obligations on behalf of the United States for civil defense purposes as authorized in this act.

During the period of any such emergency, the Administrator shall transmit quarterly to the Congress a detailed report concerning all action taken pursuant to this section.

IMMUNITY FROM SUIT

SEC. 304. During the period of such emergency, neither the Federal Government nor, except in cases of willful misconduct, gross negligence, or bad faith, any officer or employee thereof while complying with or attempting to comply with any provision of this act or of any rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant to this act shall be liable to any person, whether or not such person is engaged in civil defense, for death, injury, or property damage resulting therefrom. Nothing contained in this section shall affect the right of any person to receive any benefit or compensation to which he might otherwise be entitled under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 751), or any other act of Congress providing for any pension or retirement.

WAIVER OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 305. During the period of such emergency, the functions and duties exercised under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), except as to the requirements of section 3 thereof.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY

SEC. 401. For the purpose of carrying out his powers and duties under this act, the Administrator is authorized to—

(a) employ civilian personnel for duty in the United States, including the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, subject to the civil-service laws, and to fix the compensation of such personnel in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; and subject to the standards and procedures of that act, to place not more than 22 positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule established by that act, and any such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act; and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, including those imposing restrictions upon dual compensation or dual employment, employ in a civilian capacity, with the approval of the President, not to exceed 25 retired personnel of the armed services on a full- or part-time basis without loss or reduction of or prejudice to the retired status and compensation of such personnel;

(b) employ not to exceed 100 experts and consultants or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 55 (a), title 5, of the United States Code, and not to exceed 25 aliens. Individuals so employed may be compensated at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be paid actual travel expense and not to exceed \$15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses while so employed;

(c) utilize the services of Federal agencies and, with the consent of any State or local government, accept and utilize the services of State and local civil agencies; establish and utilize such regional and other offices as may be necessary; utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services by individuals or organizations as may from time to time be needed; and authorize the States to establish and organize such individuals and organizations into units to be known collectively as the United States Civil Defense Corps: *Provided*, That the members of such corps shall not be deemed by reason of such membership to be appointees or employees of the United States;

(d) employ persons of outstanding experience and ability without compensation to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act and such persons may be allowed transportation and not to exceed \$15 per diem in lieu of subsistence while away from their homes or regular places of business pursuant to such employment;

(e) notwithstanding any other provisions of law, accept gifts of funds, supplies, equipment, and facilities; and utilize or distribute same for civil defense purposes in accordance with the provisions of this act;

(f) reimburse any Federal agency for any of its expenditures or for compensation of its personnel and utilization or consumption of its materials and facilities under this act to the extent funds are available;

(g) purchase such printing, binding, and blank-book work from public, commercial, or private printing establishments or binderies as he may deem necessary upon orders placed by the Public Printer or upon waivers issued in accordance with section 12 of the Printing Act approved January 2, 1895, as amended; and

(h) prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this act, and, without being relieved of his responsibility therefor, perform any of the powers and duties vested in him through or with the aid of such officials of the Administration as he may designate.

XCVI—1065

EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN PROHIBITIONS

SEC. 402. The authority granted in subsections 401 (b), (c), and (d) shall be exercised in accordance with regulations of the President who may also provide by regulation for the exemption of persons employed or whose services are utilized under the authority of said subsections from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

SECURITY REGULATIONS

SEC. 403. (a) The Administrator shall establish such security requirements and safeguards, including restrictions with respect to access to information and property as he deems necessary. No employee of the Administration shall be permitted to have access to information or property with respect to which access restrictions have been established under this section, until it shall have been determined that no information is contained in the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or any other investigative agency of the Government indicating that such employee is of questionable loyalty or reliability for security purposes, or if any such information is so disclosed, until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have conducted a full field investigation concerning such person and a report thereon shall have been evaluated by the Administrator. No such employee shall occupy any position determined by the Administrator to be of critical importance from the standpoint of national security until a full field investigation concerning such employee shall have been conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon shall have been evaluated by the Administrator.

(b) Each Federal employee of the Administration shall execute the loyalty oath or appointment affidavits prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. Each person other than a Federal employee who is appointed to serve in a State or local organization for civil defense shall, before entering upon his duties, take an oath in writing before a person authorized to administer oaths, which oath shall be substantially as follows:

"I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties upon which I am about to enter.

"And I do further swear (or affirm) that I do not advocate, nor am I a member or an affiliate of any organization, group, or combination of persons that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence; and that during such time as I am a member of the (name of civil defense organization), I will not advocate nor become a member or an affiliate of any organization, group, or combination of persons that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence."

Any person who shall be found guilty of having falsely taken such oath shall be punished as provided in 18 United States Code 1621. The requirements of this subsection shall not be applicable to aliens appointed pursuant to subsection 401 (b) of this act.

TRANSFERS TO ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 404. The functions, property, and personnel of the Federal Civil Defense Administration established by Executive Order No. 10186, issued December 1, 1950, are hereby transferred to the Administration established by this act.

UTILIZATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES

SEC. 405. In performing his duties, the Administrator shall (1) cooperate with the various departments and agencies of the Government; (2) utilize to the maximum extent the existing facilities and resources of the Federal Government, and, with their consent, the facilities and resources of the States and local political subdivisions thereof, and of other organizations and agencies; and (3) refrain from engaging in any form of activity which would duplicate or parallel activity of any other Federal department or agency unless the Administrator, with the written approval of the President, shall determine that such duplication is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

APPLICABILITY OF ACT

SEC. 406. The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the United States, its Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia, and their political subdivisions.

APPROPRIATIONS AND TRANSFERS OF FUNDS

SEC. 407. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Funds made available for the purposes of this act may be allocated or transferred for any of the purposes of this act, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any agency or Government corporation designated to assist in carrying out this act: *Provided*, That each such allocation or transfer shall be reported in full detail to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives within 30 days after such allocation or transfer.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

SEC. 408. To aid in carrying out the purposes of this act, the Administrator is authorized to certify to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as to the necessity under its civil defense program of purchasing securities or making a loan or loans (including participations therein and guaranties thereof) for the purpose of aiding in financing projects for civil defense purposes, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized to purchase such securities or to make such loan or loans (including participations therein and guaranties thereof) with maturities not to exceed 50 years and on such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine except that any such purchases of securities or loans may be made only to the extent that financing is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. The total amount of loans, purchases, participations, and guaranties, made pursuant to this section shall not exceed \$250,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

SEC. 409. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to amend or modify the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SEC. 410. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize investigations of espionage, sabotage, or subversive acts by any persons other than personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 411. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provisions to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 sets up the table of contents.

Section 2 contains the declaration of policy.

Section 3 is the definition section.

Section 101 establishes a Federal Civil Defense Administration headed by an Administrator appointed from civilian life by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and a Deputy Administrator appointed under the same circumstances. The Administration is placed directly under the supervision of the President.

Section 102 creates a Civil Defense Advisory Council, consisting of representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments, as well as from the citizens at large. It has a membership of 12 and the representatives of State or local agencies shall be selected from panels recommended by specified public agencies. The Council shall meet not less than once a year to advise the Administrator in his duties.

Section 201 specifies the functions of the Administration in detail.

Section 201 (a) directs the Administrator to prepare plans making full use of plans previously prepared by the National Security Resources Board if they are feasible.

Section 201 (b): In order to coordinate at one point all information as to the civil defense activities of the Federal Government, the Administrator is authorized to review all of such activities of the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government. This would include the coordination of civil defense activities carried on by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense. In order to prevent the ignoring, duplication, or undue delay of different civil defense items or projects, the Administrator is authorized to bring the activities of such agencies with respect to civil defense into an accord or common action with each other and with the civil defense activities of the States and neighboring countries.

Section 201 (c): The Administrator is authorized to establish such communication systems as are required. It is contemplated that he must make full use of existing communication systems, including the various governmental installations and existing commercial systems. It is not intended that he establish duplicating or overlapping facilities unless absolutely essential.

Section 201 (d): The Administrator is authorized to insure the carrying on of research to afford adequate protection of life and property by developing the best methods of treating the effects of attacks by atomic, radiological, chemical, bacteriological, biological, or other weapons or processes. The Administrator must utilize the agencies best qualified to conduct such research and avoid duplication. In addition, the Administrator would develop adequate civilian shelter designs and also materials for protective covering.

It is not contemplated that the Administrator will acquire or construct research laboratories, but will utilize existing facilities. A large Federal research staff is not authorized and virtually all research will be accomplished by assignment or contract.

Section 201 (e): The Administrator will train only the top civil defense officials and training supervisors designated by the States or the political subdivisions thereof. Such schools might be operated under contract or organized and operated by the Administrator. It may be necessary to provide subsistence and quarters for the trainees and instructors on a reimbursable basis. Each class at the staff college will average about 50 students and will extend over about 5 weeks. The college staff will comprise about seven instructors. Each training school will handle about 125 students in each class and each course will extend over about 3 weeks.

Shorter courses will also be given at these schools. The expenditure over a period of 3 years is estimated at about \$10,000,000.

The Federal training program will include civil defense instruction in the curricula of schools and colleges; the provision of audiovisual aids and other training materials; on-the-spot institutes to assist State and local planners and administrators in the development of their civil defense program; development of tests to achieve standardization; and assistance in development of exercises to test civil defense planning, organization, and operations at the local, State, and regional levels. It is not planned that the Federal Government will underwrite the cost of travel, subsistence, or pay of students, other than Federal employees, while receiving civil defense training.

Section 201 (f): Civil defense information will be made available to every citizen through all appropriate means of communication. "Appropriate means" refers to maximum use of existing Government and private media, including the press, public libraries, magazines, special publications, manuals, handbooks, radio, television, motion-picture films, film strips, film slides, posters, exhibits, and such other means as may be available.

Section 201 (g): The Administrator is authorized to encourage the negotiation of civil defense compacts between States and review the terms thereof in order to obtain a reasonable degree of similarity or uniformity in the terms and conditions of such compacts which are consistent with the national civil defense plans and programs. The Administrator will also assist and coordinate the activities under such compacts.

This subsection grants the consent of Congress to such compacts by the filing thereof with the Congress. Lack of negative action by concurrent resolution of the Congress within 60 days will constitute approval.

Section 201 (h): In order to acquire stockpiles and also to acquire facilities necessary for civil defense, the Administrator is authorized to deal in materials and facilities as defined in the bill which are needed to prepare for or meet enemy attacks. Real property needed by the Administrator might be acquired by negotiation or condemnation and immediate possession can be obtained with the right to make improvements prior to the clearance of title by the Attorney General. Facilities may be constructed or renovated and may be leased as well as procured. The powers also relate to real property and are in broad terms since the exact situation confronting the Administrator at the time of exercising such powers is not known. Quarterly reports must be delivered to the Armed Services Committees under this subsection covering all property acquired thereunder.

Section 201 (i): The Administrator may make financial contributions to the States for civil defense purposes. Such contributions may include the financing of the procurement, construction, leasing, or renovating of materials and facilities considered necessary to prepare for or meet enemy attacks. No contributions may be made for State or local personnel and administrative expenses, or for items of personal equipment for State or local workers, or for the procurement of land. Contributions for organizational equipment shall be equally matched by the States. Such equipment would be peculiar to civil defense and of a type that must be in place at time of disaster, that is, fire-fighting equipment, portable pipe and fitting, service trucks, vehicle fitments for litters. Contributions for shelters are to be apportioned among the States—"in the ratio which the urban population of the critical target areas (as determined by the Administrator) in each State, at the time of the determination bears to the total urban population of the critical target areas of all the States."

This formula follows to some extent previous legislative enactments governing contributions to the States. The advice of the Department of Defense must be considered in establishing critical target areas. The apportionment on the basis of the critical target areas is designed to render aid to the States where the need is considered greatest. If a State fails to match the funds apportioned, such funds may be reallocated. The section further excludes from the contributions of the States the value of any land. Further, it contains sanctions in the event there is reasonable evidence of the misuse of funds contributed by the Administrator.

Section 201 (j): Materials acquired by the Administrator under title II can be disposed of only when found to be unnecessary or unsuitable for civil defense purposes. In such cases the materials shall be treated as excess property and handled in accordance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. Amounts received for such materials shall be covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Section 202: Under title II of the Defense Production Act of 1950 the President can requisition materials and facilities for national defense or defense. This section extends the authority to include "civil defense" within the term "national defense" or "defense."

Section 301: It is intended that the emergency authorities of this title be invoked only when the President declares a state of civil defense emergency. It can only be proclaimed during a period of war or national emergency. It is not intended that such a state of civil defense emergency exists solely because of a declaration of war or national emergency. A second positive step must be taken by the President, and it is intended that the Congress have full power to terminate these authorities whether or not the President agrees with such action. Because of the broad nature of these powers the committee is of the opinion that their invocation be exercised only under the gravest circumstances.

Section 302: This section is designed to make available the resources of the Federal Government for civil defense purposes during the period of the emergency. The decision to use these resources and the extent to which they shall be used is to be decided by the President. The President is directed to take into consideration the military requirements of the Department of Defense in directing the use of the resources, for it is not intended that anything be done which might impair the military in carrying out its primary mission. Resources include personnel, materials, and facilities. It is intended that these authorities shall exist for as short a time as practicable and then only while the requirements of section 301 are met.

Section 303 (a): The emergency authority herein contained can be exercised without regard to the limitations of existing laws. The laws cited relate to facilities and materials and briefly are as follows:

610 U. S. C. 278a: Lease of buildings to Government—maximum rental shall not exceed 15 percent of fair market value, etc.

41 U. S. C. 5: All purchases and contracts for supplies and purchases or services must be advertised.

40 U. S. C. 259: No money shall be paid for a site for a public building in excess of amount appropriated.

40 U. S. C. 267: Restrictions on buildings; approval of sketch plans, limit of cost.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 contains the general authority and limitations relating to the procurement of personal property.

The foregoing limitations may be varied to expedite and aid in the procurement of materials and facilities.

Section 303 (b): This subsection confers broad authority on the Administrator dur-

ing an emergency in connection with the transactions for the disposal of materials. Primarily such authority will be used to make available materials which have been stockpiled in the regional areas. Depending on the severity of the attack, the Administrator may sell at cost or perhaps market value. With widespread and continued attacks the Administrator might deliver the materials without compensation. In the event sales are made under these conditions, funds received are available to the Administrator and need not be covered into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Section 303 (c): Authorizes the direction of relief activities as established by section 302.

Section 303 (d): Provides, during an emergency, for the reimbursement of any State of expenses incurred in performing civil defense functions outside the State, including the payment of fair and reasonable compensation of materials used and expenses and salaries of employees utilized.

Section 303 (e): Authorizes the providing of financial assistance for the relief of aid of persons injured or who may be homeless or in want as a result of damage caused by an attack.

Section 303 (f): Authorizes employment of temporary personnel without regard to the civil service laws and the obligating of the United States for civil defense purposes as authorized by the act.

Any of the authorities of section 303 which are exercised must be reported quarterly to the Congress starting within 90 days of the invocation of the first authority.

Section 304: No employees of the Federal Government or the States or their political subdivisions shall be held liable for damage incurred in performing civil defense functions during an emergency. In effect this section sets aside the Federal Torts Act as it applies to these employees. It is not intended that they be protected from acts caused as a result of gross negligence, willful misconduct, or bad faith.

Section 305: Waives all the requirements of the administrative procedures without excepting the one requiring publication of regulations in the Federal Register.

Section 401: This section authorizes the employment of civilian personnel in accordance with the requirements of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act. The bill provides 22 positions in the so-called superclassification grade and authority for the Administrator to employ, with the approval of the President, not to exceed 25 retired military personnel. This would be without regard to the dual compensation laws to permit the drawing of both civil and retired pay.

As originally introduced, the section also authorized the employment of experts and consultants without. Such personnel could be employed at \$50 per day. The committee limited the number of such persons to 100 and authorized in addition the appointment of 25 aliens to assist in the development of the program. These aliens are to be experts in the field of civil defense from the United Kingdom and Canada. It is intended that they be screened thoroughly for security purposes in accordance with the normal provisions that may be in existence to insure no alien being employed whose employment would be a threat to the security of the United States.

This section also authorizes the utilization of the services of Federal agencies, and with their consent the utilization of the services of State and local governments. It also authorizes the States to organize their civil defense workers in a corps to be known as the United States Civil Defense Corps, but membership in such corps does not per se establish such individuals as appointees or employees of the United States.

The section also authorizes the employment of persons of outstanding experience

and ability without compensation to assist in carrying out the provisions of the act as well as the acceptance of gifts and their distribution for civil-defense purposes. Reimbursement to any Federal agency for expenditures made in connection with the purposes of this act is authorized out of funds available to the Administrator. It provides the normal provisions concerning printing and binding and permits the Administrator, without being relieved of his responsibilities, to delegate certain of his powers and duties to other officials of the Administration.

Section 402 permits the President to issue regulations exempting certain persons employed by the Administration from the operation of certain sections of the Criminal Code barring dual service of Federal employees. This authority is similar to that granted under the Defense Production Act of 1950 and it is the intent that the authorities of this section be exercised under regulations uniform with those prescribed under the Defense Production Act of 1950.

Section 403: This section provides that the Administrator establish stringent security regulations governing the activities of the agency. As originally introduced it would have required all employees to be the subject of a full field investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As amended the section provides that all employees shall be checked against the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other investigative agencies of the Federal Government. In event any derogatory information is developed, such employees shall be the subject of full field investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Administrator shall also designate positions of critical importance and the occupants of those positions shall be investigated thoroughly by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Also, since the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, apply to persons employed under the authority of this act, all employees having access to classified atomic energy data must be investigated fully by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The section also requires the Federal employees to execute the normal loyalty oath for such employees. Persons serving in State or local organizations are required to take an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. The only exception from this requirement will be the 25 aliens authorized in section 401 (b).

Section 404 transfers the functions, personnel, and property of the Federal Civil Defense Administration in the Office of Emergency Management at the present time to the Administration established by this bill.

Section 405 requires the Administrator to utilize to the maximum extent possible existing facilities and resources of the Federal Government. The committee amended the bill to make it clear that it does not intend that the Administrator establish duplicate Federal functions unless the President specifically approves such duplication in writing.

Section 406: This section provides that the bill shall apply to the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia, and their political subdivisions.

Section 407 is the normal authorization for appropriations along with authority to transfer funds appropriated to the Administrator to any agency or Government corporation designated to assist in carrying out the provisions of this bill. Such transfer requires the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and full reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

Section 408: This section is aimed at encouraging the development of self-liquidating projects to provide civil-defense facilities, including shelters, utilities, hospitals, and so forth. It merely modifies existing law to permit the Reconstruction Finance

Corporation to grant loans for such purposes with a maturity period of 50 years instead of the 40 years as contained in present law. The Administrator of Civil Defense must certify to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as to the necessity to the civil-defense program of such projects. The amount that can be outstanding at any time for this purpose is \$250,000,000, and it is the intent that this be an increase in the lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Section 409: This section makes it clear that nothing in this bill shall affect in the slightest degree the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended.

Section 410 makes it clear that nothing in this bill authorizes investigations of espionage, sabotage, or subversive activities by other than the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Section 411 establishes the usual provisions for separability to insure that in the event any section is deemed invalid the other sections shall apply.

The hearings that were held on the subject have been printed and made available to each Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we are today considering Senate bill 4268, a bill to round out the national defense of the United States by establishing a program for civil defense. This bill has been reported unanimously by the Senate Armed Services Committee. A companion bill passed the House of Representatives yesterday with only one dissenting vote. For almost a year a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, consisting of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and myself, has been studying this problem and simultaneously studies were made by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

In that connection, Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and to its Chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] for the intense study they have made of the problem and for the report on the subject which they have published. I feel that their studies and the hearings which have been held have contributed much to the information of the public and the Congress on the question of civilian defense.

Undoubtedly the activity of the joint committee in this field has done much to encourage and to hasten the submission of plans for civilian defense by the executive departments. While we are considering the bill at a late date, it probably would have been later had it not been for the excellent activity of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and of its chairman.

The staffs of the two committees have worked in concert on this proposal, and we are grateful for the assistance which they have given us.

I also desire to say, Mr. President, that the staff of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate during the past 9 or 10 months have given a great deal of consideration to the problem of civilian defense, particularly Colonel Chambers, who has been assigned to this particular work. His assistance has been very substantial and very intelligently rendered.

The Committee on Armed Services, in addition to hearing a report of which has been printed, also conducted very extensive executive hearings over a period of many days. The executive hearings are necessarily classified and are not for general use in printed form for the Members of the Senate.

The Senate Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are agreed that there is no more pressing problem facing the country today than is the prompt enactment of legislation in this field.

Over and beyond any other consideration as to the need for prompt action on this bill is the fact that it is designed to provide only a small Federal agency to guide and coordinate an extensive Federal and State structure which will be largely manned by volunteer forces. Such a plan will require the enactment of a great deal of legislation by the various State legislatures, a majority of which will convene in January.

In that connection, Mr. President, the Governors Conference urged very strenuously that this proposed legislation be passed and that the conference report be agreed upon as early as possible, in order that before the State legislatures meet in January the Administrator may have time to work out plans and programs so the activities of the States and the Federal Government can be coordinated. Forty-four of the State legislatures will meet in January. It is urgent that the bill be passed and the conference report agreed upon tomorrow, if possible. Every State in the Union has established some kind of civilian defense organization. Most of them have been established by executive orders of the various governors, but they are very anxious to have it in legislative form when the 44 State legislatures meet in January.

We are unanimous in believing that it is mandatory that the Federal civil defense law be enacted in advance of the meetings of the various State legislatures in order to provide a proper base for State laws.

I do not propose at this time to attempt to analyze in detail the provisions of this bill. I intend to explain it in general terms and answer such questions as will be raised to the best of my ability. If it appears that the bill is too controversial to be voted on today, I am more than willing to delay the voting until tomorrow so that it can be considered overnight by those Members of the Senate who retain some reservations. I would like to point out, however, that the hearings on this bill were printed and distributed to the offices of all the Senators, so that many of your inquiries have perhaps already been answered by the testimony taken before the committee.

In approaching the problem of establishing a civil defense plan, the committee has unanimously concurred in the proposition that it must be solved at the local level. Nor can it be confined to a few critical areas throughout the country. In this day of potential extensive damage which can be caused by atomic weapons or others perhaps more devas-

tating, it is essential that not only the critical target areas be defended and plans prepared for their protection, but that the various small communities be prepared to provide support for the defense of the so-called critical target cities.

Mr. President, after listening to the excellent address of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as to the necessity of mobilization, military and civil, I know that the public generally will understand this necessity. It is useless to plan a civil defense plan for Detroit, for instance, unless we gear into it the many small cities and hamlets of Michigan, Canada, and perhaps other States which must receive evacuees, furnish emergency housing, medical care, food and clothing, and help rehabilitate those persons who might be the helpless victims of such an attack. Furthermore, if the productive capacity of Detroit, which I use only as an example in this case, is to be maintained, we must have on a State and Nation-wide basis plans which will permit the rapid reestablishment of those sections of Detroit which can be quickly rehabilitated and put back into production. I know that many persons have argued that we need only to provide a civil-defense plan to include the critical target areas. Mr. President, nothing could be more shortsighted or potentially as dangerous as thinking of this type. Just as the requirements of a military campaign demand careful organization in the rear areas to support the front lines, so does our civil-defense plan require a fully organized country to support the critical cities.

When legislation on this subject was first introduced, the committee felt it proposed entirely too broad a grant of power to the Administrator. In substance, there was no normal grant of power under which the Administrator would have functioned. He always would have had available to him the so-called emergency powers, which did not seem desirable to those of us who studied the proposal. Accordingly the bill was rewritten and divided into four titles. Three of these titles establish the normal peacetime functioning of the Civil Defense Administration, which would permit the development in an orderly fashion of a well-rounded civil-defense program. Into title III were placed all the so-called emergency powers as they were by the House of Representatives. The idea was originally brought forward by Representative VINSON, the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services. The House, in the bill it passed, also made a division of the bill into titles. These powers are extremely broad and should be carefully controlled. Basically, these powers can only be invoked when the President declares a civil-defense emergency.

This civil defense emergency can only be declared after he has first declared a national emergency, or a declaration of war has been made by the Congress. There is one exception to these conditions. The committee, after hearing the testimony, was convinced that there may come a time when the President might

need to place into operation some of the emergency powers without alarming the citizens of our country or placing our actions on notice to hostile foreign countries. This could well come about through the receipt by our military and the President of certain intelligence which would indicate a pressing need to expedite our civil defense program. In the event the President thought this intelligence was of such a nature as to indicate a threat to the national safety, he is authorized, after first consulting with the chairman of the respective Armed Services Committees of the Congress, to direct the Administrator of Civil Defense to invoke any or all of the emergency powers. The committee was not very happy about this alternative procedure but inserted it after careful and considered discussion of the point involved. In all cases we reserved the right to terminate the use of such powers by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Another point which received considerable attention by the committee was the cost of this program, and how it would be financed. The committee was well aware of the fact that this project is a serious and an extensive one and could well run into heavy expenditures. It is estimated that this bill will cost over a period of 3 years between \$3,000,000,000 and \$3,200,000,000. Of this amount approximately 54 percent will be furnished by the Federal Government and 46 percent by the State and local communities. In any event it is a drain on the taxpayer. Various amendments were suggested which would have cost the Federal Government a greater proportionate share of the total expense. The committee has consistently rejected all of these proposed amendments. Furthermore, it has endeavored to reduce the total cost of the program by eliminating any expenditures for so-called self-liquidating projects. These might be underground garages, hospitals, and items of that nature. These could be financed under normal lending procedures by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but there are no direct appropriations to assist in the construction of such projects.

The largest single item of expenditure over a period of 3 years is \$2,250,000,000 for shelters, of which the Federal Government would put up 50 percent of the money. The other expensive items include stockpiles of medical supplies and equipment of various kinds which will cost in the vicinity of \$300,000,000, all to be paid from Federal money. Organizational type equipment will cost about \$200,000,000 equally divided between the Federal Government and the States, and communication equipment which will be paid for by the Federal Government and which will cost roughly \$32,000,000.

We have heard a great many questions concerning the cost of the shelter program. It is interesting to note that all the government and municipal people have been greatly interested in the shelter program because they believe that it is one of the most urgent requirements of the total program. In that the committee concurs. According to the testimony given to the committee there

is no intention on the part of the administration and certainly it is not the intention of the committee to start a promiscuous construction program of large, underground mass shelters. Rather this program contemplates a strengthening of existing basements where the basic construction permits, and the development of a certain number of relatively small bomb shelters in properly located districts to provide protection for the persons working in those areas. It does not contemplate shelters in individual back yards nor does it envision the building of shelters in communities which are not in the so-called critical target areas. Mr. President, we are spending billions of dollars on our national military machine. That machine can only function if it has the proper equipment and the tools with which to work. The ability to get those tools and equipment rests squarely on the productive effort of our country, and that in turn can only be insured by an implementation of the civil-defense program, including the shelter program.

I know that there are those who argue that this program involves too much money, but we can no longer stand idle in this business of getting ready to meet the threat of atomic war. I know that many are tired of hearing us say on the floor of the Senate that we are at war. But, Mr. President, there is an old doctrine of the law which we all know well and that is that the facts speak for themselves. We are already virtually at war and we have already waited too long in this business of civil defense. I certainly hope that no one today will oppose this bill solely because of some vague fear that it is going to cost too much money, or that the powers granted are too broad.

I repeat that the Senate Armed Services Committee unanimously approved this bill after considerable discussion. I believe the general principles of the bill have been agreed upon by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Just as we are now in a position of placing confidence and trust in our military leaders, we must create an organization and place confidence in the leaders who will handle the problem of civil defense. The Military Establishment does not want to handle this problem and has specifically recommended that it not be assigned to them. Yet they say that it is a problem which must be solved immediately because only through a program such as this can we be assured that our vital productive capacity and civilian morale in this country can be maintained. The Armed Services Committee believes that such legislation is necessary. It believes that we have already waited too long for the creation of such a plan. It believes that the bill that we have before us has been screened and modified to the point where it gives a reasonable protection against an unwarranted use of authorities by the Executive Department.

Mr. President, I could go on at great length arguing for the consideration and passage of this bill. I prefer, however, to take no more of the Senate's time, but

I am prepared to answer such questions as may be directed to me. Probably it will not be possible to act on the bill today, but tomorrow I hope we can get early consideration of it and that it may be possible to agree on the conference report tomorrow, or at least at the very earliest time possible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate. However, I have some material which I desire to have placed in the RECORD. On the 27th of April of this year during the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Earl Browder, the former secretary of the Communist Party in America, testified relative to some prior criticisms he had made of our policy, as he then understood it, of supporting the Republic of China and of being critical of the Communist regime in China. As I recall his testimony, he said he was called to the State Department by the then Under Secretary of State, Mr. Welles, and was given a memorandum, which in turn he transmitted to Mme. Sun Yat-sen, who I understand now occupies a position as one of the vice chairmen of the Communist regime in China.

Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent that there appear at this point in my remarks the statement I made immediately upon coming to the floor of the Senate from the hearing of the Committee on Foreign Relations. My statement on that day is found on page 5897 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eighty-first Congress, second session.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apropos the question raised by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] on the testimony today, to most of which I listened, as did the Senator from South Dakota, I was rather startled at the testimony of Mr. Browder to the effect that he had transmitted through some channels to the Government of the United States messages he had received from Mao Tse-tung, the Communist leader in China, which influenced this Government in changing its policy. As I understood the testimony this morning, that policy was changed on or about October 1942, and from that time to 1945 it was so satisfactory to the Communist Party of the United States that they did not feel it was necessary to carry on their agitation. While he said that he felt it would not be proper to claim sole credit for doing it, it did so happen that the policy which we pursued after October 1942 was certainly reasonably satisfactory to the Communist Party in this country.

I have not had a chance to completely re-analyze the American white paper which was issued on August 5, 1949, relative to our dealings with China, except in a somewhat cursory manner. I have checked through it, and I cannot find any such document in the American white paper on or about the date of October 1942. I have had my office contact the State Department to ask them to furnish me with a copy of this document which Mr. Browder says Sumner Welles gave him with the understanding that he would transmit it to Mme. Sun Yat-sen, who was one of the leading figures in the Communist Party in China, and who, I believe, is now

one of the vice chairmen of the Communist regime in China. I have also asked that they supply me with the documents leading up to the issuance of that paper, which apparently was turned over to Mr. Browder for transmittal to Mme. Sun Yat-sen.

Reserving my judgment until the State Department clearly can indicate whether or not this memorandum appears in the white paper, I should say that it would seem to me to be rather unusual for a document of such importance, which marks the turning point of American policy in China, should have been excluded from the white paper. I am saying now that it has been excluded. I cannot find it. Certainly I feel that there should be a full explanation to the Senate and to the country as to why these documents, which now appear to be of considerable historic interest in this whole problem, were not amply outlined in the white paper with reference to China.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire also to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a memorandum which I received from my administrative assistant, Mr. George Wilson, relative to telephone conversations which he had had at my direction with Mr. Sprouse, of the State Department, asking the State Department for a copy of the memorandum regarding which Mr. Browder testified. In this memorandum to me, which speaks for itself, which was made on April 29, 1950, Mr. Wilson informs me that he in turn had been informed by the State Department that they had made a diligent search of the records, and had not been able to find a copy to furnish me. I might say, Mr. President, that so far as I can find in the files of my office, no subsequent communication was received from the State Department in regard to that matter.

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

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

Thursday evening at about 6 o'clock I called Mr. Sprouse of the State Department (extension 5662) and told him that you would appreciate very much being furnished with a copy of a message or statement which was sent by Sumner Welles to Madame Sun Yat-sen via Mr. Earl Browder. I informed him that the message was sent approximately in October of 1942. I also informed him that you had been unable to find the message in the white paper although you had not made a detailed search for the statement.

On Friday about a quarter to 12 I again called Mr. Sprouse to inquire if he was able to locate the statement which I had discussed with him the previous evening. He advised me that they were checking their files but had not, as yet, found the message. I, therefore, advised him if they would check the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, April 27, and I gave him the specific page number, it might shed a little more light on the document that they were looking for. He thanked me and assured me that they were still looking for Mr. Welles' statement.

At about 4:15 Friday, April 28, I again called Mr. Sprouse and on being advised that he was attending a session of the Institute of Foreign Relations, asked that he call me back when he returned. At about 5:30 or 6 o'clock he returned my call and advised me that his people had been unable, as of the

moment, to find the Welles statement but would continue to look for it. I thanked him and advised him that in addition to the Welles statement, you would like a copy of a message which Mr. Browder claimed he had received from Mao Tse-tung in 1942, regarding the military situation in China, which he, in turn, claimed to have given to President Roosevelt. I stated that I assumed copies of the message were made available by the White House to the State Department and was sure the message would be in the State Department files. I further advised him that Mr. Browder stated that the information he had received from Mao was later confirmed by our own military sources. At the time of our last conversation, I informed Mr. Sproule that you were quite anxious to receive copies of the two messages as soon as possible.

In talking about the Welles statement, I also asked for any supporting papers which would be available.

GEORGE WILSON.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to have printed at this point in my remarks a copy of the memorandum given to Mr. Earl Browder by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, at his office in the State Department on October 12, 1942. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the entire memorandum because it will speak for itself, but I do desire to read this much of an extract from it:

With regard to the specific charge that "these officials continue the old policy of 'war against the Communists' in China" this Government has had no such policy, either "old" or "new." This Government has in fact viewed with skepticism many alarmist accounts of the "serious menace" of "Communism" in China.

I ask that the entire memorandum be printed as a part of my remarks.

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

MEMORANDUM GIVEN TO EARL BROWDER BY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE SUMNER WELLES, AT HIS OFFICE IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT, OCTOBER 12, 1942

With regard to the specific charge that it is on the advice of reactionary officials in the State Department that Chiang Kai-shek is keeping his best armies out of the war, the simple fact is that the nearest approach to advice given by any officials in the Department of State in this context has been an expression of an opinion that civil strife in China, at all times unfortunate, would be especially unfortunate at a time when China is engaged in a desperate struggle of self-defense against an armed invader. The implication of this expression of opinion was that the Chinese Government should try to maintain peace by processes of conciliation between and among all groups and factions in China. And the course which Chiang Kai-shek has been pursuing is not keeping his best armies out of the war. Both the armies of the National Government and the Communist armies are fighting the Japanese. No Chinese armies are actively engaged in large-scale offensive operations against the Japanese—for the reason, principally, that there is lacking to all Chinese armies types and amounts of equipment which are essential to such operations, but this situation is one which both the Chinese Government and the American Government are endeavoring to remedy as equipment becomes available.

With regard to the specific charge that the State Department in Washington has informed Chungking's representatives that our Government would be displeased if com-

plete unity was established in China between the Kuomintang and the Communists, what this statement alleges is the exact opposite of the fact. The State Department in Washington has at all times taken the position, both in diplomatic contexts and publicly, that the United States favors complete unity among the Chinese people and all groups or organizations thereof.

With regard to the specific charge that these officials continue the old policy of war against the Communists in China, this Government has had no such policy, either "old" or "new." This Government has in fact viewed with skepticism many alarmist accounts of the serious menace of communism in China. We have, for instance, as is publicly and well known, declined to be moved by the Japanese contentions that presence and maintenance of Japanese armed forces in China were and would be desirable for the purpose of combating communism.

With regard to the specific charge that officials of this Government tell Chungking it must continue to fight the Communists if it wishes United States friendship, the simple fact is that no officials of this Government ever have told Chungking either that it must fight or that it must continue to fight the Communists, this Government holds no such brief, this Government desires Chinese unity and deprecates civil strife in China; this Government treats the Government of China as an equal; it does not dictate to the Government of China, it does not make United States friendship contingent; it regards unity within China, unity within the United States, unity within each of the countries of the United Nations group, and unity among the United Nations as utterly desirable towards effectively carrying on war against the Axis powers and toward creation and maintenance of conditions of just peace when the United Nations shall have gained the victory which is to be theirs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed as a part of my remarks, for the information of the Senate, an article which I have since dug up from the Congressional Library, from the files of the New York Daily Worker, which was published Friday, October 16, 1942, in which there is an article under the heading "Welles states United States policy on China." Then it gives an interview with Mr. Browder, and following this there appeared the text of the memorandum which I have checked with the memorandum which I have just put into the RECORD, and they seem to coincide.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

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

WELLES STATES UNITED STATES POLICY ON CHINA—AFTER INTERVIEW WITH UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, BROWDER RETRACTS CHARGES AGAINST STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS

Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, at his office at 35 East Twelfth Street, New York City, made the following statement to the press yesterday:

"In the Worker of October 4, I made charges that persons whom I designated as reactionary officials in the State Department were encouraging the maintenance of a situation in China harmful to the war effort of our country and its allies. I spoke of strained relations between Kuomintang and Communists, resulting in the immobilization of large numbers of the best troops of that country.

"Upon the invitation of Mr. Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary of State, I visited him in his office on October 12, in company with Mr. Robert Minor, and heard from him, and from Mr. Lauchlin Currie, administrative assistant to the President, a detailed refutation of my charges in this respect. The information received from Mr. Welles and Mr. Currie convinced me that my charges had been made on the basis of incomplete information. I believe it is established that no responsible official of the State Department is contributing to disunity in China, and that the policy of the United States Government is being exerted in the opposite direction.

"I am therefore more than happy to retract those charges without reservation. What I had thought of as a heavy door that needed pushing open proved to be but a curtain of lack of information. Since many persons in the United States and in China also are without that information which I lacked before visiting Mr. Welles, I believe our war effort will be benefited if I make public that portion of Mr. Welles' remarks which was given to me in written form."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that one of the great difficulties the Senate of the United States has in meeting its problems is getting information. It is very difficult sometimes for a United States Senator to get information he needs in the discharge of his duties. I was here during a portion of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in which he quite properly, I believe, said that had the Senate been consulted on certain policies which were followed in the Far East and elsewhere, he believes that perhaps a different policy might have ensued.

I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I agree with him in his statement, if I correctly understood him. But I also wish to point out to him that it is very difficult for the Senate to discharge its constitutional obligations when from time to time, and rather consistently, there is lowered an iron curtain between the activities of the executive departments and Senators in their quest for information which they need in the discharge of their duties. I call his attention again to the fact that for a period of 2 years, I might say the most crucial 2 years, from 1947 to 1949, the Wedemeyer report on China was suppressed, despite the fact that it was officially requested by Members of the Senate and by Senate committees.

I might say for the record that I think the Wedemeyer report on Korea, which the junior Senator from California has read—and I believe he is one of the few Senators who have had opportunity and occasion to read it—very clearly pointed out some of the very dangers which the Senator from Oregon was discussing today. If that report had been made available to the Senate of the United States and its committees, I believe that both the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, as well as individual Senators, might have been able to make their influence felt.

The Senator from California did not see that report until just a month or so ago, long after the June 25 invasion of South Korea by the North Korean Communists. So it is very difficult for the

legislative branch of the Government to conduct its share of the responsibilities of the Government—and we have some very heavy responsibilities—when we do not have cooperation from the executive branch in supplying us with information.

I might say to the Senator from Oregon that the Wedemeyer report on Korea was unanimously and officially requested of the State Department by the Committee on Appropriations, which was dealing with appropriations having to do with the Korean situation. I sat in a meeting of that committee, and I raised the question again with the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson. Mr. Acheson at that time said that he had not had an opportunity to take the matter up with the President of the United States, that he expected to do so in a few days. However, it was only fair, he said, for him to tell the committee that his recommendation was to be that the committee not get the information. I thought that ought to be a matter of record for the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I desire to have printed at this point in my remarks an item which appeared on the news ticker in the anteroom of the regular Senate Chamber, saying that "The United States was reported today to be ready to send about 30 B-26 bombers to Indochina to bolster French forces fighting Communist-led rebels." I shall not read the whole article. I merely make the observation that while not objecting to this program, it seems to me to be a very strange policy which has denied for a period of more than a year much-needed planes for the defense of the island of Formosa, and yet with such alacrity the officials can find the planes and actually ship them to Indochina.

I believe the policies we have followed in the past have been the major reason for the criticism of the Department of State. I must differ with my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, because I believe it is not a matter of personalities, but is a matter of policies, and the policy involved in the news item I have just quoted is one of the policies we are apparently continuing to follow.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the item from the news ticker was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The United States was reported today to be ready to send about 30 B-26 bombers to Indochina to bolster French forces fighting Communist-led rebels.

The ships will be flown to Indochina by American crews and turned over to the French.

Officials who told reporters of the plans said there would be two squadrons of the bombers. A squadron has 15 planes.

The officials said delivery of the planes reflects American determination to rush as much military equipment as possible to the French and loyal Indochinese forces, in an effort to thwart Communist bid for power in that strategic area.

Secretary of Defense George Marshall has personally promised French Defense Minister Jules Moch that the B-26 bombers would be sent. Moch pleaded for air reinforcements when he was here in October for conferences with top officials.

The French aircraft carrier *Dixmude* several weeks ago arrived at an Indochina port with a cargo of some 48 American Helicat and Heldiver fighters.

The United States also has supplied enough ground equipment and ammunition to enable the French to establish 12 battalions of loyal Indochinese nationals to help in the fight against Ho Chi Minh's guerrilla forces.

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as a part of my remarks I also desire to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I addressed today to Mr. Sprouse, of the State Department, enclosing for the files of the State Department the memorandum which they gave to Mr. Browder, and which they have not been able to find.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

DECEMBER 21, 1950.

MR. PHILIP D. SPROUSE,
Office of Chinese Affairs,
Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPROUSE: You will recall during the testimony before the Foreign Relations subcommittee Mr. Earl Browder testified that he had been furnished a statement in October 1942 by Mr. Sumner Wells, then Under Secretary of State, which statement Mr. Browder apparently transmitted to Madame Sun Yat-sen.

On Thursday, April 28, Mr. George Wilson, my administrative assistant, contacted you and requested a copy of the Wells statement together with certain other documents which had been mentioned in Mr. Browder's testimony. You informed Mr. Wilson that a search had been made of the State Department's records and you had been unable to locate copies of the several statements mentioned.

Today, I received what purports to be a copy of the memorandum given by Mr. Sumner Wells to Mr. Earl Browder. This may help you locate at least one of the documents that you heretofore had been unable to find.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed as a part of my remarks extracts from the speech of the distinguished educator and philosopher, Dr. Hu Shih, former Ambassador to the United States which he made at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco on December 1 of this year.

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

CHINESE PEOPLE AND GOVERNMENT NOT FREE;
MAO A KREMLIN GAULEITER—BUT, DR. HU
SAYS, "FREE CHINA"—MILLIONS UNDER RED
BONDAGE—ON OUR SIDE

(From address by Dr. Hu Shih, famed Chinese scholar and ex-Ambassador to United States)

Before the end of 1949, nearly the whole of continental China, except for the guerrilla areas, came under the conquest of world communism.

In September 1949, the Chinese Communist Party put up a great show in Peiping. A new people's political consultative conference attended by 635 delegates designated by the Communist Party passed three documents: (1) The common program of the PPCC hailed as the constitution of the Communist regime; (2) the organization law of the central government; and (3) the organization law of the PPCC itself.

DICTATORSHIP BY PARTY

The first article of the common program gives this definition: "The People's Republic of China is a state of the new democracy, that is, a state of the people's democracy. It carries out the people's democratic dictatorship, which is led by the working class."

Translated into plain language, it means that the People's Republic of China is a dictatorship of the Chinese Communist Party in the name of the people.

It is called a state of the new democracy, because in 1940 Mao Tse-tung published a pamphlet, the New Democracy, which was an attempt to present the Chinese Communist Party under the disguise of liberalism.

The new democracy—high sounding name for the united front—was to be the combined dictatorship of several revolutionary classes.

PREVICTORY SLOGANS FORGOTTEN

My former student Mao Tse-tung, being an orthodox Communist, could conceive of all states and governments only as class dictatorships. Therefore he tells us in his pamphlet that in the whole world there are only three forms of state: (1) Republic of bourgeois dictatorship, which prevails in all old democratic countries; (2) republic of proletarian dictatorship, which is the form of state of the Soviet Union; (3) republic of joint dictatorship of several classes, which Mao calls the new democracy.

Mao Tse-tung actually talked about "an election based on a real popular and equal suffrage irrespective of differences, of sex, belief, property, and education."

But of course no Communist Party could ever tolerate sharing political power with non-Communist groups or parties. So today all previctory slogans and promises are conveniently forgotten, and the people's government is indisputably a dictatorship of the one and only party, with a number of non-Communist democratic personages holding nominal and honorary posts.

MAO ADMITS DICTATORSHIP

On July 1, 1949, the official Communist news agency broadcast a lengthy article by Mao Tse-tung which has become required reading for all teachers and students. A few sentences:

"You are dictatorial." Yes, dear gentlemen, you are right and we are dictatorial. * * * The reactionaries must be deprived of the right to voice their opinion, and only the people are allowed to have the right to voice their opinion.

"Who are the people? At the present stage in China, they are the working class, the peasants, the petty bourgeoisie, and the national bourgeoisie. Under the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party, these classes unite together to form their own state and elect their own government to carry out dictatorship over the running dogs of the imperialism—the landlords, the bureaucratic class, the Kuomintang reactionaries and their henchmen—these classes shall oppress them and only allow them to behave properly, and not allow them to talk and act wildly. If they talk and act wildly, they shall be curbed and punished immediately. * * *

INSTRUMENTS OF OPPRESSION

"These two aspects, namely, democracy among the people, and dictatorship over the reactionaries, combine to form the people's democratic dictatorship.

"Do you not want to do away with the state authority?" Yes, but not at the present. Why? Because imperialism still exists, the internal reactionaries still exist, and classes in the country still exist. * * *

"The army, the police, the court—these machineries of the state are instruments for classes to oppress classes. To the hostile classes, the state apparatus is an instrument of oppression. It is violent and not benevolent."

These arrogant and insolent words of Mao Tse-tung give a vivid picture of the dictatorial and oppressive rule under which about 400,000,000 Chinese are now suffering.

Article 5 of the common program stipulates that the people of the Chinese People's Republic shall have 11 kinds of freedom. But article 7 says:

"With regard to all reactionaries, feudalistic landlords, bureaucratic capitalists, after they are disarmed and their special influences are liquidated, they must be deprived of their political rights, but at the same time given some means of livelihood and forced to reconstruct themselves to become 'new men' by means of hard labor. . . . Here we find forced slave labor already dignified into a constitutional provision.

NO FREEDOM OF SILENCE

Under such a regime, there is no freedom for the nonconformist. There is no freedom of speaking out, and no freedom of silence. At any moment, a man may be called upon to make positive statements of his own belief and disbelief.

A year ago last May the chancellor of the Catholic University in Peiping was made to publish an open letter in which my old friend and fellow academician said emphatically that there was no real freedom anywhere except in the areas liberated by the Communists. Did he really say that? Did he have the freedom not to say that?

A few weeks ago, all newspapers in Communist China published what purported to be a written confession of my younger son, in which he denounced me as "an enemy of the people" and also his own enemy. Did my son actually say that? Was he free not to say that? I cite this to show how oppressive the Communist regime is.

But it is not the Chinese people alone who are not free. The Chinese Communist regime itself is not free.

CHINA'S GOVERNMENT IN BONDAGE

Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese Communist Party, and the entire Chinese Communist Government are not free: They are all under the bondage which the U. S. S. R. imposes on her satellite countries.

They have always taken orders from the Kremlin, and they must continue to take such orders because Communist China is dependent on the military and industrial power of the Soviet Union.

It was Stalin who conceived and ordered creation of the Chinese Red Army. It was Stalin who throughout two decades nurtured this Red Army to full strength. It was Stalin who wrested from President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill the secret Yalta agreement which made it possible for Stalin to convert both Manchuria and North Korea into contiguous bases for the U. S. S. R. to aid effectively the Chinese and Korean Communist armies in their military conquest of China.

All this indebtedness to the U. S. S. R. has been openly acknowledged by the leaders of Chinese communism.

Mao has declared that Communist-led China must "lean to one side," must "ally with the Soviet Union, with the new people's democracies, and with the proletariat and masses of the people (that is, the communists) in other countries, to form an international united front."

ALLEGIANCE TO STALIN

This allegiance has been formally stipulated into the constitution of the Communist state in China. Article 11 says:

"The People's Republic of China allies itself with all those states and peoples who love peace and freedom. First of all, it allies itself with the Soviet Union. . . ."

The Moscow treaty made Communist China and Soviet Russia partners in a defensive and offensive alliance.

What has been happening in Tibet, what is now happening in Korea, are best evidences that Communist China has no choice but to march wherever it is ordered to move.

What could be more foolish than for the Chinese Communists to invade Tibet, thereby alienating the undoubted sympathy and support of India? The only possible explanation is that Communist China was under orders to do so.

AT WAR WITH CAPTIVE CHINA

And what could be more insane than for the new state of Communist China to embark on war with one of the two greatest powers in the world? The only possible explanation is that the great prestige of world communism is at stake and that therefore Communist China has been ordered to come to the rescue of North Korea regardless of all possible consequences.

It becomes self-evident now that all the trouble in Korea and in the Far East today stems from the fact that China is no longer free, has become a captive nation of world communism. The free world is at war with captive China.

It would have been absolutely impossible even to imagine a free China fighting the United States.

Captive China is attacking you, but free China is still your friend, ever ready to help you and fight shoulder to shoulder with you.

By "free China," I do not mean merely the 600,000 well-trained soldiers and the 7,000,000 population in the island bastion of Formosa. Nor do I mean merely the vast numbers of Chinese guerrilla units now fighting on the Chinese mainland against the Communists.

By "free China" I mean the vast majority of the Chinese people who are mentally and emotionally anti-Communist even though they are physically living and suffering under the iron yoke.

IT ALWAYS BE FREE CHINA

Free China exists as a reality because, of all the peoples conquered by world communism, my people are the most civilized and have lived under a civilization noted for its individualism and its century-long fights for intellectual, religious, and political freedom.

If history and civilization mean anything at all, there shall always be a free China.

And this free China is prodemocracy, pro-America and pro-West. The 100 years of China's contact with modern western ideas and institutions has not been in vain; the over 100 years of Christian missionary work in China has not been in vain; the 75 years of intensive education and training of thousands of Chinese youths in the American universities and colleges has not been and cannot be in vain.

KNOW WHAT COMMUNISM IS

The sad experience of living and suffering under Communist rule has enabled my people to understand clearly what communism and Communist rule is.

Let the free world make it clear to the people of China that it is fighting the Communist dictatorship in China and not the vast majority of the people of China; that any movement on the part of the people of China to sabotage the Communist conquerors or to rid themselves of their Stalinist puppet dictators will have the moral support and, whenever possible, the material support of democratic and peace-loving peoples of the world.

When the free world gives the word, free China will surely respond.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also desire to have printed at this point in my remarks an article which appeared in the *Fortnight Magazine* for December 11, 1950, by Mr. Clement Reicher, under the title "How Vulnerable Is the Mao Regime?"

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

HOW VULNERABLE IS THE MAO REGIME?

(By Clement Reicher)

It appears that the Government has drawn the following conclusions from the all-out attack by the Chinese Communists: that it has brought total war near enough to make a further substantial speed-up of mobilization necessary, but not near enough to call for an immediate transfer of our troops to other potential theaters of war. It is still assumed that we have time enough to build up strength in all the most exposed positions before we have to meet a showdown with Russia. Let us hope that we have that time and that we will not have to pay a staggering price for all those years of neglecting our defense. Meanwhile, we are in for a protracted war with the Chinese Communists, unless the latter give in and withdraw their troops from Korea.

On the opposite page are indicated the lines of policy which we of *Fortnight* believe should be adopted. I shall here only add certain considerations which flow from my experience of living among the Chinese for 13 years with open eyes and an open mind.

For years the American public has been feasted on writings giving a vivid description of the Chinese scene, pleasantly dramatized, mostly correct in detail, but fundamentally false. From these writings the public has got the impression that Mao Tse-tung is at the head of an incomparably strong government wholeheartedly supported by all the Chinese people. Now we have to fight it. It looks a formidable, terrifying task.

Fortunately, Mao's regime is highly vulnerable. Though it has a strong army and will certainly prove to be no pushover, it rests on a shaky political basis which coming events are bound to subject to enormous pressure.

According to the popular picture, the Chinese Communists owe their phenomenal rise to power essentially to their discovery of an explosive "charge" lying hidden in the Chinese village communities. The peasants, having been "inertly miserable" for thousands of years under the crushing burdens imposed on them by usurers and the owners of the land they tilled, became "alertly miserable" after our ideals of democracy and the rights of man had reached them. This was the explosive charge. Along came the Communists and provided the "fuse" by showing the peasants how to revolt and get ownership of their farms. Liberation of the energies contained in the "charge" has swept the Communists into power.

So far, all this is true. The "charge" is certainly there; but if we know how to play our cards we can make it explode right into the faces of the Communists themselves.

What a tragedy that America, of all nations, should now have to bend her energies toward destroying what little order and peace there is in China. But since the new rulers have wantonly dragged their country into the great conspiracy against the civilized world, what else could we do? We may thank God that the National Government of China has survived American foreign policy and is still there to help us and to remind us, always, that it is not the Chinese Nation but a conspiratorial regime which is our enemy.

THE CHINESE ARE WAKING UP

Look at the holes in the glowing picture painted in the books:

The Chinese peasant now owns the land he tills. The long-coveted title deed is his and so is the joy of possessing it. It gives him all the rice he needs, and security. Piffle. It does not. Under any government with limited powers it would; but it does not under a regime with unlimited rights of taxation. It all goes up in smoke. The title

deed given him by the Communists was a hoax; he has been betrayed. He can't help noticing it.

He never knew that the money extracted from him in rentals flowed, ultimately, into capital investments which kept the national economy going. He never thought that a government that relieved him from paying rentals would have to increase his taxes to make up for the loss in national savings. He did not know that Communist governments deliberately sacrifice the living generation for alleged benefits to future generations, that they do it by outrageously accelerating the process of capital formation—in other words, by taxing him as he had never been taxed before, in order to pay for rapid industrialization. He did not know it, and he does not know it now. But he is not pleased to pay, as he does now, more in taxes than he formerly paid in rentals and interest rates. On the contrary, he is as eagerly inclined to revolt against the new masters as he was against the old.

After having become the stronger party in the civil war, the Communists were in a position to offer peace. Weary of perpetual warfare, the Chinese people flocked to them by the millions. Now the angels of peace are leading the people into an even more frightful war. Won't they notice that, also?

The students, adolescent spearhead of Chinese public opinion, revolted against the little thought control there was under the old regime, only to creep into the strait-jacket thought control of the new. Many of them are becoming aware of it, and resent it.

The industrial workers are now idle, or working for less pay.

The patriots turned their fury against the ghost of western imperialism and delivered their country into the grip of Russia. They are beginning to question what they have done.

WHAT KIND OF WAR?

We will not fight this war as the Japanese did, who sent their armies into the vast interior where they got bogged down. We could not even try to match American manpower against Chinese manpower, nor do we need Chinese raw materials or anything else out of China.

We should fight with planes and ships, and make up for our manpower shortage by raising Asian armies under the United Nations flag. No time should be lost in rearming Japan. Above all, we should allow the entirely reorganized and modernized army of the Chinese Nationalists on Formosa to take part in the war, giving it all the equipment and air cover it needs to become effective on the mainland. The masses of anti-Communist guerrillas, who are active in many parts of China, could be easily increased. The Communists taught the peasantry guerrilla tactics and the art of self-defense. Now this knowledge can be used against the Communist authorities and their tax collectors.

In this war, there will be a destructive task for us, and a constructive one. On the one hand, we have to undermine the Communist regime, on the other, to demonstrate to the Chinese people that there is an alternative. The Japanese failed because they could not offer that choice; a revitalized National government would provide it. It is enormously difficult to modernize a country like China. Yet, the younger men who have risen to leadership in Formosa have all it takes to succeed if we support and help them. By contrast, we shall find that subversion of the Communist regime is a much easier task, since it does not involve problems of readjustment between East and West. It can be accomplished by methods which are as old as China herself; and here is where Chiang Kai-shek comes back into the picture. He is past master in playing the old game of Chinese politics. Furthermore, only his name is known to every Chinese peasant and coolie and can become the symbol of an alternative to Communist rule.

While we were doing nothing, there was little hope for a split in Communist ranks. The war may produce it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Finally, Mr. President, I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks an editorial which appeared in the same issue of the same magazine over the signature of Mr. Keep, the publisher, entitled "Let Us Do Our Stern Duty."

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

LET US DO OUR STERN DUTY

The raw intervention of Red China in the Korean War is the final proof that the Communist regimes of Russia and China are twins in evil and barbarism. Hard-minded people have never doubted it, but wishful thinkers among our socialistic do-gooders, scholars, and diplomats have clung desperately to the illusion that somehow the Chinese Reds were different and somehow might be appeased.

The British Socialists and Pandit Nehru, of India, have been as unrealistic as has Mr. Acheson. Now it is time for Mr. Acheson, Professor Jessup, John Carter Vincent, Dean Rusk, and other soft thinkers to resign from our State Department. This coterie of bad guessers has completely lost the confidence of the people.

Surely President Truman must know this. No considerations of pride, politics, or personal friendship can possibly justify his continuing to entrust the future of mankind to these discredited men. The President, like everyone else, must now do his stern duty. He will have Americans of both parties with him when he does.

There are only two things, it seems to us, that can prevent world war III and, if it comes, save Asia and the entire world from communism: (1) American willingness to fight as we were willing to fight after Pearl Harbor; (2) our realistic readiness to use every available ally, whether we like him or not, including, immediately, Chiang Kai-shek and his reformed and powerful Formosan Army and the hordes of disaffected Chinese guerrillas on the mainland.

We may very well be able to upset the Chinese Communist government without a general war, if we play our cards boldly and coldly before effective internal opposition is smothered. We have no intention of invading China, of course.

But Chiang must be released, as Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND so wisely states, from his commitment not to raid the mainland of China, and we must immediately authorize our airmen to bomb the Manchurian airfields and centers from which the Chinese Reds are dispatched and supplied.

England 10 short years ago saved civilization from Hitlerism until help arrived. With infinitely greater resources the United States can save itself and the world from communism. There are enormous factors in our favor.

The Communist regimes are founded on fear, fanaticism, hate, and incredible cruelty. These regimes by now are as abhorrent to millions of Russians and Chinese as they are to us. There are already powerful undergrounds in both Russia and China, not to mention the shaky satellite nations. Millions of Communist troops are "undependable" and vast will be the sabotage and quick surrenders once the issue is fully joined.

We are fighting for our lives and for all freedom-loving people. We cannot afford to be too squeamish as to the means or the allies we employ against an absolutely ruthless enemy. This is the test of western civilization; can it again master a bold and savage tyranny?

Fortnight believes that in the interest of possible peace and—falling that—ultimate victory:

1. We must ask the UN bluntly to accuse Red China of outright aggression and deny her UN recognition.

2. We must maintain and strengthen our armies in Korea and keep this beachhead in Asia at all costs.

3. We must aid Chiang's Formosan army and his mainland guerrillas and saboteurs in every possible hard-boiled way.

4. We must first threaten to bomb Manchurian military objectives unless the Chinese Reds withdraw promptly from Korea, following through if they defy us.

5. We must, as Senator KNOWLAND says, arm the western Germans, the Japanese, and the Spaniards against the Russian threat.

6. We must put the Harry Bridges and the Hugh Brysons out of action, for their efforts to create unrest are intolerable at a time like this.

7. We must purge our Government of all suspected traitors whether proof sufficient for actual prosecution can be adduced or not. It is no part of anyone's civil rights to work for the United States Government.

8. We must draft more young men, after giving the harder of them a chance to volunteer for hand-picked combat units which we now so sadly lack. We must call up more reserves and additional National Guard outfits. We must, unfortunately, get back to a war footing as rapidly as possible.

And we must keep our heads, embark on no witch hunts, persecute no groups. We must accustom ourselves to doing the hard thing rather than the soft and we must believe in Almighty God and the justice of our cause. Then, deserving leadership, we will surely find the entire civilized and semi-civilized world following our lead. In due time the top-heavy structure of world communism will fall in ruins as the result of our pressure against it and its own evil weakness.

O. D. KEEP,
Publisher.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, December 22, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 21 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

DIRECTOR FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS
Thomas D. Cabot, of Massachusetts, to be Director for International Security Affairs.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

John Patrick Hartigan, of Rhode Island, to be United States circuit judge, first circuit, vice John C. Mahoney, retired.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Edward L. Leahy, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge for the district of Rhode Island, vice John Patrick Hartigan, elevated.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Dalton T. Pierson, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana, vice John B. Tansil, deceased.

Arthur A. Maguire, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Pennsylvania. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired August 7, 1950.

Powless W. Lanier, of North Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of North Dakota. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 4, 1950.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 21 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Anna M. Rosenberg, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Stephen J. Spingarn, of New York, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1946.

DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

John W. Gibson, of Michigan, to be a member of the Displaced Persons Commission.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Homer N. Wallin, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

Rear Adm. Malcolm F. Schoeffel, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Rear Adm. Albert G. Noble, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief of Naval Material in the Department of the Navy.

IN THE ARMY

COMMANDING GENERAL, SEVENTH ARMY

Lt. Gen. Manton Sprague Eddy, (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Seventh Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as a lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Albert Cowper Smith, (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Seventh Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as a lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

George Bittmann Barth, (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Seventh Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as a lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Ira Platt Swift, (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Seventh Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as a lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

Albert Pierson, (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Seventh Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as a lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Orlando Clarendon Mood, (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Seventh Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as a lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Maxwell Gordon Keeler, (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Seventh Army, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as a lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointments to the positions indicated under the provisions of sections 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Nathan Farragut Twining, (major general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with rank of general, with date of rank from October 10, 1950.

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad, (major general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be commander in chief, United States Air Forces in Europe, with rank of lieutenant general, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

Lt. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards, (major general, U. S. Air Force), Air Force of the United States, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations, Headquarters, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant

general, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the United States Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-first Congress, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947) and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be major, USAF (medical)

Morris F. Wiener, (major, USAF, Medical Corps), for appointment as major, USAF, Medical Corps, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

To be captains, USAF (medical)

Frank J. DiTraglia, (captain, USAF, Medical Corps), for appointment as captain, USAF, Medical Corps, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

To be captains, USAF (dental)

Frank H. Ketcham, (captain, USAF, Dental Corps), for appointment as captain, USAF, Dental Corps, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical)

James B. Anderson, (first lieutenant, USAF, Medical Corps), for appointment as first lieutenant, USAF, Medical Corps, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (dental)

John R. Ashton, (first lieutenant, USAF, Dental Corps), for appointment as first lieutenant, USAF, Dental Corps, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets, who were appointed in the United States Air Force under recess-appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eighty-first Congress, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

James F. Bahl, (second lieutenant, USAF, Medical Corps), for appointment as second lieutenant, USAF, Medical Corps, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Air Force, in the grades indicated with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and title II, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947):

To be majors, USAF (Medical)

Benjamin H. Inloes, Jr., (major, USAF, Medical Corps), for appointment as major, USAF, Medical Corps, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Robert L. Forrest, (captain, USAF, Medical Corps), for appointment as captain, USAF, Medical Corps, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Alexander G. Klier, (captain, USAF, Dental Corps), for appointment as captain, USAF, Dental Corps, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Frederick G. Collins, (first lieutenant, USAF, Medical Corps), for appointment as first lieutenant, USAF, Medical Corps, with date of rank from October 1, 1947.

Robert A. Matuska, [REDACTED]
Theodore E. Patrick.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

William P. Dohoney, [REDACTED]
David R. Jordan, [REDACTED]
John F. Mack, [REDACTED]
Robert J. Morrison, [REDACTED]
Ensle I. Schlib, Jr., [REDACTED]
George B. Shrewsbury, [REDACTED]
William W. Steiner, [REDACTED]

Subject to physical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following-named distinguished military students of the Senior Division, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

Theodore W. Alexander	Albert W. Madigan
Donald E. Bodie	William M. Menco
[REDACTED]	Kenneth E. Murley
[REDACTED]	Guy D. Perham
Moses R. Box	James L. Pyle
[REDACTED]	Mose F. Ramsey, Jr.
Charles P. Caruso	William A. Robertson, Jr.
Guy C. Cisco, Jr.	Orville H. Schwanger, Jr.
Kenneth H. Coffee	Charles S. Hoke
Marvin H. Franzen	Rolf S. Scovell
Milton D. Hill	John H. Stotts
Charles S. Hoke	John W. Innis
Eugene E. Holmen	Edgar Udine
John W. Innis	David A. Vardaman
Grant W. Johnson	
Bernard C. Lorenz	

The following-named distinguished aviation cadets for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be second lieutenants

Robert B. Bigelow.
George R. Cox, [REDACTED]

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Warren Rice Carter, [REDACTED]
Emery Scott Wetzel, [REDACTED]
John Alexander Samford, [REDACTED]
Robert Kinder Taylor, [REDACTED]
John Paul McConnell, [REDACTED]

To be brigadier generals

John Stewart Mills, [REDACTED]
Edwin Minor Day, [REDACTED]
William Preston Nuckols, [REDACTED]
Joseph Harold Hicks, [REDACTED]
Herbert Miller Kidner, [REDACTED]
Monroe MacCloskey, [REDACTED]
Frederic Ernst Glantzberg, [REDACTED]
Dudley Durward Hale, [REDACTED]
Marshall Stanley Roth, [REDACTED]
Donald John Keirn, [REDACTED]
Pearl Harvey Robey, [REDACTED]
John Walker Sessums, Jr., [REDACTED]
Roy Henry Lynn, [REDACTED]
William John Clinch, [REDACTED]
Thetus Cayce Odum, [REDACTED]
Morris John Lee, [REDACTED]
Jacob Edward Smart, [REDACTED]
Hunter Harris, Jr., [REDACTED]
Leigh Wade, [REDACTED]
Gabriel Poillon Disosway, [REDACTED]
Charles Raeburne Landon, [REDACTED]
Charles John Bondley, Jr., [REDACTED]
James Clyde Selser, Jr., [REDACTED]
Frederick Jensen Dau, [REDACTED]

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Lynde D. McCormick, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of an admiral while serving as Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral:

Rear admirals, line

Wallace R. Dowd	Walter E. Moore
Hugh E. Haven	Burton B. Biggs
Calvin M. Bolster	Lyman A. Thackrey
Ralph E. McShane	Grover B. H. Hall
John P. Womble, Jr.	Lorenzo S. Sabin, Jr.
Byron H. Hanlon	Walter G. Schindler
Robert F. Hickey	George L. Russell
Ruthven E. Libby	Milton E. Miles
Thomas H. Binford	William S. Parsons

Rear admirals, Medical Corps

Bertran Groesbeck, Jr. Carl A. Broadus
Herbert L. Pugh Joseph B. Logue

Rear admiral, Supply Corps

Charles L. Austin

Rear admiral, Dental Corps

Daniel W. Ryan

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

Allen E. Alman	Edwin A. McLean
Jack H. Anderson	Bruce R. McCullough
Robert T. Billington	Charles D. Mendenhall
Robert W. Blodgett	Russell H. Miles, Jr.
Robert L. Boonstra	Albert C. Mitchell
Daniel M. Branigan	James W. Murray
Frank S. Dennis	Loren A. Norden
Gerald W. Fauth, Jr.	Maurice T. Ross
Kenneth Fox	Harry M. Sumner
Robert N. Gray	Russell W. VanDore
Arthur S. Grenell	Jr.
William A. Henshaw	Leonard T. Weinstein
Albert M. Hunt	Clinton C. Williams
Donald L. Keach	
Lawrence C. Lander	

III

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 5th day of June 1951:

Richard G. Gresla	Floyd O. Stroup
William S. Gripman	
Duane C. Nuechterlein	

The following-named women (civilian-college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Nancy J. Arditt	Lorraine Kraff
Margaret L. Bristol	Mary L. McCarty
Elizabeth E. Bryan	Fran McKee
Allyne Burns	Patricia E. J. Moore
Margaret Caldwell	Norma F. Parlin
Marian A. Campbell	Mary C. Pettit
Dorothy I. Clark	Catherine L. Rutherford
Dorothy J. Cralle	Mary F. Saunders
Gladys D. Duffy	Anne P. Smith
Marie K. Elsen	Margaret N. Spangler
Lauraine A. Freethy	Mary E. Sturges
Norma J. Gray	Faith E. Walters
Betty J. Grimes	Mary E. Wood
Dolores L. Hanan	
Betty L. Harrah	

Mary S. Read, woman (civilian-college graduate), to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy.

The nominations of Joe L. Akagi et al. for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on December 8, 1950, and appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Joe L. Akagi and ending with the name of Ruth E. Kennedy, which appear on page 16359.

The nominations of Theodore H. Armstrong et al. for temporary appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on December 8, 1950, appear in the congressional proceedings of the Senate for that date, under the caption, "Nominations," beginning with the name of Theodore H. Armstrong and ending with the name of Jacob Siegel, which appear on page 16407.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Gerald C. Thomas	Edward A. Craig
Henry D. Linscott	Christian F. Schilt

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James P. Riseley	William J. Scheyer
Gregon A. Williams	Albert D. Cooley
Frank H. Lamson-Scribner	Lewis B. Puller
	Robert O. Bare

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

James H. Wilbanks, Fyffe.
Festus T. Bryan, Glenwood.
Billye S. McElroy, Livingston.
James E. Nettles, Jr., Repton.
Stephen H. Greene, Troy.

ALASKA

Norma A. Anderson, Craig.
Nancy E. Parker, Spenard.

ARKANSAS

Cecil Charles Walker, Eureka Springs.

CONNECTICUT

Jerry C. Cotrone, Old Greenwich.
Michael L. White, South Woodstock.

DELAWARE

Francis Allyn Cooch, Jr., Newark.

FLORIDA

Jackson F. Ritch, DeLeon Springs.
John Kenneth Rogers, Naples.
Lucius A. Bryant, Orlando.
Edward F. Thrasher, Seffner.

GEORGIA

Henry Ward Beecher Collins, Collins.
Dorothy K. Moxley, Wadley.

HAWAII

Lei Pansy Pickard, Hauula.

IDAHO

Bennie D. Harmon, Dubois.
Jimmy H. Christopherson, Hazelton.
Archie E. McKinley, Kellogg.
Willis J. Lyman, Rexburg.

ILLINOIS

James H. Sneed, Creal Springs.
John A. Weber, Lostant.
Roy H. Dawkins, Jr., Louisville.
Lowell L. Taylor, Metropolis.
Frances H. Pembroke, Monticello.
Curtis C. Lake, Niantic.
Arthur L. Koetting, Jr., Okawville.
Harry C. Shaw, Palestine.
Mary M. Hackett, Polo.
Everett C. Leeper, Rockport.
Frederick A. Dreyer, Steeleville.
Armando R. Napoli, Steger.
Florence M. Binkley, Warrensburg.
Everett W. Patterson, Watseka.
Willard W. Cain, Woodhull.
Claude E. Wedel, Worden.

INDIANA

Ralph L. Combs, Cedar Lake.
Walter B. Popejoy, Delphi.
Leonard Y. Cripe, Goschen.
Clyde V. Wolford, Newberry.
Otho F. Wilson, Paoli.

IOWA

Loyd D. Webb, Alta Vista.
Gordon F. Williamson, Battle Creek.
Raymond A. Veale, Boone.
Elbie R. Petro, Cedar Rapids.
Raymond C. Formanek, Chelsea.
Gorman B. Howell, Clarinda.
Earl E. Gaule, Clearfield.
Leo J. Miller, Denison.
Reginald T. Naae, Graettinger.
Paul F. Goergen, Granville.
Richard D. McCarty, Hartley.
Walter E. Dietsch, Hills.

Edward C. Fritsche, Homestead.
Jerome E. Whalen, Jefferson.
Arlie V. Otto, Johnston.
Lloyd M. Crumly, Letts.
Harlan W. Cohrs, Lewis.
Paul J. Vollmer, Manning.
Henry C. Pendergraft, Mason City.
Doris B. Kimzey, Milo.
Robert E. Allmon, Missouri Valley.
Mark H. Booth, Montour.
John L. Weno, North Liberty.
Elder O. Bottolfson, Northwood.
Mary A. Boldra, Randolph.
Harold A. Berg, Ruthven.
Robert J. Balik, Spillville.
Gerald J. Svacina, Tama.
Berle G. Keck, Washta.
Matthew J. Blong, Waucoma.

KENTUCKY

Parker D. Moore, Bardwell.
Donald McDonald, Hardyville.

LOUISIANA

Dan W. Graves, Bogalusa.
Loy R. Gaar, Dodson.
Arthur H. Prevey, Elizabeth.
Etna C. Ducote, Hackberry.
Thomas F. Mahafey, Jennings.
Clifford Duplechin, Mamou.
Tilon M. O'Bier, Shongaloo.

MAINE

John A. Merriman, Sedgwick.

MINNESOTA

John O. Parklow, Kasota.
Fritz R. Greenfield, Pease.
Leslie J. Henderson, Roosevelt.

MISSISSIPPI

Ruth Seale, Lyon.
Mary Bell Smith, Midnight.
Jimmy Griffith, Sunflower.

MISSOURI

Charles E. Jones, Rolla.

NEBRASKA

Chester A. Koza, Clarkson.
Burton E. McKee, Lyman.
Dean J. Ehle, Ponca.

NEW JERSEY

Frank A. Brown, Arlington.
Gladys A. Rysinski, Cliffwood Beach.
Dorothy B. Jahn, Mantoloking.
Edna M. Thompson, Mickleton.
Edward J. Brennan, Ocean Gate.
Francis E. Davenport, Pitman.
Harry F. Kolbert, Skillman.
Florence V. Romeo, Stirling.
John F. Carroll, Teaneck.
Joseph S. Chamberlain, Titusville.

NEW YORK

Harold James Hyland, Arcade.
George A. Christensen, Clymer.
Abraham Finkle, Far Rockaway.
Michael S. Valvo, Forestville.
Marjorie H. Schneider, Islip.
Jesse J. Bridge, McCison.
Horace V. Orton, Wingdale.

NORTH CAROLINA

Emmett Robinson Wooten, Kinston.
Willie H. Smith, Rocky Mount.
James P. McPherson, Snow Camp.
Kent Haynes, State Road.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mary S. Tomlinson, Benedict.

OHIO

Gwendolyn M. Flack, Bettsville.
Jacob Benjamin Romine, Gallon.
Dennis E. Hurst, Marietta.
Fred A. Luhnnow, North Madison.
Florence V. Needler, Poland.
Verdi C. Von Thron, Port Clinton.

OKLAHOMA

Paul Hampton, Hinton.
Elsie V. Fulfs, Randlett.

OREGON

Donald B. Estes, Coquille.
Elva G. Varnum, Crater Lake.

PENNSYLVANIA

William L. Bedsworth, Belle Vernon.
Elizabeth S. Whitesell, Washington Crossing.

Samuel R. Klinger, Wiconisco.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sam W. Lytchfield, Jr., Bonneau.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Marion E. Peterson, Arlington.
LaVerna L. Marshall, Draper.
James W. Sweaney, Sturgis.

TENNESSEE

Andrew J. Frazier, Bon Aqua.
Ted L. Rozell, Chapel Hill.
Charles H. Settle, Gainesboro.
Vesta C. Locke, Mount Juliet.
Charles R. Byrn, Murfreesboro.
James A. Britton, Whitesburg.

TEXAS

Ethan L. Upshaw, Belton.
Claude B. Lynch, Jr., Como.
Arlon T. Carroll, Crane.
Joe B. Chastain, Emory.
Clarence R. Wiley, Fort Stockton.
Roland A. Johnson, McCamey.
Thomas J. Agnor, Marshall.
Bonnie F. Goldsmith, Needville.

UTAH

Alva G. Boman, Lewiston.
Arvin L. Bellon, Roosevelt.
Franklin G. Slaugh, Vernal.

VERMONT

Fredric L. Pierce, Barnet.
Frederick L. Kemp, Craftsbury.
John P. Dudley, East Montpelier.
Reginald F. Pelow, Lyndon.

VIRGINIA

Charles F. Shuler, Elkton.
Hicklen B. Quillen, Jr., Gate City.
Charles T. Braswell, Norton.
Howard S. Myers, Virginia Beach.
Moffett E. Bibb, Jr., Weyers Cave.
Samuel H. Hale, Wise.
Mayo H. Worrell, Zuni.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles W. Maloney, Bradshaw.
Elizabeth D. Burch, Smithers.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1950

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp,
D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou blessed and eternal God, we
thank Thee for the high and holy privi-
lege of coming unto Thee through the
old and familiar way of prayer.

Grant that in these perilous times we
may not rely only upon the might and
power of material resources, but may we
seek to develop strength of spirit and
faith with which we shall be prepared
and able to cope with anything that the
future may hold for us of suffering and
sacrifice.

We are confident that no enemy from
the outside can ever conquer us and that
if defeat should overtake us it would be
because of our inner failures and the
spiritual weakness of our hearts.

Inspire us to cultivate the habit of
daily prayer for we have the testimony of

experience that if we pray in ordinary
days we shall know how to pray with con-
quering power when we are beset by
trials and tribulations, by moods of
cowardice and fear, and by despondency
and despair.

In Christ's name we bring our peti-
tions. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yes-
terday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr.
Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that
the Senate had passed, with amendments
in which the concurrence of the House
is requested, a bill of the House of the
following title:

H. R. 9827. An act to provide revenue by
imposing a corporate excess-profits tax, and
for other purposes.

The message also announced that the
Senate insists upon its amendments to
the foregoing bill, requests a conference
with the House on the disagreeing votes
of the two Houses thereon, and appoints
Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD,
Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT to be the
conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXCESS-PROFITS-TAX ACT OF 1950

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent to take from the
Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9827) to
provide revenue by imposing a corporate
excess-profits tax, and for other pur-
poses, with Senate amendments thereto,
disagree to the Senate amendments, and
agree to the conference requested by the
Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to
the request of the gentleman from North
Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair
hears none, and appoints the following
conferees: Messrs. DOUGHTON, COOPER,
DINGELL, MILLS, REED of New York,
WOODBUFF, and SIMPSON of Pennsylvania.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum
is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the fol-
lowing Members failed to answer to their
names:

[Roll No. 299]

Abernethy	Cannon	Elston
Allen, Ill.	Case, S. Dak.	Engel, Mich.
Allen, La.	Cavalcante	Engle, Calif.
Anderson, Calif.	Chatham	Fellows
Andrews	Chesney	Fisher
Angell	Christopher	Fogarty
Barden	Cole, Kans.	Gamble
Baring	Colmer	Gary
Barrett, Wyo.	Combs	Gathings
Bates, Ky.	Cotton	Gavin
Battle	Coudert	George
Bennett, Mich.	Crook	Gillette
Blackney	Crosser	Goodwin
Boggs, La.	Davenport	Gordon
Bonner	Davies, N. Y.	Gorski
Boykin	Davis, Ga.	Graham
Brehm	Dawson	Gregory
Brooks	Denton	Gross
Buchanan	D'Ewart	Guill
Buckley, Ill.	Dondero	Hagen
Buckley, N. Y.	Doyle	Hall
Burke	Durham	Leonard W.
Burleson	Eaton	Hand

Hare	McDonough	Rogers, Fla.
Harrison	McGrath	Roosevelt
Harvey	McMillan, S. C.	Sabath
Hays, Ark.	McMillen, Ill.	Sadiak
Hays, Ohio	Mack, Ill.	St. George
Hébert	Macy	Saylor
Hedrick	Madden	Scott, Hardie
Heffernan	Mahon	Scudder
Heller	Mansfield	Shafer
Herlong	Marcantonio	Short
Herter	Marshall	Sikes
Hill	Martin, Iowa	Simpson, Ill.
Hobbs	Martin, Mass.	Simpson, Pa.
Hoeven	Mason	Sims
Hoffman, Ill.	Miller, Nebr.	Smathers
Hoffman, Mich.	Morgan	Smith, Kans.
Hollfield	Morrison	Smith, Ohio
Horan	Morton	Smith, Wis.
Huber	Moulder	Stanley
Irving	Murray, Tenn.	Stefan
Jackson, Calif.	Nicholson	Sutton
Jackson, Wash.	Noland	Talle
Jacobs	O'Brien, Ill.	Taylor
James	O'Brien, Mich.	Teague
Jenkins	Pace	Thompson
Jennings	Patman	Thornberry
Johnson	Patterson	Towe
Jonas	Peterson	Underwood
Jones, Mo.	Pfeifer	Vorys
Jones	Joseph L.	Wagner
Hamilton C.	Pfeiffer	Walsh
Karst	William L.	Welch
Kearns	Plumley	Werdel
Kee	Poage	Wheeler
Keefe	Potter	Whitaker
Kennedy	Poulson	White, Calif.
Keogh	Powell	White, Idaho
Kerr	Preston	Whitten
Kilburn	Quinn	Whittington
Kilday	Rabaut	Widnall
Klein	Rains	Willis
Kruse	Redden	Wilson, Ind.
Larcade	Reed, Ill.	Wilson, Tex.
Latham	Regan	Winstead
LeCompte	Rich	Wood
LeFevre	Richards	Woodhouse
Lichtenwalter	Riehlman	Yates
Lodge	Rivers	Zablocki
Lyle	Robeson	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 218 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

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

There was no objection.

H. HALPERN & BRO., INC.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9236) for the relief of H. Halpern & Bro., Inc., of Boston, Mass., with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$3,874.79" and insert "\$661.86."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREST LUMBER CO.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S.

3966) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what this bill is?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co., which, as I understand it, has been cleared with the objectors.

Mr. TABER. How much is involved?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. I cannot say what the terms of the claim may be.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 25, sec. 81) and notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time or any limitation upon the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims with respect to claims upon any contract implied in law, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such court to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co. either against the United States in a fiduciary capacity for the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians or against said Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians in connection with the contract construed by such court in its decision dated January 12, 1938, in the case of Forest Lumber Co., a corporation, against the United States (86 C. Cls. 188).

SEC. 2. The amount of any judgment awarded by the Court of Claims upon such claim shall not exceed the amount of the judgment heretofore awarded by such court in the case of Forest Lumber Co., a corporation, against the United States (86 C. Cls. 188, 225).

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted by or on behalf of the Forest Lumber Co. at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code, and the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians shall be entitled to be represented in such proceedings, if they so desire, by legal counsel employed in conformity with the provisions of section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (25 U. S. C. 81). In the trial of any such suit the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any defenses available under the rules of law and equity applicable to contracts made by the United States, defenses of waiver or estoppel based on the course of dealing between the parties, and defenses based on mistake of law or fact, including any failure to collect sums payable under the contract involved in such suit by reason of mistake of law or fact, and shall determine the liability, if any, of the parties defendant as the facts and law require. Parol evidence shall be admissible for the purposes of proving or disproving such defenses notwithstanding any limitation upon the admissibility of parol evidence in suits involving contracts in writing. Any set-off, counterclaim, claim for damages, or other demand set up on the part of any de-

fendant shall be heard and determined by the court in accordance with the provisions of section 2508 of title 28 of the United States Code.

SEC. 4. Any part of any judgment rendered hereunder which represents sums actually deposited to the credit of said Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians for timber cut from tribal lands shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury, upon appropriation by the Congress, from any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said tribe. Any other part of any judgment rendered shall be payable in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

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

ALGOMA LUMBER CO.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3967) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this bill is?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill similar to the one just passed giving jurisdiction to the Court of Claims and also cleared by the objectors.

Mr. TABER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 25, sec. 81) and notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time or any limitation upon the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims with respect to claims upon any contract implied in law, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon such court to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. (including the claim of George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust, successors by transfer, conveyance, and assignment thereof) either against the United States in a fiduciary capacity for the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians or against said Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians in connection with the contract construed by such court in its decision dated January 12, 1938, in the case of Algoma Lumber Co., a corporation, against the United States (86 C. Cls. 226).

SEC. 2. The amount of any judgment awarded by the Court of Claims upon such claim shall not exceed the amount of the judgment heretofore awarded by such court

in the case of Algoma Lumber Co., a corporation, against the United States (86 C. Cls. 226, 271).

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted by or on behalf of the Algoma Lumber Co. or by the said trustees as successors in interest thereto at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code, and the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians shall be entitled to be represented in such proceedings, if they so desire, by legal counsel employed in conformity with the provisions of section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (25 U. S. C. 81). In the trial of any such suit the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any defenses available under the rules of law and equity applicable to contracts made by the United States, defenses of waiver or estoppel based on the course of dealing between the parties, and defenses based on mistake of law or fact, including any failure to collect sums payable under the contract involved in such suit by reason of mistake of law or fact, and shall determine the liability, if any, of the parties defendant as the facts and law require. Parol evidence shall be admissible for the purposes of proving or disproving such defenses notwithstanding any limitation upon the admissibility of parol evidence in suits involving contracts in writing. Any set-off, counterclaim, claim for damages, or other demand set up on the part of any defendant shall be heard and determined by the court in accordance with the provisions of section 2508 of title 28 of the United States Code.

SEC. 4. Any part of any judgment rendered hereunder which represents sums actually deposited to the credit of said Klamath and Modoc Tribes and Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians for timber cut from tribal lands shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury, upon appropriation by the Congress, from any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of said tribe. Any other part of any judgment rendered shall be payable in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code.

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

E. J. ALBRECHT CO.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 752) for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. This particular bill, Mr. Speaker, has been objected to by the objectors. I simply call it up to indicate that I would call it up and expected, of course, an objection from the objectors.

Mr. TABER. What does the bill do?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. This bill came from the Senate; I believe it is Senator Lucas' bill. It was passed by our Claims Committee, and the objectors have objected to it.

Mr. TABER. I think under those circumstances I shall object, Mr. Speaker.

RICHARD H. BUSH

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3260) for the relief of Richard H. Bush.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain that bill?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. This is a bill which has been reduced in the amount of some three-hundred-odd dollars, and it is not objected to by the objectors.

Mr. TABER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any salary payments made by any disbursing officer of the United States Army to Richard H. Bush (Army serial No. RA 6955646) for the period from January 21, 1946, to May 16, 1947, for which the said Richard H. Bush was retroactively rated and paid as a technical sergeant, shall be held valid and lawful.

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

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3945) to amend sections 3052 and 3107 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the powers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. This particular bill will grant to the Director, Associate Director, Assistant to the Director, Assistant Directors, inspectors, and agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice the right to carry firearms, serve warrants and subpoenas issued under the authority of the United States and make arrests without warrant for any offense against the United States; in other words, this bill will correct the situation that was brought about by the arrest of the Coplon woman and upon which arrest the verdict against her was reversed by the circuit court of appeals in New York recently.

Mr. TABER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3052 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Director, Associate Director, Assistant to the Director, Assistant Directors, inspectors, and agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice may carry firearms, serve warrants and subpoenas issued under the authority of the United States and make arrests without warrant for any offense against the United States committed in their presence, or for any felony cognizable under the laws of the United States if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such felony."

SEC. 2. Section 3107 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Director, Associate Director, Assistant to the Director, Assistant Directors, agents, and inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice are empowered to make seizures under warrant for violation of the laws of the United States."

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

House Resolution 888 was laid on the table.

GEORGE O. DRUCKER AND OTHERS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2460) for the relief of George O. Drucker, Livia Drucker, and their minor daughter, Gloria Elizabeth Drucker.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. WALTER. This bill and 11 similar bills, all Senate bills, have been passed by the Senate. Our committee has reported them unanimously. They are all private immigration bills.

Mr. TABER. Have they been cleared by the objectors?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; they were cleared by the objectors.

Mr. TABER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, George O. Drucker, Livia Drucker, and their minor daughter, Gloria Elizabeth Drucker, who entered the United States on transit visas, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 14, 1949, the date on which they entered the United States, upon payment of the required head taxes and visa fees.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Czechoslovakia.

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

FRANCES ETHEL BEDDINGTON

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2888) for the relief of Frances Ethel Beddington. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Frances Ethel Beddington as of December 16, 1945, the date she was admitted temporarily to the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

GIUSEPPE MERLINET FORGNONE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2981) for the relief of Giuseppe Merlinet Forgnone. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Giuseppe Merlinet Forgnone, who was admitted into the United States on February 7, 1949, on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Italy.

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

BERNIECE JOSEPHINE LAZAGA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3044) for the relief of Berniece Josephine Lazaga. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Berniece Josephine Lazaga, Berkeley, Calif., who entered the United States on March 12, 1948, at San Francisco, Calif., as a nonquota immigrant student, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State

shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Philippine Islands for the first year such quota is available.

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

DR. LUTFU LAHUT UZMAN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3125) for the relief of Dr. Lutfu Lahut Uzman. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Dr. Lutfu Lahut Uzman, of Cambridge, Mass., who was admitted into the United States on a student visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Turkey.

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

GEORGE BRANDER PALOHEIMO AND EVA LEONORA PALOHEIMO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3241) for the relief of George Brander Paloheimo and Eva Leonora Paloheimo. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, George Brander Paloheimo and Eva Leonora Paloheimo, natives of Finland, shall be considered the natural-born alien children of their adopted parents, Mr. and Mrs. Y. A. Paloheimo, citizens of the United States.

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

ETHELYN ISOBEL CHENALLOY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3259) for the relief of Ethelyn Isobel Chenalloy. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Ethelyn Isobel Chenalloy, of Los Angeles, Calif., who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United

States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Chinese immigration quota.

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

WILLARD SIDMER RUTTAN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3261) for the relief of Willard Sidmer Ruttan. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence and relating to admissions at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (39 Stat. 875), as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (e)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony, or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude shall not hereafter be held to apply to Willard Sidmer Ruttan.

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

ARMANDO SANTINI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 3378) for the relief of Armando Santini, and ask for its immediate consideration. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Armando Santini shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of July 12, 1948, the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Italy.

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

JOSE MANZANO SOMERA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 3554) for the relief of Jose Manzano Somera, and ask for its immediate consideration. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Jose Manzano Somera, temporarily residing in Chicago, Ill., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the appropriate immigration quota for the first year such quota is available.

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

LINDA LEO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 3699) for the relief of Linda Leo, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Linda Leo, the minor child of Yee Leo, a citizen of the United States, shall be deemed to be eligible for admission into the United States under the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

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

FAVORING SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

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

Abraham, Abraham, Veronika, or Veronica Abraham.

Abreu y Alvarez, Ricardo, or Richard Abreu.

Abstender, Liza (nee Liza Markowicz).

Ali, Asod, or Ali Asod Ullah or Asodeoolla Ashruffoolla.

Alinosi, Lottie Bernice (nee Dean).

Alma, Helen (nee Stedman Kinter or Alma S. Kinter or Alma Stedman Kinter).

Altamura, Pasquale.
Alter Salomon Sloima.
Alvarez, Justina Martin.
Amat, Kasmoin, or Kasmoin

Bin Amat.

Arce, Socorro Labrado Ylanan, or Socorro Labrado Rodrigues (maiden name), formerly Socorro Labrado Ylanan alias Mrs. Joe Manila.

Arcellana, Juan Aquino.

Arnold, Gustavus or Gus Arnold.
Arron, Barbara, or Sydney Barbara Arron or Barbara Lewis.

Ashton, Sarah Ellen, or Sarah Ellen Lewis (nee Muskett).

Asrlant, Willy, or Wolka Asrlant or Zev Wolf.

Auriammo, Elsie.

Avvantaggio, Frank, or Frank

Conti.

Bagues, Salvador, or Ruben Mar-rufo or Salvador Bagues-Villanueva.

Bahler, Karl F., or Karl Friedrich Bahler or Karl Bahler.

Basalo-Sosa, Carmen Teresa.

Bautista, Adalia Marquez de.

Benintende, Francesco, or Frank Benintende.

Berken, Regina Jean Matyas.

Bijjani, George Yousuf.

Birznier, Lina Margareta.

Blount, Richard Keith.

Blumberg, Barney Masei, or Bo-roch Blumberg.

Boeschling, Henry Frederick Wilhelm.

Bohn, Odette (nee De Rich or Rich).

Bonacasa, Liborio, or Benny Bonacasa or Bonacasa Liborio.

Bongini, Christino, or Christino Bongini.

Boutillier, Verner Trinimon, or Fred Gavin.

Bovoletis, Peter Considine.

Brega, Ernesto.

Brown, Basilette Argendeli (nee Argendeli).

Brown, Percy Flint.

Brown, Vernal Albert.

Bruck, Lila, or Hedwig Drdlik or Hedwig Bruck.

Bulleri, Dora Luigiana.

Burack, Sam.

Cardoza, Joao Ferreira, or John F. Cardoza.

Carlson, Berna Birgit Allrum.

Carroll, Louis Lawrence, or Louis Carroll.

Carty, Peter Silven.

Casals, Domingo, or Domingo Cassis y Costa.

Chaltas, Aristeia Constantinou Katraouzou, or Aristeia Constantinou Katraouzou.

Chan, William Hee, or Gik Hee Chan.

Chan, Linda Siu King, or Chum Shao King.

Charleson, Frank Langeller.

Chiang, Chien Yin, or Chien Chick Yin.

Yink, Chiang Chu Sheng (nee Chu Sheng Ying).

Chikhmatoff, Olga Chirinsky, or Olga Shirinsky Shikhmatoff (nee Korff).

Clewis, Raimer Herman, or Raimer Herman Clewis (formerly Raimer Herman Saladin or Raimer Herman Saladin).

Cohen, Albert Kibrit, or Alberto Cohen Kibrit or Albert Cohen.

Constantios, Philippos Nikolas, or Philip Constantios.

Costa, Amedeo Giovanni, or Amedeo G. Costa.

Damhus, Ejnar Jensen, or Edward or Eddy Damhus.

Dapas, Pietro, or Peter Dapas.

De Acosta, Petronila Machuca.

De Barrios, America Cabrera.

Barrios Y Cabrera, Jesus.

De Escobedo, Consuelo Gomez-Alonzo, or Rafaela Lopez.

De Ferrari, Felicina Gallo (nee Felicina Serafina Gallo).

De Grimwood, Laura Antonia Padilla.

Delikat, Lottie Margaret.

Dennis, Edward Victor, or Edward Victor Brown.

Diamantis, Stavros Spyridon.

Di Carlo, Calogero, or Calogero Lello Di Carlo.

Doorly, Joseph, or Joseph Dorley.

Doring, Uwe Franz.

Dumkolis, Trifo Alexander, or Trifo Alexander Dumkoloff or Trifo Alex Dumkeles.

Eastman, Elsa Oria (formerly Elsa Oria Garchitorenna, nee Elsa Erinko Oria).

Elefant, Clara, or Elder, nee Lakatos.

Enomoto, Mihacri or Jack.

Entralgo, Luis Estella.

Esop, Edward.

Esposito, Lucien Nicolas.

Essoglou, Panteleimon Elle.

Estaque, Jeanne (nee Seitelsohn).

Faustino, Iluminador Flores.

Femino, Marina Domenica Grace (formerly Hislop).

Fieldhouse, Roger Hyde.

Figueiras, Jose Gallardo, or Jose Gallardo.

Flanagan, Johanna Adriana.

Fogel, Morris, or Moische Fogel.

Forcke, Nadine Elwin.

Forcke, Eddie Wallace.

Fournaris, Constantinos Georgios, or Constantinos Fournaris or Gus Fournaris or Kostas Fournaris.

Franklin, Gudrun, or Gudrun Bruinsma.

Friedman, Fanny or Kalmar.

Fu, Huang, or Wong Fook or Wong Fook Nygoon or Wong Fook Yuen or Wong Chun Go.

Galati, Salvatore.

Galati, Maria Antico.

Gampe, Roland Pierre Lucien, or Roland P. Gampe.

Garden, Janet Miller, or Jean Whatling.

Gernaey, Marie Madeline (nee Kemmer, or Marie Madeline Jablonski).

Godley, Percival Francis, or Francis Percival Godley.

Godley, Doris (nee Eldred).

Goldstein, Rubin, or Riven Goldstein.

Goldstein, Sol.

Grille, Paul Jacques.

Gronek, Helena, or Helen Gronek.

Grun, Elza, or Elise Welsz, or Elzi or Eliz or Elsa.

Gubel, Josef.

Guerrero, Bozena Tomankova (nee Bozena Tomankova).

Gum, Mim, or Min Gum.

Guthrie, James.

Gutierrez, Dolores, or Dolores Arroyo.

Gutierrez, Guadalupe (alias Guadalupe Arroyo).

Hagymasi, Terez, or Terez Massey.

Hallas, Dionisios or Georgadidgh.

Hand, Monique Yvonne (nee Placide).

Handell, Vitali, and Victor Handell.

Hardy, Cornelia Agatha.

Haritopoulos, Elias Theodore (alias Elias Charitopoulos alias Louis Haritopoulos).

Hartmann, Barbara (nee Hess).

Hastings, John.

Hayes, James Victor.

Heinz, Joseph Karl.
Hendrickson, Agda Jakobina, formerly Ruutikainen (nee Meriruusu).
Holen, Jenny Klara (nee Walderhaug).
Hou, Ai Ying, or Mah Ah Ying or Wang Ai Ying.
Howe, Maclean Kenneth Daniel (alias Hau Kam Tat or Daat).
Hristostomidis, Hristostomis Yani, or Chris John Hristostomidis.
Hronis, Sophie.
Hsiang, Ping, or Ping Hsian Hsiang or Catherine Hsiang or Bian Hsian Hsiang or Hsiang Bin Hsien.
Huffan, Edwin Eric.
Hum, Lee Shee, or Hum Lee Shee.
Huvas, Laszlo, or Leslie Huvas.
Iacovetta, Osvaldo, or Osvaldo Iacovetta or Osvaldo Iacouetta.
Ibrahim, Mehmet, or Ibrahim Mehmet or Mehmet Ibrahim.
Iversen, Bjorg Wennberg.
Jacks, Edna Eulalia (nee Barkas, or Edna E. Jacks).
James, Poullia or Poullia Cotsifa, maiden name, or Poullia Kotsifa.
Jaresch, Emma Johanna.
Jarosz, Ingelise Solveig (nee Jensen).
Kakowoulis, Nicolis, or Nickolis Kakowoulis.
Kastanos, Antonios Simos.
Kew, Ko, or Kew Ko.
Khourl, Mounira (nee Mounira Abouzeid or Mme. Vve Nagib).
Kiang, Stuart, or Chao-Hai Kiang.
Killian, Jozef.
Kim, June Jha.
Kiu, Kong Yuet, or Cecile Kong or Tong Yuet Kiu.
Klesznicki, Wilhelm August, or Wilhelm Kleznicki or William August Klesznicki or William August Klesznicki.
Knaus, Maxmilian, or Max Knaus.
Knudsen, Soren Anton or Steve Knudsen.
Kurth, Paul Gustav.
Kyriakides, Makrina, or Makrina S. Kyriakides or Makrina Socrates Kyriakides (nee Makrina Kouzoudjacojlu).
Lai, Leung.
Larsen, Christian Peter, or Christian Peter Werdelbon.
Larsen, Dagny Kirstine Johanna Sorensen.
Larsen, Betty Dagny.
Lawver, Maria Tome Da Silva.
Lee, Hung Yuke.
Lekich, John, or John Sam Lekich.
Lemak, Oscar.
Lemak, Zoltan.
Leon, Francisco Ysmael Martinez, or Francisco Martinez.
Lewis, Rosane Maria, or Rosana Maria Mannucci, Rosanna Mannucci.
Lima, Jose Palva, or Jose De Palva Lima.
Lincourt, Linda Margaret, or Linda Margaret Suttter.
Linkous, Gladys Corless (nee Corless).
Loeschnigg, Janet, or Misuet Loeschnigg, or Misuet Loeschnigg.
Loginoff, Natali N.
Lowe, Evelyn Joan (nee Sommerfeld or Summerfield, formerly Rutherford).
Luckiewicz, Joseph Kazimierz.
Luehmann, Alwin Albert Hermann.
Luis, Domingo.
Macpherson, Donald Joseph.
Madore, Rose Marie (nee Cote or Rose Marie Labrie).
Mahlmann, Dirk Robert, or Dirk Robert Vogel or Dirk Robert Hogan.
Majchrzak, Mary.

Manalis, John Ioannis.
Marchetti, Pietro Guido, or Pietro Marchetti or Pete Marchetti or Francisco Genetti.
Mark, See Cheung.
Markiori, Emilio, or Emilio Marchiori or Emilio Marki.
Markoures, Irene Panageotou, or Irini Athanasios Panageotou.
Marlmann, Rainer Wolfgang, or Rainer Wolfgang Hogan.
Marmorstein, Alexander, or Alex M. Stone.
Marwick, Nancy Joy.
Masuko, Sadao.
Matchkaloff, Alexander Serge, or Alexander S. Machavariani or Alexander Sedrakovitch Matchkaloff or Alexander S. Machavarian or Alexander Angelo.
Matthiesen, Heinrich, or Heinrich Walter Matthiesen.
McCombs, Gordon Leslie.
Mckay, Sariphas.
Mehr, Lena Melissa, or Lena Melissa Bates (nee Goodwin).
Menagatos, Soterios Demitriou (alias Sam Poulos).
Mendoza, Jose Leofranco Perez.
Metzger, Henryk.
Meukow, Walter Trendel, or Walter Trendel.
Millios, Argyro, or Argyro Millou (nee Argyro Gouliou).
Mitchell, Irene (nee Tsingheraki).
Mohamed, Niaz.
Montesantos, Eleftherios, or Terry Montesantos.
Moret, Giovanni Battista, or John Moret.
Morrall, Edgar Michael, or William Henry Thomas.
Moss, Joseph.
Moss, Sarah.
Mul, Kan Chi, or Lung Sheung Mul.
Muniz-Gardea, Sotero, or Sotero G. Muniz, or Sotero Soto.
De Muniz, Catalina Gomez.
Mustapa, Margit Hildegard, or Margit Hildegard Jarvinen.
Nacinovich, Frank.
Nevarez, Heriberto, or Heriberto Nevarez Valencia.
Ngon, Jew Yee Sue.
Nicholoff, Karl Christ, or Karl Nicholoff or Kyrillos Bozannis Nicholoff.
Nicolas, Herman Henry or Nicholas.
Nicoletopoulos, Leonidas Diomidis.
Norby, Arnt.
Ohnstein, Martin, or Charles Hagendorf.
Olesen, Marius Imanuel.
Orro, Ano Rosa, or Nina R. Lopez or Maria Teresa Cartaya.
Orsini, Filippo.
Ortiz, Jose, or Joseph Ortiz or Jose Ortiz Camus.
Ortiz, Robert.
Pallaga, Peter.
Palmes, Stanley Gerald.
Paolini, Giuseppini, formerly Giuseppina Milesi (nee Bargellini).
Papadopoulos, Yoannis, or Ioannis Papadopoulos.
Papitzky, Ingeborg Ingrid.
Pascual, Marta Villarin.
Patakli, Viola Klara (nee Lanyi).
Paulsen, Greta Juul.
Paulsen, Einar Juul.
Penalva, Marcel Aime.
Perugini, Pasquale Aniello, or Pasquale Perugini.
Pfeiffer, Richard Ewald.
Pilos, Thalia Kalkandis, or Thalia Kalkandis or Thalis Stavros Pilos or Thalia Stavros Kalkandis.
Pina, Enrique (alias Henry Pina).

Piscope, Domenico.
Pla, Yolande, or Yolande Prato.
Poharnack, Zoltan Imre.
Polzin, Rudolf.
Poppo, Demetrios, or Demilrios Poppo.
Powell, Alwyn Leslie.
Prol, Antonio Alvarez.
Proskouriakoff, Irene Daniel.
Purdy, Cassie May.
Puzzolo, Giuseppe.
Rabias, Constantinos Nicolaos.
Radulich, Blasul, or Blasul Radulic.
Redfern, Ruth Myrtle.
Redfern, Allan Henry.
Redwood, Margaret (nee Margaret Marshall).
Rein, Monika.
Reis, Rosa Oliveira (nee Rosa Candida Oliveira).
Rigas, Eleftherios.
Rim, Lilly Mary (Mrs. Herbert Rim) (nee Lilly Mary Ruppert or Lilly Mary Ruppert De Rin by a former marriage Mrs. Hans Neumann).
Roberts, Grace Ruth Kearny.
Roininen, Laina Maria, or Laina Maria Roine.
Rosadio, Jose.
Rosenblum, Lajb, or Leo Rosenblum.
Rosenlund, Rolf.
Roston, Albert Joseph, or Abraham Josef Rothstein.
Roth, Elizabeth Evelyn Achica, or Elizabeth Evelyn Achica.
Rubinstein, Israel.
Rukoje, Jadwiga, or Jean Rukoje or Jadwiga Rukoic.
Sa, Manuel Afonso.
Sackville, Patricia Ann.
Sackville, Roma Collard.
Salcer, Herman, or Herman Salcer.
Sam, Choy (Chinese name), or Johnny Sam Choy (American name).
Sanchez, Domingo Valluluz.
Sarno, Mamerto Torres, or Mamerto Torres.
Sarno, Rosauro Torres, or Rosauro Torres.
Sawaya, Louis Neemer.
Sclavogiannis, Emmanuel.
Schenk, Knut.
Scherzter, Michael.
Schliemann, Wilhelm Johannes.
Scillama, Antonia (nee Restivo).
Scocco, Giacomo.
Scott, Louise (nee Harris).
Seymour, Alex.
Shee, Jew, or Jew Ngui Haal.
Shong, Wong, or Shong Wong.
Sima, Albin Franz.
Sirigos, Antonios Nicolaos, or Antonios Sirigos or Anthony Sirigos.
Skorpak, William.
Slowes, Mendel.
Smith, Constance Agnes (nee Brady).
Smith, Vina (nee Mitchell).
Smoke, Josef, or Josef Smuk.
Soler, Maria Barber, or Mother Bienvenida De San Jose.
Sonck, Edouard.
Souze, Joao Azevedo, or John Azevedo Souza.
Spigno, Enrico Giuseppe.
Stapleton, Thomas Michael.
Stefanovich, Mitre, or Mitro or Stefanoff alias Jim Stevens, Mitro Stefan Nandanovic, Mitre Stefan or Stefanou, Stoyanis Egos.
Stein, Paul, or Pelta Szejn.
Szejn, Rywka, or Rita Stein.
Stern, Irving, or Isaac, Isak and Isaac Stern.
Stoor, John Hjalmar.
Stout, Catharina Maria (nee Berendsen).

Stow, Peggy Spencer, or Peggy Spencer (maiden name).

Straus, Ernst Gabor.

Suan-Chi, Lee, or Suan Chi Lee or Stephen Charles Lee.

Suarez, Francisco Betanco, or Frank P. Suarez or Frank Petanco or (Petanko) or Frankly Bestanco or Manuel Martinis or Francisco Suarez Betanco or Francisco Betanco Santana Suarez.

Suchman, Andrew, or Arpad Suchman or Suchmann.

Sultanis, Aphrodite.

Szekely, Istvan Attila.

Sziber, John, or Joan.

Sztankay, Zoltan Ferencz.

Sztankay, Ada Hackl (nee Adelheid Josephine Marie Hackl).

Tasco, Vincenzo.

Teitelbaum, Hana, Mrs. or Mrs. Hana Teitelbaum (nee Halberstam).

Theocharis, George Emanuel.

Thomas, Pnangiotos Sotiriou, or Pete Thomas.

Thorne, Julia Veronica, formerly Julia Veronica Loft (nee Cohoon).

Thornton, Patrick, or Patrick Joseph Thornton.

Torres-Hernandez, Nicanor, or Nicanor Torres-Torres.

Trepper, Moritz, or Morris Trepper or Nolshe Trepper.

Tselentis, Jerasimas (alias Jerry Lent).

Tsistinas, Andreas Christos.

Tzetzos, Evangelos, or Angelo Tzetzos.

Uscatu, Everdichia.

Utter, Alice Ruth (nee Simmons).

Valensi, Cleopatra, or Cleopatra Manoussaki.

Van De Velde, Martha Maria, or Martha Van De Velde (alias Martha Maria Van Haver).

Van Der Veen, Olga, or Olga Van Der Neen Wisner.

Van Tilburg, Cornelius Arnoides, or John Beckos.

Velge William.

Verticchio, Giuseppe.

Von Bomsdorff, Felix.

Vonderohe, William Lillie, or William Lillie.

Wadeikis, Veronica Irene.

Wan, Fong.

Wang, Francis Chwen-Tao.

Warr, Rosa (nee Rosa or Rose Mahfooz).

Wassner, Danuta, or Danuta Ziff.

Wawrzkievicz, Rura Serrano (nee Rura Serrano).

Weinberg, Morris (Molshe).

Weinberg, Tillie (nee Steinschneider or Taube, Toba or Tobe Weinberg).

Weiss, Lieselotte.

Wells, Adelheid Anna, or Adelheid Anna Schuecke (Schucke) (nee Klinner (Kinner)).

Wing, Fung, Sik, or Fung Yee Wing.

Woo, Ji-Hung.

Woo, Yun-Chwang, or Woo Chung.

Wor, Echling Shen, or Mrs. Y. C. Woo.

Yankelewitz, Leib or Leon.

Yau, Au (Owyou).

Yeung, Fung Kim.

Young, Kenneth Abram.

Yum, Ma.

Yung, Yip Kung (alias Benjamin Yip).

Zacks, Milly, or Millie Sachs, formerly Milka Zuk.

Santamarina y Alvarez, Fernando Garcia, or Fernando Garcia Santamarina.

Fry, Madeline Thurza (nee Logan).

Mitani, Masatane.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 10, line 12, strike out all of line 12.

On page 15, line 10, strike out all of line 10.

On page 21, line 11, insert "Salgo Miklos or Nicholas Salgo or Nicolas M. Salgo."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REV. ANDREW CHAI KYUNG WHANG

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8759) for the relief of Rev. Andrew Chai Kyung Whang, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, after "taxes," insert "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARCHIBALD WALTER CAMPBELL SEYMOUR

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8973) for the relief of Archibald Walter Campbell Seymour, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Archibald Walter Campbell Seymour, who was born in India of British parents, shall be held and considered to have been born in Great Britain."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOMOKO YAMAYA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9145) for the relief of Tomoko Yamaya, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the provisions of the immigra-

tion laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Tomoko Yamaya, the Japanese fiancée of Paul H. Vine, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that the said Tomoko Yamaya may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Tomoko Yamaya is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to Paul H. Vine, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Tomoko Yamaya, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Tomoko Yamaya as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION FROM DUAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2351) to simplify and consolidate the laws relating to the receipt of compensation from dual employments under the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this comes to us rather hastily. It has not been possible in this short time to study in detail all of the provisions of this particular bill. But in substance it would provide, for instance, that retired Army and Navy officers might be recalled to service and receive not only their retired pay, but also to be paid for their new Government service. There is no one who has higher regard for these military men than I. They have served their country well. But their country has also served them well. It educated them. It has taken care of them through adversity and depression. It has cared for them in their illness. It has helped them to nurse their families back to health. When the time came for them to retire they were given very substantial retirement pay. Although the Government owes them a debt, they, in turn, owe the Government a much greater debt. If these men are needed in the service today during this or any future emergency, there is the very simple expedient of recalling them to active duty and letting them revert back to active duty pay being assigned where their ability

can be best used. That takes care of the situation entirely. Of course it will be said that the bill provides a ceiling of \$5,000.

But at the same time the President, in a national emergency is given the power to suspend that ceiling. If that is done there is no limit on what this dual remuneration might be.

May I point out further, Mr. Speaker, there was no such legislation or provision such as this during all of World War II. Certainly the present emergency is not as serious as World War II. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of this bill.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of asking the majority leader if he can clarify the program for the next day or two, or up to January 1.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be confined to any conference reports that may be ready; also any bills that can be taken up by unanimous consent. That is always implied if it is not expressed.

I am unable to state whether the conference report will be ready on the tax bill. If so, we would like to get through with that tomorrow. If not, it will be taken up on January 1.

The union shop bill will be taken up on January 1, as well as the War Powers Act.

Any conference reports not acted upon tomorrow will be taken up on January 1. I do not know of any other legislation, but by this statement I do not want to exclude any other legislation being considered on January 1 if that may develop. What I have stated is the only legislation I can specifically refer to that will be taken up after we meet on January 1.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. What about the appropriation bill?

Mr. TABER. The appropriation bill is going to conference tonight, we expect.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are hopeful that that will be agreed upon and acted upon tomorrow. If that is agreed upon, it will be acted upon tomorrow. Also the conference report on the tax bill, if that has been agreed upon in conference.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have been assigned the rule on the War Powers Act on the minority side. I understood the gentleman to say the railroad labor bill and the War Powers Act would be called up on January 1. Can the gentleman tell us which bill will be called up first under that schedule?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state that, but it is my understanding that, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] seeks recognition, he probably will have to be recognized.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman knows, doubtless, that the gentleman from Texas would seek recognition on that bill when he is told by the leadership it is the proper time. That is substantially what we have tried to do as a committee thus far.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am telling the gentleman that that matter will be taken up on January 1.

Mr. BECKWORTH. January 1 was set without consulting the gentleman from Texas or any member of his committee that I know of.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is that intended as an implied rebuke to anybody?

Mr. BECKWORTH. No; no rebuke is implied. However, I feel the situation should be clear.

Mr. McCORMACK. If so, let me advise the gentleman—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman's recognition is entirely within the discretion of the Chair. If the Chair thinks other matters have priority, they will be taken up first.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman just wants it understood.

Mr. McCORMACK. But the gentleman from Massachusetts wants the gentleman from Texas to understand that there are situations where members of a committee cannot be consulted at times.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Ohio simply asked that question because he had been assigned the rule on the War Powers Act on the minority side, and he just wanted to know what time he should be here.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts is sorry the gentleman from Ohio has not had an opportunity to make the speech he has in mind.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the House has lost a great deal of wisdom.

Mr. McCORMACK. Whether we agree on that or not, we all agree that we respect the gentleman and his views.

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS AND OUR GRATITUDE TO THE BOYS IN KOREA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it would be ironical to wish the men fighting for us in Korea a merry Christmas, but we can unite in sending them our prayers, our love, and our deep gratitude for what they are doing for us. The Prince of Peace was born years ago on Christmas Day. The Prince of Peace gave his life for us. These men in Korea are giving their lives for us. We can pledge ourselves today never for one instant to cease to care for them and to see that their sacrifices are not in vain. We can pray that their sacrifices will bring a just and lasting peace.

The Prince of Peace was born years ago on Christmas Day. The Prince of Peace gave his life for us. These men in Korea are giving their lives for us. We can pledge ourselves today never for one instant to cease to care for them and to see that their sacrifices are not in vain. We can pray that their sacrifices will bring a just and lasting peace.

THE LATE HON. HATTIE W. CARAWAY
Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my unpleasant responsibility as chairman of the House delegation from Arkansas to announce the untimely passing this morning of ex-Senator Hattie W. Caraway of Arkansas. You will remember her as the first woman to be elected to the United States Senate in her own right. She served in that body for about 15 years, succeeding her great and illustrious husband, Hon. T. H. Caraway. After the death of her husband she was on November 13, 1931, appointed to succeed him and to serve until the next general election. Then at the following general election in 1932 was elected to a full term. She was reelected in 1938, and she retired at the expiration of her term on January 3, 1945. Many of the people of Arkansas will remember Mrs. Caraway as a charming and pleasant young woman in her early days; they will remember her as a beautiful and charming, hospitable and pleasing wife and widow of the great Senator, T. H. Caraway. Their residence in Arkansas was at Jonesboro. All of Arkansas will remember her as one of the outstanding members of the United States Senate for a period of about 15 years. After she retired from the United States Senate she was appointed to the United States Employees Commission and then in 1946 she was appointed to the United States Employees Compensation Appeals Board. She always rendered very able and conscientious public service.

I wish to say on behalf of the people of Arkansas that we bow our heads today in grief and sorrow at the untimely passing and answering of the last roll call of that great, good, and gracious woman, Mrs. Hattie W. Caraway of Arkansas. We extend our deepest sympathy to her surviving children, Messrs. Forrest and Paul Caraway.

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

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague and the other members of the Arkansas delegation, and I am sure all Members of the Congress, in expressing my deep regret and sorrow at the passing of former Senator Caraway.

I knew Mrs. Caraway very well, as did the gentleman and the other members of our delegation. We had known her for a long, long time. We knew her husband before her, a very able Senator in the United States Senate representing our State.

I learned that Mrs. Caraway passed away only a little while ago. My heart was sad, regardless of the fact I had known about her condition during the past several weeks. We had known her as not only a very fine woman but one of the outstanding Senators who served the Government of the United States, her country, and the Senate of the United States. I know her two boys, both of whom graduated from West Point Military Academy and now are

serving their country in the Armed Forces.

The people of our State are bereaved in the loss of this outstanding woman who has made such a remarkable record during her lifetime. She was a person of sweet disposition, lovable character, firm in her conviction, loyal to her friends, and a very able servant. Our State and Nation have lost a most loyal officer in the important post she has held for several years as a member of the Federal Employees Compensation Commission.

She has now gone to rest with the Great Maker and Master of all, our God, as she was a devoted Christian mother. May our Lord keep her in peace and have blessing on her soul.

I join with the gentleman and others in extending to the family, to which she was so devoted and loved so much, our heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas and the Members of the Arkansas delegation in the deserving and splendid tribute they have paid to the life and memory of Mrs. Caraway.

Mrs. Caraway was not only a sweet lady but an outstanding legislator, a fine and noble character with a philosophical mind, one who attracted and made friends because of the respect they had for her.

Her late husband was also one of the outstanding Members of the United States Senate, a most unusual situation in our history for a husband and wife both to have served in the Senate of the United States. That very fact of itself shows the respect and the confidence the people of Arkansas had in both of them as individuals and in both of them as a couple. That is the finest evidence of respect that any couple could receive, any husband and wife could receive, from the people of any State of the Union or of any congressional district of the Union, if they had served in this body.

I was honored by knowing her late husband and also in knowing Mrs. Caraway. When we speak about one we speak about both of them, Mrs. Caraway and her late husband, because if ever a husband and wife signified the very highest and finest of unity in marriage it was the late Senator Caraway and Mrs. Caraway.

I join with the Members of the Arkansas delegation in expressing a feeling of keen regret that I know is in the mind of each and every Member of this House in her death, and also in extending to her two sons my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who has an intimate knowledge of the great public service rendered by Senator Caraway. The congressional service of Mrs. Caraway and her husband, Thaddeus Caraway, also a Senator from

Arkansas, covered a span of 32 years and they left a lasting influence upon our State and national life. The citizens of our State experience a deep sorrow in the passing of Mrs. Caraway and they will always cherish the memory of this good and faithful servant of her people.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the passing of Mrs. Caraway.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my tribute to Senator Hattie Caraway. I knew her for a great many years. I always admired her; admired her for her ability, her courage, her moral and physical courage, her courage to do what she thought was right, to vote as she thought she ought to vote. I saw her once when she was injured. It was a very painful and very trying injury. I remember her physical courage at that time. I remember her brilliant mind and I know of no one who had a quicker or more delightful wit than Hattie Caraway. I remember during World War I, the friendliness and the generosity of the Arkansas people when they gave wheat for the war. We shall miss Hattie Caraway, Mr. Speaker, and I join in mourning her loss.

Mr. NORRELL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts very kindly.

BERNARD F. ELMERS

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4803) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 3211)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4803) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the funds appropriated for the International Refugee Organization"; Senate amendment numbered 1, in lieu of the sum inserted by the Senate amendment in-

sert "\$12,500"; amendment numbered 2, restore the language "personal injuries and".

And the Senate agree to the same.

WILLIAM T. BYRNE,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
KENNETH B. KEATING,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALEXANDER WILEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4803) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

This bill as passed the House appropriated the sum of \$12,500 to Bernard F. Elmers for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on July 8, 1947, when he was assaulted and robbed while employed as a civilian employee of the Army Exchange Service, serving with the Army in Germany. Mr. Elmers could not be regarded as having been an employee of the United States for the purpose of entitlement to the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742; 5 U. S. C. 751), as amended. The officers' mess and the enlisted men's club, whose accounts he had been auditing during the evening he was injured, are not operated by or connected with the Army Exchange Service. His injuries received while he was returning home after auditing the accounts of those agencies cannot, therefore, be considered as having been sustained during the course of his employment with the Army Exchange Service. Consequently, he is not entitled to any benefits under the employees' compensation insurance provided from private sources for the protection of Army Exchange Service employees.

Inasmuch as the evidence in this case shows that Mr. Elmers was assaulted while returning to his quarters late at night after having worked on an audit of the accounts of the officers' mess and the enlisted men's club at the direction of his commanding officer, and as there is no method by which he may be compensated for damages sustained by him except through the enactment of special legislation by the Congress, such as that proposed in H. R. 4803, the Secretary of the Army states in his report dated February 2, 1950:

"Considering the nature and extent of the injuries sustained by Mr. Elmers, which have resulted in a large degree of permanent disability, the earnings lost by him on account of his injury, and the value of the personal property lost, the proposed award of \$12,500 provided in H. R. 4803 appears to be fair and reasonable."

On the Senate floor on August 23, 1950, when this bill passed the Senate, Senator SCHOEPPLE asked the question, "May we have an explanation of the bill, please?"

Senator MCCARRAN, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, stated:

"Bernard F. Elmers was a civilian employee of the Army in Germany in 1947, when he was seriously injured by two Polish displaced persons who attacked him, inflicting serious injuries upon him, fracturing his skull and severing certain nerves which caused permanent paralysis and disfigurement of his face, and causing him to lose mental capacity and impair his hearing and vision. He is being paid the sum of \$2,500, which is the value of certain bonds that were taken from him by the criminal investigation division of the Army and not returned to him. Apparently the bonds were lost while in the possession

of the Army in connection with said investigation."

Senator SCHOEPPEL then stated:

"I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee a question. This measure is a House bill, and it will, of course, go to conference. There is some question about the compensation having been reduced from a larger amount to the amount stated in the bill. In the judgment of the chairman of the committee, is this amount adequate compensation for this man, considering the type of his injury?"

Senator McCARRAN then stated:

"I am not ready to say that, but I thought it was the best we could get under the circumstances. I do not think it is adequate compensation."

It would appear that Members of the Senate realize that the sum of \$2,500 is not adequate and that the amount would be worked out in conference. Therefore, after a full discussion, it was the opinion of the conferees that, in view of the fact that large sums of money have been appropriated to the International Refugee Organization, this appropriation should be made from that fund, and the following amendment was agreed upon:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the funds appropriated for the International Refugee Organization"; Senate amendment No. 1, in lieu of the sum inserted by the Senate amendment insert "\$12,500"; amendment No. 2, restore the language "personal injuries and".

WILLIAM T. BYRNE,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
KENNETH B. KEATING,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] and myself were delayed by the late arrival of the plane. Had we been able to get here in time we would have voted "aye" on the civil defense measure.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] is recognized for 60 minutes.

BLUEPRINT FOR SECURITY

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, may it please the House: Like all of you, I have been searching for some way out of the disastrous situation in which America finds itself. In analyzing that situation, it seems to me that out of all the tangled events of the recent past, two conclusions can be drawn: First, this Nation has had no definite long-range policy upon which a predetermined course of action could be taken; second, communism has had such a policy.

The time has long since come for this Nation to guide itself by planned action rather than by intuitive guesswork. We must accept the facts as they are, evaluate them to the best of our present ability, and then act. We can no

longer wait for the "right" course—the certain, easy, and safe one. There will be no such choice in our generation.

Let me preface my remarks by acknowledging that I speak only as a layman who has no more information than is equally available to anyone who can read or hear. I do not want anyone to be misled into thinking that I speak from knowledge of any facts that are not already accessible to the public. I do not want anyone to be persuaded to my beliefs or suggestions in the thought that we in Congress are "in the know." The simple fact is that we are not—and I do not believe anyone else in the Government is, either.

CONGRESSMEN HAVE A DUTY

Being in Congress has only one bearing here: it gives me the duty of reporting the situation as I see it. The qualifications I have do not warrant this talk but the position I hold demands it.

Probably time will prove my analysis is inaccurate, my fears unfounded, and my recommendations ill-advised. Be that as it may, and in the full realization of my own lack of qualifications to either analyze or advise, I cannot conscientiously remain silent. I can merely express my thoughts and then those of greater knowledge and wisdom may accept or reject them.

CHANGING WORLD

We in America must awaken to the fact that the world has changed in the past 20 years. We are aware of that in a vague sort of way, but the full realization of its meaning has not yet struck us with any forcible impact. Consequently, we do not know what we are up against.

The world has the same geography in terms of land and water but the countries of the world have changed and are changing daily. I do not refer merely to boundary lines but rather to changes of values. In many cases the strong have become weak and the weak strong. Agricultural people have become industrial, backward nations progressive, peaceful civilizations warlike, and vice versa. Giant nations have toppled, slumbering peoples are stirring, revolutions, both peaceful and bloody, have been changing the course of history. New philosophies, new sets of values, new ways of living have appeared. The once slow march of science has become a flight too rapid for our vision or intellect. We are dimly aware of it but its true significance has escaped us.

THE OLD ORDER CHANGETH

We are not living in the same world or at the same time as many other nations, in one sense. Measured by time as we know it, America and many nations of comparable culture have progressed 50 years in the last decade—but still other nations have progressed a thousand years in the same period. Where our own experience has perhaps been an orderly transition from horse to auto to airplane to atomic energy, others have gone almost directly from horse to atomic energy. The whole world is catching up with us. The old order changeth so that today very few, if any, nations tremble at the voice of America. There are many giants today.

THE TRUTH MAY HURT

We in America justly take pride in the military prowess of our youth, but we must recognize that other peoples have warriors, too. They are not going to run because we announce that we are sending fighting men. They will not drop dead of fright simply because American troops land. Perhaps once upon a time a hundred Americans were the match for a thousand from any other nation—but that is no longer true.

It may hurt our pride and vanity to acknowledge that, but failure to, may destroy our Nation. The cold, unalterable fact is that bad men who believe in bad principles can kill good men who believe in good principles. Bullets and bombs cannot tell the difference.

NO SUPERMEN

We all know that, of course, but our failure to act upon its truth has been tragic. Where China is concerned, for example, most Americans had conjured up a mental picture of a few GIs with machine guns ordering several thousand Chinese to lay down their sticks and stones and go back to the rice paddies. Ten years ago it was having some American battleship take an afternoon off to sink the Jap Navy. Think back to Pearl Harbor and you will recall that no one could comprehend that tiny Japan dared stand up to mighty America.

Was it only the people in Government who did not understand that? No, it was the people of America.

We thought we could win by calling the Japs "monkey men" who lived on a pound of rice a month and were crazy enough to believe their Emperor was divine. Then we learned that monkey men fired bullets that killed as effectively as those fired by fine young Americans. We found out that the pound of rice a month we had sneered at kept the Jap as healthy as a month's GI rations. And crazy Japs who died for an Emperor they believed to be divine also took young Americans to death with them.

We had been blissfully unaware of the fact that the world had been changing. We had thought Japan was Gilbert and Sullivan—but when the curtain went up, there was Tojo.

THE ATOM BOMB

Today we are beginning to recognize that many nations have military strength equal to or greater than ours—"but we have the atom bomb." We will not open our eyes to the facts of life and realize that neither the atom bomb nor anything else is a quick, easy, and safe way out of the situation in which we and the world find ourselves.

The days of monkey men and Maginot lines are gone forever. The world is moving and will continue to move too rapidly. There is no "atom bomb line" any more than there was ever really a "Maginot line." Neither will there be a "chemical line" or a "bacteriological warfare line" or anything else. We are trapped, hoist by the petard of our own civilization.

NOT THE ANSWER

We must banish all self-delusions or we shall perish in the darkness of ignorance. We cannot find the path

through the forest unless we first see the trees.

The facts are that we cannot destroy Russia or China or communism by the atom bomb without destroying the world. We may bomb the cities of Russia, but what will we then do about the rest of Europe when Russian soldiers move into France, Germany, Poland, Italy, and other nations? Can the Russian soldiers in Europe be destroyed by the atom bomb without destroying all the people of Europe? Are we also to assume that Russia has no retaliatory weapons of her own?

The atom bomb alone is not the answer. Other nations may have it or something equally effective. Or, if they do not, we cannot use it without destroying our friends as well as our enemies.

Let me point out that I do not intend at this time to discuss the moral issues involved in either using the atom bomb or engaging in preventive war. I am merely trying to analyze the facts without getting into moral questions that might well affect any decision to be made by this country.

WHERE WE STAND

Aside from the atom bomb, where do we stand militarily? Taking the most optimistic view, those we consider our enemies have more men under arms than we do, have equally good weapons and equipment, and have certain geographic advantages.

On long-range policy, where do we stand? Our enemies seem to know where they are going, what they will try to do, and when they will seek to accomplish it. They know the what, where, when, how, and why of their endeavors. Do we?

The easy answer is to say that all we want is peace, but how do we achieve it? What do we do? When? Where? How? O, there are so many questions but so few answers.

THE TERRIBLE TRUTH

There can be no peacetime economy for America in a world of nations living under wartime economies. There will be no peace in our lifetime—none, that is, as we have always thought of peace. There may be for future generations, but only if we have the fortitude to measure up to the task before us in this generation.

Of course, we in this generation must always keep our eyes raised to the hope of true and lasting peace in our lifetime, but we must also keep our eyes on the road to that sort of peace. The road is going to be long and difficult, and it will not be traveled in 5, 10, or perhaps even 20 years. The way will be precarious, fraught with danger and hardship, and calling for personal sacrifices on the part of everyone in the Nation.

It will involve gearing our Nation to a wartime economy for many years—a wartime economy even if our men are not actively engaged in combat any place in the world. That is a very difficult thing for peace-loving Americans to undertake, but there is no escape from it because we cannot escape the world in which we live.

How will realization of that terrible truth be of help to America? First of all,

it should enable the powers that be to decide on a long-range policy to achieve peace. Instead of drifting, hoping against hope that a favorable wind will come, we will steer a definite course toward a definite objective. We have not been able to do that because we have never really known the various stations on the way to our ultimate destination.

PRECIPICE TO PRECIPICE

We have had an essentially negative policy of waiting for an emergency, then rushing to patch up the situation, then sitting back and hoping that no future emergencies would arise. We have breathlessly rushed from crisis to crisis like a mountain goat hopping from precipice to precipice, always hoping that we might somehow escape falling into the abyss.

When war clouds gathered, we have drafted a few men, threatened industry and labor, disrupted homes, thrown business and the stock market into a tail spin, and scared the daylights out of the Nation. Two weeks later we resumed normal living. Another crisis, more jitters, then normalcy again. There has been no certainty, no permanence, no settling down to anything—neither to war nor to peace. We hover between the two, being afraid to accept either.

REMEDIES?

There is a panacea for each of us, depending upon who we are. The Republicans can blame the Democrats who are in power, the Democrats can accuse the Republicans of sabotaging efforts of the administration, the people can blame both parties. Praise Johnson for economy, then condemn him for stupidity. Impeach the President, throw Acheson out, fire MacArthur. A head can roll for every new disaster—but will it stop Stalin or Mao?

We have weakened ourselves and our chances for ultimate peace because we still insist on thinking of every new development as being a new crisis. The truth is that we are in for one crisis after the other and we had better adjust to "situation crisis" as being "situation normal." We must settle down before we can help the world to settle down.

THE PEOPLE'S FIGHT

That calls for positive diplomacy on the part of our leaders—hard, definite, calculated diplomacy that the world will understand. But the tragic truth is that no such action is even possible until the people of this Nation are first conditioned for and ready to accept such leadership with all the sacrifices it will entail.

There is absolutely no way of accomplishing the task without the complete and wholehearted support of all the people of the Nation. It is really the fight of the people, not simply that of the President or the State Department or the members of the Armed Forces.

All the people must appreciate what this country is up against. They must try to understand the difficulties that confront our Nation when dealing with some of the other nations of the world. We have a horror of war because of the havoc, suffering, and death it brings—but there are many peoples today who

look on war as being normal. It is the only way of life many of the Chinese Communists have ever known. They do not think of death and destruction in the same terms that America does because both those tragedies have little meaning for people who have spent their lives in the midst of death and destruction.

ONCE UPON A TIME

We have been adjusted to dealing with European nations. Our relationships, our diplomacy, and our wars have been with peoples of Europe who have our own general background and civilization. We understood them and they understood us because, basically and fundamentally, we were of the same human cloth. Our philosophies, our minds, our ways of life were very much alike. We spoke their language in mind if not in tongue. Is that true of the peoples with whom we must deal from now on? Do we know what appeals to or impresses the Oriental mind? Or the Communist mind? The Hindus? The Moslems? Once whatever made sense to us also made sense to the other powerful nations of the world because we all lived by substantially the same standards, beliefs, morals, religions, and philosophies. Our way of dealing with the world was based on that criterion. It is difficult if not impossible for us to realize that that is no longer true in the world today.

The world of 20 years ago is no longer with us. Instead we have a completely new world and perhaps—not inevitably but merely perhaps—there must be new ways of dealing with this new world.

THE TASK BEFORE US

We must set out to accomplish many seemingly inconsistent ends. We must prepare for both war and peace, make sacrifices without undermining our own standard of living, adjust our way of life to the realities of the world, and yet still keep our democratic institutions. How can we do it? How can we save both America and the American way of life?

A 25-YEAR PLAN

First of all, we must become strong militarily. We must adopt a plan that will enable us to keep adequate military strength for 25 years without bankrupting the Nation. Let us at least plan for 25 years—we can always abandon the plan if events prove we have been overly pessimistic.

At least three objections are immediately presented: First, the manpower shortage; second, the expense; third, the disruption of individual and family life. Those same objections are not so forceful if we are planning for only a year or two but a long range policy covering 25 years is another story.

MANPOWER—MONEY—MORES

Is there any plan that may resolve the three difficulties outlined above? The only suggestions being considered are either universal military training or a draft similar to that used in World Wars I and II or a combination of the two. I do not believe either plan, or a combination of the two, is the answer. Either or both may be all right for a

short period of time, but I do not think either is suitable for any long-range program, assuming that we do not want to bankrupt the Nation or seriously undermine the American way of life.

INTERNAL COLLAPSE

It is impossible for us to consider any draft or military training program without also taking into account the Nation's financial status. We must figure the tremendous drain of finances and the possibility of a complete collapse of our financial structure. We must remember that this country can be destroyed from within as well as from without. Internal collapse can give victory to our enemies just as quickly as defeat on the battlefield. We cannot simply order millions of men into uniform without first knowing what the financial effect upon the country will be. Obviously, we must have armed forces that can adequately protect the security of this Nation. But we must never lose sight of the fact that the security of the Nation can also be endangered by financial bankruptcy.

NATURAL PREJUDICE

It is probably not the primary responsibility of the military to be concerned about finances. Neither is it the primary responsibility of our financial experts to be concerned about the size of the military. The military man naturally feels that the best way to guarantee the security of the Nation is by giving the Armed Forces whatever is needed. The financier naturally thinks the best way to guarantee the security of the Nation is by avoiding bankruptcy. Each authority is a product of his own background and experience, and each has a natural bias or prejudice in favor of his particular viewpoint. We all represent our own beliefs, and our opinions are colored by our convictions gained in a lifetime. Each, in his own way, is right; but, in another sense, each is wrong in that he only sees a part of the entire picture.

The same is true when we begin to consider the effect of a manpower shortage on domestic industry. The industrialist believes that emphasis must be placed on keeping our productive output at highest efficiency. And there is a great deal to be said for his viewpoint that the way to win wars or to guarantee America's security is by keeping defense production moving at top speed.

All three—the financier, the military man, and the industrialist—recognize the need for strength in all three departments. But each believes most consideration should be given to his particular field.

FAMILY PROBLEM

To further complicate the picture, there is the individual or family problem. It seems that most families are for a strong America and fully appreciate the need for sound economy, full military strength, and maximum productive output. The only condition they place upon such endeavors is that the ends be accomplished without disrupting the family life of America—or, as they put it to most Congressmen: "Cannot they win the war without my husband?"

They recognize that nothing will more seriously undermine the American way of life than disruption of our families. They know the consequences of that just as we do.

Now, if my talk were based on an assumption of a short war, the family problem would of course still be serious but would not be insurmountable. However, it is a different matter where any long-range policy is concerned. It of course is also directly connected with the military, financial, and productive problems.

Even with generous family allowances, the wives, children, and parents of servicemen suffer. Family allowances will increase with its resultant effect upon our financial condition. Industrial output is decreased as skilled workers are taken from industry. The same is true of agriculture and all other fields of endeavor, of course. Yet, in spite of everything, we must somehow afford to give this Nation adequate military protection. We dare not do otherwise. What is the best way of doing that?

Before we can answer, we must admit that any conclusion we reach is going to be merely a guess or a calculated risk. We cannot conclude anything until we have assumed a set of facts that we are willing to use for a springboard to our ultimate decision. Again, we must analyze the situation coldly and ascertain the known facts to the best of our ability. To the known facts must be added certain estimated or probable facts that will provide us with a basic assumption. Before we can adopt any long-range policy, we must start from a basis of some sort. We know we must become militarily strong. What is the best way to achieve that end?

THE EASIEST WAY

One easy answer is to decide that we must immediately put as many men under arms as our enemies have and at all times maintain a standing army as large as theirs. Unfortunately, we cannot match them man-for-man because their numbers are greater. But suppose we could? Suppose we immediately put ten or fifteen million men under arms. Would that be a solution?

It would answer the military phase, perhaps. But what about our financial structure? What about our production? What about the domestic upheaval? The cost of keeping 15,000,000 men under arms even for a short period is staggering. The cost for a 25-year period would be disastrous to our entire economy and to our American way of life.

If Russia wanted to see us destroyed, the easiest way for her to accomplish that end would be to lead us into the maintenance of a huge standing army for a long period of time. Our productive output would be seriously damaged, our financial structure would collapse, and our American way of life would be dangerously undermined or destroyed. The battle might be won without a single shot having been fired.

OUR STANDARDS ARE DIFFERENT

Why is it that other nations can support large standing armies? Because their standards are different than ours.

We have the best-paid, best-clothed, and best-fed servicemen in the world. There are times when that is not true, of course, but over any long period it is a fact. We do not have slave labor in industry or agriculture, we do not exploit any conquered nations, we do not have a low standard of living, and we do not have the same type of economy or culture that characterizes many other nations. That is why our military structure must always have a standing force numerically less than that of our enemies. I emphasize standing force, and, by that term, mean men actually in the service 24 hours a day. And, of course, I am not referring now to a shooting war.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING?

If putting all men under arms is not the answer, how about the alternative offered of a fairly large standing force coupled with universal military training whereby a substantial force of young men will also be trained and theoretically ready for active duty?

That may be adequate but I do not believe that is the answer, either. The expense, while less than the other, is still great. But, in addition to that, the system may still not always make available for active duty a large enough group in a short enough time, assuming complete mobilization as quickly as possible becomes necessary. It still leaves many millions of potential fighting men out of the defense picture. In the world today, we cannot leave anyone out of our defense set-up. Failure to adequately prepare every possible fighting man may be fatal to the security of this Nation.

There may not be any solution but I believe all of us have a duty to make suggestions in the hope that something constructive may possibly be offered. That is the reason for my talk.

THREEFOLD PROGRAM

The military preparedness program that I suggest, as one part of a long-range program, is threefold. First of all, I believe we should immediately establish an armed force that will have sufficient personnel to meet the needs of the present situation. Those men would be drafted under the Selective Service System. By sufficient I mean 1,000,000 more men than must be sent out of the country immediately.

Let me illustrate very roughly by assuming that we must immediately provide 2,000,000 men for service abroad, whether that service be as part of United Nations troops or as American troops. I use the figure 2,000,000 arbitrarily merely for purposes of illustration. The correct figure might be more or less than that. Under my plan, an additional 1,000,000 men would also be called to active duty to be held in readiness in camps here in this country. In brief, the first part of the program I suggest is merely a draft under the already established selective-service system.

My reason for the figure of 1,000,000 men held in camps is this: It is impossible to ship more than a million men out of America to probable battlefields in less than 6 months, even under the best conditions we could hope for, and using every means of transportation we have.

Our military leaders know that and every nation in the world knows it, too. The conclusion is reached simply by counting ships, determining the number of men each can carry, and figuring the length of time the voyage would take.

HOW LONG A TRAINING PERIOD?

Why is the figure "6 months" so important? Because the program I suggest is based on the belief that troops can be ready for combat duty after 6 months of training.

I am not an authority on military training; in fact, I know practically nothing about it. But I believe any civilian who ever served in the last war will corroborate my statement. Actually I believe only 3 months of training is necessary but I have doubled the figure to be on the safe side.

I believe most authorities in the military itself say that 10 months of training is necessary for combat duty. Experience in the last war does not substantiate their opinion, in my belief. However, as I shall attempt to point out, I believe even the military viewpoint can be reconciled with my estimate of 6 months.

This is why: The military's own estimate is based on training a completely raw recruit who has had no instruction of any kind and who knows absolutely nothing about military life. That, however, is not true under the second and third steps of my program which insure that the recruits our Armed Forces get will have had a high degree of preservice training. With such personnel, I believe even the military will agree that 6 months in the service is more than adequate preparation for combat duty.

STUDENTS

The second step of the program I suggest would be what I call a Student Military Training program of 3 months a year for every high-school or college student between the ages of 17 and 35. Those 3 months would be from June 15 to September 15, 8 hours a day. The only exemptions for this type of training would be for reasons determined by our present selective-service boards or similar judges—probably for physical cause or for unusual hardship. Whether any payment for such service could or could not be given to trainees would be decided after a careful study of the country's financial state. Even if not paid, I believe most students would prefer this type of training to the universal military-training system with pay.

The period from June 15 to September 15 is based on two reasons: First, it will not interfere with their education; second, 3 months at 8 hours a day is a fairly substantial period of training for youths of that age who will still receive at least an additional 6 months of further training after they have been called to active duty, assuming that eventuality arises. And, as I have pointed out, since it is virtually impossible for them to even be landed abroad before they have been on active duty for 6 months, they will have had approximately at least 9 months of military training before getting combat duty.

I assume that such a student military-training program would give the military a reserve of about one-half million par-

tially trained young men between the ages of 17 and 22—a reserve that is available for active duty at any time, a reserve that cannot even be shipped abroad until the million men already under arms in military camps in this country have first been shipped overseas.

CIVILIAN SELECTEES

The third step in the program I suggest I have called a Civilian-Selectee System. It will operate somewhat like the present selective-service system, under which we draft men right into the Armed Forces, but it is not an actual draft for active military duty.

What I call the Civilian-Selectee System would operate in this way: a civilian-selectee board, very comparable to the Selective Service Draft Board, would be established as a counterpart to the draft board. Except for students who were receiving training under the student military training program outlined above, every male civilian between the ages of 17 and 35 would be available for training under the Civilian-Selectee System. The only other exceptions would be exemptions granted under provisions similar to those prevailing under our present draft laws.

TRAINING CENTERS

Training centers would be established for every community in the Nation. Heavily populated areas might have several training centers; rural areas might have a central place for many surrounding communities. As far as possible, existing facilities would be used but unquestionably many additional ones would also have to be provided.

A schedule of training hours, probably not to exceed 10 hours a week, would be established. Regular military men would be instructors. Insofar as possible, training materials would be the same as those used by recruits on active duty in the Armed Forces. The training period would be 1 year—about 520 hours of training on the basis of 10 hours a week.

Rules for attendance, standards for marks, and other such details would be established. The enforcement provisions would be extremely strict: eligible for immediate call in the actual draft for absenteeism or continued failure to maintain satisfactory grades. There would be provisions to protect civilian selectees from unfair treatment, discriminatory instructors, and other possible injustices.

Insofar as possible, the hours of training would be set so as to interfere as little as possible with the civilian selectee's daily work and home life. I would assume that most civilian selectees would put in 4 hours on Saturday and 3 hours a night on two weekday nights for a total of 10 hours a week. Men working the 3 to 11 shift in industry—assuming industry goes on 2 or 3 shifts a day—would probably have their training mornings—4 hours on Saturday morning and 3 hours a morning on 2 weekdays for a total of 10 hours.

I am giving a very rough sketch of what I have in mind to illustrate possible training schedules. To detail it at length would require considerable time and, in addition, would not serve much

purpose because the actual hours would depend largely on the type of instruction to be given. It might well be that one 8-hour day a week with study periods at home would be preferable.

I believe 520 hours a year of such training would be the equivalent of 2 months of training as a recruit on active duty in the Armed Forces, with the exception of physical conditioning. I also believe that a person who had had such training would only need an additional 4 months of active duty to be prepared for combat assignment, if it became necessary to call him into the Armed Forces.

There probably would be at least 15,000,000 men eligible for civilian selectee service. That would give the military an additional reserve of 15,000,000 at least partially trained men to call on if needed by this Nation.

OVER-ALL MILITARY PICTURE

What would our over-all military picture be then? Assuming 2,000,000 men are already abroad, another million in this country on active duty in military camps and fully trained for combat duty, there would be another half million about half trained under the Student Military Training program, and another 15,000,000 at least partially trained under the Civilian-Selectee System. And, returning to my original point that it will take at least 6 months to transport those in camps to overseas duty, it also means that there is still more than ample time to fully train every single one in that vast reserve of manpower.

If they are needed, the military will still have an additional 6 months to give them full military training as active duty draftees because they cannot be shipped abroad for at least 6 months. They cannot because every available means of transportation will be being used to ship the million men already in camps on active duty.

Assuming my facts are true, it means that the military has at all times a constant supply of adequately trained men ready for combat just as fast as the military has means of transportation to get them overseas.

NET RESULT

The net result is this: The military has enough men, domestic production has enough men, families are not disrupted, and there is no great drain on the Nation's finances.

Certainly such a program protects home life because it leaves more men at home with their families. Certainly industry and agriculture are better off for the same reason: more men remain on their jobs. Certainly such a program means a tremendous financial saving because fewer men are receiving military pay, food, clothing, and so forth; and fewer family allotments are being paid out by the Government.

As under the student military training program, it could be decided whether or not the country is able to pay civilian selectees anything. Even if not paid, I believe most men would prefer civilian-selectee training without pay to the alternative of active military duty with pay.

Incidentally, the financial saving part is double-barreled; not only is the

Government saving money on salaries and allowances but it is actually taking in more money in the form of income taxes from men who earn more because they remain on their civilian jobs than those men would pay from their earnings in the military services.

The threefold program I have outlined is the best method I can think of to militarily guarantee national security without hurting our productive output, bankrupting the Nation, or seriously undermining our American way of life. Of course it is based on the two major assumptions: First, we are not in world war III; second, we need a 25-year long-range policy.

WILL IT WORK

Will such a program work? I do not imagine you will find a military leader in the country who will say that it will. I will be surprised if even one agrees with me in the conclusions I have drawn. But there are certain facts on which I think many will agree.

The first one, and to me the basic one, is that they cannot ship over 1,000,000 men abroad in 6 months if they use every means of transportation we now have or expect to have for another 2 years.

The second one on which I think they will agree is that a man who has had absolutely no military training of any kind can be made ready for combat duty within 10 months from the time he first enters the service. If they do not agree to that, I believe the testimony of those who know best of all should be heard: the civilians who served in the last war. They may disagree with my estimate completely—I have no way of knowing their opinion, of course—but I believe they know more about it than anyone.

ASK ANY VETERAN

The third point on which I think many military leaders may agree is that there are at least a great many details of military training that can be given to men outside of regular military camps. Let me illustrate what I mean.

A good part of the training of any recruit in the Armed Forces involves such matters as drilling, understanding commands, practice in military courtesy, learning the mechanisms of weapons, firing practice, and such matters.

Men learn to drill when they are placed in a body and are given instructions by officers. It does not matter whether the ground on which they stand is a drill field in an Army camp or a football field or lot outside of camp. It does not matter if it is an Army base gymnasium or a YMCA, school gym, auditorium, town hall or basement outside of camp. All that is needed is enough room and an instructor giving the right commands. The same thing applies to learning the commands.

A recruit must also learn to know military organization, rates and ranks, who to salute and when, and things of that nature. That is mostly classroom training that can be done practically as well outside of a camp as in it.

What about first-aid training? Can an instructor teach that as well outside a camp as in it if he has textbooks and bandages?

Learning the mechanisms of weapons is a little different. As far as small arms are concerned—revolvers, rifles, and small weapons—there's no great problem. You need the weapon, an instructor, and maybe some printed diagrams. The student learns the parts of the revolver or rifle and he practices taking it apart, putting it together, and the cleaning and proper care of it. You do not need a camp for that. The same would apply to most machine guns, I believe.

Heavier artillery poses a different problem only because of its size, and it undoubtedly would be impractical to learn too much about it outside of a camp except for book knowledge—which, incidentally, is of great importance in learning the theory and parts of heavier weapons.

Other things a recruit may learn might include study to properly identify planes, ships, tanks, and so on to be able to distinguish friendly ones from those of the enemy. That is almost completely taught by books, movie slides, toy models, and so forth. Identification can be learned just as well in any adequate room as it can in a camp classroom.

Semaphore, Morse codes, ship's lights, signal identification and things of that nature—all classroom instruction with books or slides, and so forth.

Learning the layout of a ship, nautical terms, how to tie knots, points of the compass, and so on—about a hundred percent classroom training.

Revolver firing practice is exactly the same outside of a camp as in it, provided a safe location is chosen. Any community has at least dozens of safe places and most communities already have established facilities in rod and gun clubs, police stations, and so forth. The same probably cannot be said for rifle firing but certainly there would be no great problem about revolver firing. Target practice is still target practice whether it is on a firing range, in a camp, or a safe place outside of camp.

Anyone who has ever been in the service knows from his own experience that at least 75 percent of the instruction given him in his first 3 months in active duty could be given him just about as well outside of a camp if trained instructors and proper textbooks, literature, and equipment are provided.

He would not get the rigorous physical training, of course—nothing but active duty will give him that, in my opinion—but I do not think that is overly important when we remember that he will have at least 6 months in camp once he is called to active duty. In less than 2 months of active duty the average man of 17 to 35 will probably be in as good shape as he is ever going to be.

He also will not get the discipline or the regimentation that he would on active duty—but once he is called for active duty the military will take care of that in a good deal less than 6 months.

DOES YOUR OWN COMMUNITY HAVE FACILITIES?

There is no difficulty about obtaining instructors and educational material: the military already has both available. But there is a question about facilities in which to teach.

I think a survey will disclose that most communities already have existing facilities that are adequate. Schools, armories, gymnasiums, public halls, grange halls, civic and social clubrooms, arenas, YMCA's, Legion homes, police departments, athletic fields, town halls, community halls, church basements, rod and gun club grounds, parks, and other similar facilities exist in practically every community. Most industrial communities also have large gathering places in factories and other similar buildings. There are military bases in many areas of the country that also could be of great help.

So, to begin with, I think that many, many communities would be able to provide training space in local Federal, State, town, and public buildings, together with existing private facilities, at no expense to the Government.

Of course it would also be necessary to erect suitable structures in many, if not all, sections of the country. That would run to considerable expense but it would only be a fraction of the cost of continuing under the existing system.

IT SAVES A HUNDRED BILLION DOLLARS IN 5 YEARS

Suppose a thousand facilities had to be established all over the country in places where there were no facilities of any kind. I assume it would not cost over \$200,000 at most per facility. The total cost would be about \$200,000,000. Even that relatively small cost is further minimized in that the buildings erected would have considerable value to the Government. The buildings continue to have value even after long usage and are not in the same category as food, uniforms, wages, family allowances, and so forth, which, once used, are gone forever as far as any return value to the Government is concerned.

Contrast that with the existing system of holding draftees in readiness in military camps, where the cost of 4,000,000 men a month runs to over \$1,000,000,000—or over \$12,000,000,000 a year, not counting other costs of barracks, utilities, and training expenses that would run to almost another \$10,000,000,000 or \$12,000,000,000 a year.

Five years of that under the existing system would cost over \$100,000,000,000 for 4,000,000 men in military camps in this Nation. Five years of the Civilian-Selectee System can be had for considerably less than \$1,000,000,000 total, even if the erection of training facilities has cost \$200,000,000.

I do not think providing facilities, if none be available, is any great obstacle in those circumstances.

COOPERATE OR BE DRAFTED

The next question is this: Will the civilian selectees seriously and conscientiously study, train, and cooperate? I think they will for several reasons.

First and foremost, of course, I believe they will as a patriotic duty.

Secondly, they will be impelled by recognizing the need for it if this country is to be saved.

Thirdly, the urge for civilian self-preservation and the desire to avoid active duty will be a strong factor. The system provides that failure to comply

with regulations means induction into the Armed Forces.

As I pointed out before, there will be suitable safeguards to protect the individual from any abuse of this power by military instructors. Some of the safeguards are provisions that no civilian selectees can be inducted into the Armed Forces without first having the right to a probationary period to change his ways, an appeal from the final decision, and a full review by the Civilian Selectee Board, composed exclusively of civilians.

Fourthly, domestic influences would give the civilian selectee every incentive to cooperate. He would know that suitable work would make it possible not only for him to keep on his civilian job but would also let him remain with his family. And, of course, in that situation the average wife would be a pretty safe guaranty of good training conduct by the husband.

If cooperation by any trainee is to be left to the tender mercies of either a tough sergeant or a loving wife, I am inclined to think that under the circumstances the wife will inspire even more dread than the sergeant. You can imagine the fate of any man guilty of either absenteeism or poor marks when the home and children of his wife are at stake. The wife's rolling pin in any man's marriage carries more authority than the sergeant's guardhouse in any man's army.

Boiling it down, what it comes to is this: If the civilian selectee does good work, the military should be satisfied. If he does not do good work, the military gets him and can make him cooperate, which should satisfy the military. The result should be satisfactory to the military in either event.

The program I have suggested is not going to be completely acceptable to anyone, of course. It does not give the military everything it wants but, on the other hand, neither does it give the individual or the family or agriculture or industry or the financier everything they want.

I am proceeding from the basic assumption that it is impossible to achieve 100 percent results for all the endeavors we seek to accomplish. That is necessarily so because our goals are completely opposite. We must resolve our dilemma by seeking to give reasonably adequate and satisfactory treatment to each of the many factors that must be considered. It would be very easy to arrive at an absolutely perfect solution to any one of the demands if we completely ignored the others. Unfortunately we cannot do that.

THE WHOLE PICTURE

I readily understand the insistence of the military for all the manpower they need to carry out their program. I have the same feeling for those responsible for our productive output and for those who are primarily concerned about our financial condition. Unfortunately, neither one is required to consider the difficulties of the others. Probably it is not the business of either to do that. It may be that they merely see one part of the picture and their conclusions are not based on any over-all factors.

I believe we in Congress have the responsibility of looking at the entire picture.

I do not believe any solution is proper unless it takes into account at least all the factors I have discussed. There probably are more and undoubtedly there will be different and better solutions reached by those with better information and judgment. I hope this will at least offer some ideas.

PATRIOTISM FOR ALL

While on the subject of service to this Nation, let me parenthetically mention a matter that has always disturbed me. When we think about people making sacrifices to defend this country, our minds invariably seem to turn only to those who are between the ages of 17 and 35. Our attitude there is that if this country needs those men for the Armed Forces, they are drafted at certain pay rates and that is all there is to it. They and their families get along as best they can. It may mean less food, clothing, and shelter for the draftee's dependents but that is one of the unfortunate things about war.

But the same reasoning does not seem to hold good for others. If the Government needs a high-powered executive, for example, we have to offer some "inducement" in terms of a large salary—large only in the sense that it is more than a military draftee gets. There are actually cases of vacancies in positions that are essential to national defense and attempts are being made to fill those vacancies by financial inducements to get the proper personnel. Why?

Perhaps Americans over the age of 35 should not be drafted into military service because of their age, but what about other defense duties they are physically and mentally qualified to perform? If this country needs anyone for any sort of duty that is essential to defense, why must any more "inducement" be offered to that person than to anyone called for duty in the Armed Forces? How do we rationalize calling young men without regard to whether they want to serve or not but still feel the necessity of offering inducements to those above draft age?

NOT SOLELY THE PRIVILEGE OF YOUTH

There are hundreds of illustrations of what I mean, but let me cite just one. We have ruled that civilian defense is essential to our national security. There must be a civilian director. Do we simply select the proper man and say "you are it"? Oh, no. We have to offer a salary that is "attractive" as an inducement.

I have no objection to that except insofar as it discriminates against the men in the Armed Forces and their families. If they do not need any inducement when services and sacrifices are required of them, neither does anyone else. We should simply choose anyone who is wanted and draft him into the job.

Does that mean a \$50,000-a-year man may suddenly find himself pulled out of the presidency of some corporation and put into a \$5,000-a-year job whether he wants it or not? The same thing has happened on a smaller scale to almost every man in the Armed Forces.

Patriotism and sacrifices for this Nation are not solely the privilege of those of draft age. We cannot spare anyone needed, whether it be individuals under or over the age of 35. The same applies to property and profits. If the liberty and life of the lowliest GI can be taken, anything can be taken: this is everyone's fight.

COOPERATION BETWEEN CIVILIAN AND MILITARY ESSENTIAL

Now let me resume my main discussion about the need for more cooperation and joint efforts by the civilian and military forces by briefly discussing another measure I advanced back in 1942. There are many examples similar to the one I shall take up now for purposes of illustration, but I think this will explain the point I wish to make.

Both the military and civilian populations need medical attention. There simply will not be enough doctors to take care of the needs of both if we follow the same procedure we did in World War II. In that war we largely disregarded the needs of the civilian population in order to give the military all the medical men requested. Perhaps the military did not get all the doctors they needed or wanted, I do not know, but as between the civilian population and the Armed Forces there can be no doubt that the wishes of the Armed Forces were given greater consideration.

I believe it is going to be necessary to adopt a program that will completely satisfy neither the military nor the civilian population. I think the two are going to have to share the services of many doctors.

The military must, of course, be given the full time of enough doctors to take care of the service men and women who are in our Armed Forces. But there are many, many cases where doctors can continue with their private practice and still devote some of their time to taking care of the military. That is not true of physicians called to overseas duty, of course, but it will apply to many others.

WHY NOT?

During the last war I recommended that the number of doctors on duty in military camps be reduced provided civilian doctors in adjacent communities would spend a certain part of their day either on call or on duty at the camp.

For example, there was—and is—an air base in my district in western Massachusetts with probably 500 civilian doctors practicing within a radius of 10 miles—less than 20 minutes away by automobile. If that air base needed 10 doctors, for example, to take care of the military personnel 24 hours a day, why would all 10 have to be full time military doctors? Why could not the camp get along adequately with three full time military doctors in charge supplemented by the services of many civilian doctors working on a schedule that called for duty for them at certain hours of the day at the camp?

If 10 doctors are needed 24 hours a day, the system would provide for 10 doctors at all times—but only 3 of the 10 would be full time military doctors. The other seven would be civilian physicians

rotating out of a medical pool of doctors in the area.

That system would give the military personnel adequate care and it would also enable the civilian physician to continue caring for the civilian population. Less than 4 hours a week would have been taken away from the civilian practice of each of several hundred civilian doctors—yet the total number of such hours would give the military the equivalent of full-time service by many military doctors.

What is wrong with that suggestion? Are not the bodies and illnesses of servicemen the same as those of civilians? Are not most military service exempt physicians as capable as those called for active duty?

Civilian doctors were willing to cooperate in such a system for many reasons, probably the first being patriotism. Another was the realization that such cooperation insured many doctors being available for civilian needs. A third was perhaps the hope that active duty for the physician himself might be avoided if military needs were taken care of under the system I had suggested.

We all remember the shortage of doctors for civilians in the last war. The need in the future may be even greater—probably will be because if there be a next war it will be fought largely against civilian populations.

Can the military get along with fewer doctors? Of course many doctors in the Armed Forces in World War II worked as hard or even harder than civilian doctors. But anyone who was in the service knows that there was often what seemed to be overmanning of physicians by the military. I am not referring now to cases where ships and combat units carried doctors who did very little but had to be on hand at all times in case of battle casualties. I am referring rather to doctors in camps in America.

There were often many days when many doctors did very little except put in their time. It was necessary to have the doctor on hand even if there were no business: there might be. And I want to emphasize that this is not intended as any criticism of the military medical fraternity—they had nothing to say about it. As a result, we had the anomalous situation of a scarcity of doctors at home even though many doctors in the Armed Forces were caring for patients only a few hours a day.

THE LUXURY OF WASTE

We can no longer afford any such waste of our medical manpower. The whole answer is not my suggestion but I believe it will at least ease the shortage a little bit. If we can give adequate medical service to military personnel in camps in America by a combined use of military and civilian doctors, why not do it? It will keep many doctors at home to care for their patients and will tend to keep our national health level up where it must be if America is to remain strong.

The same is perhaps true of dentists and probably there are many other similar cases in other fields. We have never felt the full brunt of the situation because we have never had it for any great

length of time. If, however, we are to adopt a long-range policy running over a great many years we will feel the impact of a shortage of physicians more than we now realize. We must prepare for it.

There are many other preparations that should be made in the light of present and probable future conditions. I pointed out earlier that we do not fully appreciate the changes that have taken place in the past 20 years that have so radically altered the world in which we live. We have not taken any positive steps to adapt ourselves to the new world. We must do so.

EDUCATION

Let me illustrate what I mean by referring to our educational system, for example. It naturally has been set up for a peacetime economy. The subjects of study have been chosen with that in mind. Emphasis on certain courses in philosophy, language, history, and so on has been the result of the world as we have known it. The changes in that world in the past 20 years have been largely disregarded by our educational authorities.

We know, for example, that there has been considerable change in the world position of Russia, India, China, France, Germany, and many other nations. New spheres of influence have replaced old ones, new peoples have emerged, and new forces on world history have been created.

Has there been any corresponding change in any of the subjects taught in our schools? Are we adequately equipping our youth for the world in which they will live? Have we forgotten that that world differs from the one into which we were graduated from school?

Subjects that might have been extremely valuable 20 years ago may not mean so much today and tomorrow may mean even less. Our students may be still studying for a world in which France and Germany were major influences, where China and Russia were vast non-entities, where Europe was dominant and Asia merely a great void—but is that the situation today? The culture, mores, and civilizations of once unimportant nations may have been of little significance once—but what about the future?

THE NEW WORLD

We must learn to know more about the peoples of the world with whom we are going to be compelled to deal. We must know their history, their ways of living, their philosophy of life, their ethnic background, and what motivates them. We must understand them before we can properly deal with them.

Very often the history of a nation will tell a great deal about the people who are the product of that history. How many schools in America offer courses in the history of Russia, China, and India, for example? How many teach the language?

We hear a great deal about the oriental mind and we are confused by such matters as "face" and other mystifying concepts that are almost meaningless to us. We overlook the fact that many people in other parts of the world often guide their lives by such concepts. Na-

tions take action that may affect us and the world and we do not comprehend why. Sometimes the reason is hidden in the history of that nation and such a situation should concern our educational authorities and the people of this Nation.

What the leaders of another nation may do is often subject to ascertainment by some knowledge of the philosophy of that nation. The stream of history often carries a people along into channels that can be predetermined and foretold once we have traced it from the source. Men often fall into a mold that has been cast by the ages. There is a pattern of life that reveals itself once some basis of understanding has been reached. Have we forgotten that?

ARE WE KEEPING UP WITH IT?

The world has been changing but there has been no corresponding change made by us in our preparation for it. I do not mean any drastic revolutionary upheaval in our educational system—I mean slight, gradual, progressive change that will keep us up to the times in which we live.

Is a change necessary? I do not know because I do not know enough about either the world or our educational system—but there are people in this country who do know and we can easily find out. I believe the matter should be thoroughly investigated in a way that I shall propose in a few minutes.

CHANCE FOR SURVIVAL

I also believe that our educational system has not met the responsibility of more adequately helping to prepare our youth for the status of military readiness that we may have to maintain for a great many years. Has there been any change in our educational system to meet the world situation that confronts us militarily?—a world situation incidentally in which our youngsters will have a better chance of survival if they are better prepared for what they must face.

I do not mean any drastic revisions of the educational curriculum but merely some slight changes that might be beneficial even in peacetime and would certainly be extremely helpful in wartime. For example, courses in first aid; Morse code; knowledge of military rates, ranks, and commands; ship and plane identification; protective measures against gas, atomic radiation, and bacteriological warfare; intercommunication systems and language; nomenclature for parts of guns, ships, tanks, and so forth.

There are many, many things that must be taught to a recruit before he is ready for combat duty. They take time to learn—all too precious time. They concern matters that we must live with today whether we want to or not. Knowledge of such matters may save lives.

Why do we not give our high school students that chance for self-protection and self-preservation by including such courses in our educational curriculum? Why do we not give our Nation that same chance for self-preservation? Most of the courses would be helpful even if we never have another world war. Under present world conditions, the

value would be inestimable—it might even mean the life of the Nation.

NO UNTAPPED RESOURCES

I do not know if there have been any conferences between our military and educational leaders to determine whether or not one may be of help to the other without any sacrifice to itself. There certainly should be many such conferences because, from here on in, we cannot overlook any untapped resource of readiness.

There are so many illustrations but in my opinion, at least, they all point to one inescapable conclusion: the need to reexamine our whole educational system in the light of present and probable future world conditions.

I believe a congressional committee should immediately be named to call in leaders in military, educational, industrial, governmental, and productive fields for a united effort to determine whether we can give better preparation to the youth of America.

We must learn immediately what, if anything, our educational system may be able to contribute to the needs of the military. We must know where there may be better cooperation. We must know what changes there have been to conform to new world conditions.

RABBITS AND TIGERS

Russia now dominates over half the world and, from all indications, may continue to do so for many years. In that situation, it is incredible to me that every high school does not offer courses in Russian history, language, and civilization.

We are going to live under air raid warning signals that are established to tell us bombs, fire, death, and destruction are coming. In that situation, it is incredible to me that every high school does not have compulsory courses in first aid, the use of fire-fighting equipment, and other protective measures that may save lives.

We are preparing our children to hunt rabbits when tigers are stalking the jungle. It is not simply that history may call us to account. It is closer than that: our own children may call us to account. What is our answer to be to them?

I think it essential to have an over-all review of our educational system as quickly as possible so that, if any changes be desired, they may be put into effect as quickly as possible. Any nation gives its children a chance to die: let us give ours a chance to live.

A REAL SURVEY

Let me emphasize that the last thing in the world that I am recommending is that the military dictate to our educational authorities or be the final judge as to what subjects should be studied by our youth. I certainly would not subscribe to that.

Neither do I believe that industry should usurp that function. Nor should our diplomatic and governmental policy makers.

I am inclined to think that those who now determine our educational policies are fully qualified to make any changes once the need has been demonstrated. A real survey should be made and rec-

ommendations advanced by leaders in education, production, military affairs, and those who determine what our national and international policies are to be. I believe hearings should be held as soon as possible by a joint congressional committee appointed for that specific purpose.

STUDENT EXCHANGE

Speaking of education and high-school students brings to my mind another matter that I discussed some months ago that should be a feature of any long-range program, in my opinion. I am referring to a proposal I made that I termed the "truth through youth" movement.

Briefly, it is a modified version of the student-exchange program. I outlined my suggestion in detail in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 19, 1950, so I will not discuss it further at this time other than to say that I believe it should play an important role in any long-range program.

ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

We also know that the future is going to see the need for more highly trained specialists to be available for governmental service in the sciences. There is going to be a shortage in all those fields of endeavor and we must prepare for it.

Perhaps a United States Scientific Academy along lines similar to the academies at West Point and Annapolis may be one answer. Let the Government select applicants to such a scientific academy with the understanding that they will be held by the Government for a service period after graduation—say 5 years, for example. That would insure this Nation of a constant source of supply of personnel to fill needs that not only now exist but will continue. It would, for example, help eliminate the shortage of doctors in rural areas; and it would also insure our scientific laboratories of adequate personnel for both peacetime and wartime efforts.

Our need for doctors, biologists, chemists, physicists, bacteriologists, engineers, and others skilled in scientific pursuits is going to increase as the complexities of our world civilization increase. Our existing system cannot keep up with the demand.

EDUCATION IS WEALTH

Not exactly the same but in keeping with the need for education is another proposal I made back in January of 1949 which I termed the Federal scholarship plan. It contemplates a program whereby qualified high-school students may go on to higher education even though they are unable to pay for it. The Government makes it possible for them to do so but at no cost to the Government.

I outlined the details of my suggestion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last year—January 25, 1949—so I will not repeat them here. In my opinion, the Federal scholarship plan I suggested should also be incorporated in any long-range program.

OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM

I believe any long-range program must also encompass an over-all review of our judicial system in the light of world con-

ditions. Over a year ago I asked the President to appoint a committee of outstanding legal authorities to survey the problem and make recommendations for necessary changes.

It is possible that present laws pertaining to arrest and introduction of evidence may no longer be adequate for the security of this Nation. It may well be that our Constitution does not place the security of any one individual above the security of the entire Nation although our present laws are susceptible of interpretations demanding that result.

Individuals who have been accused of committing acts detrimental to the Nation's security have not even been brought to trial in many cases because of laws that have not been carefully examined for many decades. Statutes of limitations, doctrines on illegal arrest, granting of mistrials, and rules of evidence have often been used as vehicles for miscarriages of justice.

In other cases, our judicial system has invited directed verdicts because of perfectly permissible legal maneuvers that have thwarted justice—if by justice we mean acquitting the innocent and convicting the guilty.

That is not theory; that is fact established by records of our courts, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Department of Justice. Some of the cases have become public property in the newspapers; still others are buried in confidential files of our law-enforcement agencies.

LAW SHOULD BE STRENGTH

A legal system that was originally established to protect the Nation and all the individuals in our Nation is failing to fulfill its functions. The courts have often had to place the Nation in jeopardy in order to fully protect every single legal right given to individuals who sought to destroy the very Nation that was protecting them. It is truly an anomalous situation when the law and the Constitution are the tools of those who would destroy our law and Constitution.

Our rules of evidence have often placed the Department of Justice in a situation that has prevented it from even bringing to trial persons believed guilty of trying to destroy this Nation. I am not talking about convicting them, now—I am talking about even bringing them to trial.

Perhaps those people were not really guilty, regardless of the amount of evidence obtained against them by the Department of Justice—I would be the last to say the Department of Justice should decide—but certainly this Nation and the people of this Nation are at least entitled to have a decision made by the courts we have established to see that justice triumphs.

Under prevailing law, and under the world conditions that exist today, the Government of the people of the United States has often had to drop cases because of disclosures of confidential matters that could be forced by defendants—disclosures that would seriously impair the security of this Nation. That is not theory—it has happened and will happen again.

THE INDIVIDUAL OR THE NATION?

Perhaps there is no solution to the problem but we must at least attempt to arrive at one. Our only attempt thus far has been by a piecemeal, makeshift approach that finds the remedy at least as bad and possibly worse than the condition.

Our legal difficulties call for an exhaustive, penetrating analysis of our legal procedure by the most competent authorities we can obtain. Recommendations should be presented and then, in their turn, those recommendations should be sifted and thoroughly analyzed to be sure that the individual is given every possible protection that is consistent with the security of the Nation. That is not the situation today.

Right now we give the individual every possible protection even if it imperils the security of the Nation. We have placed the security of an individual who seeks to destroy this Nation above the security of the Nation itself. That may or may not be true in any theoretical or academic sense but it is gospel truth as a practical matter. The net result of many legal shibboleths and rationalizations is to give one individual greater rights than those guaranteed a hundred and fifty million people.

Neither I nor anyone else wants any change of any kind that will allow the conviction of an innocent defendant. If that ever comes to pass the America we love will have passed, too. Of course, no change in our laws that would result in that would be either necessary or worthy.

CRIMES AGAINST NATIONAL SECURITY

Let me point out, too, that the emphasis in any revision of existing legal procedure should be placed primarily on matters affecting national security. Perhaps it should even be limited solely to such matters.

Perhaps all we need is a separate code for such cases as espionage, treason, sabotage, and other related matters. Perhaps what is needed is a separate tribunal with rules of evidence solely for cases of that sort in that court. The great care that must be taken in trying to institute any reform is readily apparent when we see how dangerously close we may be getting to star-chamber proceedings.

I mention that only to indicate how carefully we must proceed and why hit-or-miss methods conceived in hysteria will not do. It must be a painstaking, detailed study by the best legal minds of the country. The results of their study must be followed by a review by the Nation's best nonlegal minds. Lastly, of course, the Congress itself must decide. The final legislative decision will be reviewed by the highest court of the land and, ultimately, by the people themselves.

I have suggestions I should like to present to a properly constituted committee and probably we all do. I hesitate to offer my ideas publicly before they have been considered by legal minds of much greater knowledge and wisdom than I possess. The right committee should be able to finish cooking a half-baked idea or throw out a lemon. My

only qualification has been the very limited experience of a brief legal practice and I am the first to concede that that is not sufficient.

But there are suitable legal minds for the task and they can easily be found in our law schools, courts, and bar associations. Why not make use of their services to strengthen our internal security by strengthening our judicial system?

I wish to again renew my suggestion to the President of over a year ago that he immediately appoint a committee to begin such a study. Perhaps it will accomplish nothing—perhaps it may save this Nation—but certainly it cannot do any harm and it may do a great deal of good. Why not do it?

ECONOMY

A little earlier I mentioned that we are going to have to pull in our belts to keep this Nation solvent. It has been advisable to do it for some time but now it is imperative. It cannot be done without the cooperation of everyone in the Nation.

Taxes are going to increase, of course, regardless of every possible economy, because we must provide the financial sinews of war and defense. But the greater the economies practiced, the lesser the taxes needed. True economy does not mean simply cutting every expenditure because many expenditures provide strength for America and our people. Anything that weakens this Nation is poor economy. But there are many possible savings that can be made without hurting the Nation and they must be made.

Taxation alone will not suffice for any long-range policy. Our program must be double-barreled: taxes as low and as few as possible, economies as great and as many as possible. Only in that way can we maintain our military strength, our world position, our financial solvency, and our American way of life.

That means further cuts in some types of Government spending must be made. It probably also means depriving the general public of services and benefits to which our people have become accustomed. We had better steel ourselves because if we listen to domestic screams of anguish we will be deaf to moans on distant battlefields.

ANY CHANGE SINCE KOREA?

We should know as quickly as possible what every governmental department and agency has done to effect economy since the Korean war began. Maybe they believe no further savings are possible but, in the situation in which we find ourselves today, even "impossible" savings must be made. Let me cite just one example of what I mean—printing. I mentioned it last year. It covers merely very minor items, it is true, but pennies add up to dollars and we must begin some place.

BULLETS OR BULLETINS?

The Government prints and gives away many educational pamphlets that probably are very valuable and helpful to the public. I am not referring just to the familiar cook books, baby books, agricultural books, and so on, but also to the lesser-known books and pamphlets with

the fantastic titles. Why Jellyfish Migrate, the Sex Life of the Clam, Flying Habits of the Cuckoo, How To Measure a Cupboard, and such might be illustrative of some of the subjects covered. Probably every single one may be helpful to someone but what do they contribute in any real sense to the strength of America? Can we afford them?

Every department or agency should be required to furnish a list of every book or pamphlet upon which a loss is taken. They must be ordered to stop printing every single one that is not clearly essential to our well-being, having in mind our precarious financial situation. Incidentally, I think we in Congress could probably set them a good example by cutting down items in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Ninety percent of them are so much trash and we all know it. Some small saving might be effected there.

DUPLICATION IS EXPENSIVE

Another item has to do with congressional hearings. The House and Senate each considers substantially the same bills. Each holds hearings and copies of the testimony together with majority and minority reports are printed. The waste of time of Senators, Representatives, departments, agencies, clerks, stenographers, and witnesses in attending two hearings on the same subject is probably a fairly substantial item. The duplication in printing amounts to something, too.

That is the way the Government operates for reasons beyond my comprehension unless it be jealousy of power and authority on the part of each body of Congress. The necessity of separate reports and bills is readily discernible because, of course, each body must select its own report and write its own bill, but that can easily be done even after a joint hearing.

Would not a joint hearing eliminate double attendance by witnesses, stenographers, and clerks? Would not a joint hearing eliminate the duplication in printing? There should be no insurmountable difficulty in establishing some such time- and money-saving procedure. After all, the details would be set up by Representatives and Senators who provided for unification of the Armed Forces—and I suppose generals and admirals are as touchy and jealous of authority as Congressmen and Senators.

Perhaps such items are too small to talk about but they are painless savings. Let us begin there and continue on into the not so painless economies. It may cause some inconvenience and grumbling but that is not the governing consideration—after all, the men being drafted into military service are not getting exactly what they want, either.

GRASS ROOTS ECONOMY

I believe the public should also make a start on the so-called "Grass Roots Economy Program" I suggested in a talk on governmental expenditures several months ago. I will not go into detail here, as I went into the subject fully in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when I discussed it—June 29, 1950. In that talk I attempted to show that one branch of the Government had attempted to spend

about \$2,000,000,000 a year more than the House of Representatives thought was necessary. The total came to about \$20,000,000,000 in the period from 1940 to 1950. I suggested a program that I felt might have stopped such practices and effected economies.

I believe the proposal I termed a "grass roots economy program" would be helpful in our efforts to keep this Nation solvent and should be included in any long-range policy.

ALL THE ELEMENTS

I have not tried to give any full or detailed exposition of all the elements I believe are necessary for a rounded-out program for America. I have merely tried to indicate that America cannot embark on any sort of policy that does not provide for some cooperative effort on the part of all the phases of our civilization that combine to make the American way of life.

I do not believe we can remain strong merely by providing a great military force without regard to its effect upon our production or our economy. On the other hand, I do not believe we can keep strong by balancing our budget at the expense of the military. Neither do I think we can save our civil rights by allowing our defense secrets to be sold to the enemy. Nor do we protect our children by completely disrupting the family life of America.

The way to strength, in my opinion, lies in an over-all, united effort by all the people of America. No vital part in our strength must be either over-emphasized or underemphasized.

We must not be topheavy militarily or otherwise; we must not spend ourselves into destruction; we must not sell ourselves into bondage by throwing away our liberties; we must not deplete our productive effort; we must not destroy the American way of life. Disaster lies in all those directions.

Any single remedy that does not give consideration to at least all those factors is not the answer; it will fall of its own weight.

"BETTER TO LIGHT ONE CANDLE THAN TO CURSE THE DARKNESS"

I have proposed the solution that appeals most to my judgment. It probably is not a good solution but if even one line of it has the slightest merit, at least that is something. I believe all Congressmen should offer their own solutions, not because any of us think ours is the best, but rather in the spirit and hope that something in our suggestions may be constructive or point the way to the right answer.

I have no desire to risk the scoffings of those who will easily prove what I already admit—that I not only am not an expert on military, productive, educational, historical, legal, or financial matters—but actually I know but little of any of those things. My only excuse for this talk is what I stated in the beginning—that if I have any thoughts at all on the subject, the position demands that they be expressed for the consideration of those with greater experience, knowledge, and judgment.

I shall not mind being accused of not having spoken wisely or well so long as I know I have spoken from my conscience and to the best of my ability. That I have done and I am content.

Let me conclude by again pointing out that practically everything I have said has been based on the assumption that we are not yet in world war III. Let us hope that with the help and cooperation of all, and with the help and guidance of God, we may yet find the right policy and program that will lead to peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include excerpts from a speech made last night by Hon. Herbert Hoover.

Mr. RAMSAY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include an article.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include the text of an address made recently by the President and also the text of the emergency proclamation.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the mayor of the city of New York and a speech before the Senate Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3357. An act to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MAHON (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) for today, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 22, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. BURNSIDE introduced a bill (H. R. 9940) to provide for the evacuation of dependents of Armed Forces personnel from occupation zones or areas, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. JENNINGS introduced a bill (H. R. 9941) for the relief of Dewey Esco Hill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 22, 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:

Most gracious Father, we lift up our hearts as again o'er the earth's dark shadows the angels' song is heard, and over an earth grown old with its burden of care again the voice of the Christ Child rings out with its cheer, that mankind are the children of God.

May we see with new eyes, as Christmas comes to a world where ill will has wrought such horror, that that One whose coming breaks the ages in two is set for the falling and rising of nations; that He does not stay in the manger, He walks in our world of pretense and greed and self-seeking, and that where He goes the judgment of God goes with Him. Bending low through the gate of the child heart, may we find the simplicity, the freedom, and the truth that sword and tongue and pen can never give. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McCARRAN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 21, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On December 21, 1950:

S. 3091. An act for the relief of Master Stanley (Zachne) Hiller.

On December 22, 1950:

S. 3329. An act for the relief of Kiyomi Kitamura;

S. 3430. An act for the relief of Martina Arnalz Zarandona (Sister Blanca Eugenia);

S. 3444. An act for the relief of Victor Francis Oberschall; and

S. 4111. An act for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 108) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.